CANADA

HOUSE OF COMMONS DEBATES

OFFICIAL REPORT

SECOND SESSION—TWENTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT

19 ELIZABETH II

VOLUME VIII, 1970

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE FIFTH DAY OF JUNE, 1970,
TO THE SEVENTH DAY OF OCTOBER, 1970, INCLUSIVE.

INDEX ISSUED IN A SEPARATE VOLUME

Queen's Printer for Canada, Ottawa, 1970

22478—1½

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, June 5, 1970

The House met at 11 a.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND NATIONAL DEFENCE

Eighth report of Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence—Mr. Wahn.

[*Translation*]

MISCELLANEOUS ESTIMATES

Sixth report of Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates, in both official languages—Mr. Serré (on behalf of the chairman).

[*English*]

JUSTICE AND LEGAL AFFAIRS

Fourteenth report of Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs—Mr. Murphy.

[*Editor's Note: For text of above reports, see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. May I ask the Acting Prime Minister if we can expect more than this corporal's guard of ministers for the question period before it is over?

Mr. McIlraith: I do not think that question is a point of order at all and it should not have been raised under the guise of one.

TAXATION

WHITE PAPER ON REFORM—REPRESENTATIONS BY PRIVATE INTERESTS TO STANDING COMMITTEE

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): I should like to ask the Acting Prime Minister whether he approves of the decision by the Liberal majority on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs to bring down the guillotine on the hearing of representations from the private sector in regard to white paper on taxation?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have some doubts about the question. The hon. member is asking the Acting Prime Minister to comment on the proceedings of the committee. I wonder whether a question asked in those terms is acceptable. The hon. member is knowledgeable in the rules of the House. Perhaps he might like to rephrase the question.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Is it government policy to bring down the guillotine on the hearing of representations by the Finance Committee from the private sector on the question of the white paper?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Acting Prime Minister): It is well known that the conduct of committees in matters referred to them is their own responsibility. I have no comment—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. McIlraith: —to make—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McIlraith: —about the conduct of the committee in its own work on matters referred to it. Any opinion I have on that subject would only be available in the House when the subject matter is being debated here as a proper item of business.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): I am asking the Acting Prime Minister whether any instructions were given with regard to the length of the hearings for representations by the public?

Mr. McIlraith: No, Mr. Speaker. No government of which I am a member—certainly no Liberal government—would instruct the members of a committee. The only authority empowered to instruct a committee is the House of Commons itself.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): I would like to ask the Acting Prime Minister if he does not think that the Prime Minister has

already done enough to destroy the parliamentary processes without inhibiting free discussion of this matter in this way?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I think that is a most improper suggestion by the Acting Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

ENERGY

UNITED STATES POSITION RESPECTING CONTINENTAL POLICY—INCREASED U.S. IMPORTS OF VENEZUELAN OIL

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, in the not unusual absence of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources may I direct a question to the acting minister. More than a week ago I asked the minister a question regarding a letter which was sent to 25 United States senators from the office of the President of the United States. The relevant sentence in that letter which I asked him about was the following:

> The national security of the United States requires the conclusion of a comprehensive agreement with Canada with respect to all energy matters and the imposition of some quantitative limitations on the entry of Canadian petroleum pending the conclusion of such a pact.

The minister undertook to ascertain from the United States government whether or not the statement in this letter represented American policy. Can the acting minister now tell the House whether or not he has received a reply from the United States, and what is the nature of that reply?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Acting Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I believe that at this point in time a reply has not been received but I would like to check that more accurately.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Has the Canadian government been informed or has it made any inquiries regarding the announcement yesterday by the government of the United States that they are increasing their importation of Venezuelan oil at a time when they are curtailing importation of Canadian oil? Also, can the acting minister tell the House, first of all, what is the size of these increases in imports of Venezuelan oil and whether or not this action is related to the American attempt to influence Canadians into accepting the continental energy policy referred to in the letter from the President's office?

[Mr. Baldwin.]

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, as far as I know the size of the change in regard to Venezuela was not announced, and of course I certainly would not comment on the motivation behind the increase as part of the over-all policy changes going on in the United States.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Has the minister had his attention drawn to the statement of the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission in Washington last Wednesday in which he said that the United States is especially short of natural gas and electricity and the Nixon administration is using the carrot of a bigger market for Canadian crude oil to gain more Canadian natural gas and electricity? Also, is the department making any inquiries whether or not the Chairman was stating American policy as was indicated by the letter from President Nixon's office to which I have already referred?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I would not read that as a statement of policy at all. Of course we have been aware for some time of the importance to the United States of various kinds of energy available in Canada, particularly natural gas, and have tried to be as aware of its value to the United States as possible in the course of our negotiations and discussions with them.

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister whether the Canadian government was either consulted or notified of this announcement?

Mr. Lang: I would want to check that, Mr. Speaker.

BUILDING OF PIPELINE FROM WESTERN CANADA TO EASTERN MARKET

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the acting minister this question. In view of the important and deleterious effect of the United States announcement yesterday regarding Venezuelan oil on the shipment of western Canadian oil, would the government give new consideration to making public any studies which have been prepared either by the department or by private sources of the advantages or disadvantages of building a pipeline to Montreal so that the Quebec market could be supplied with western oil?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Acting Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I shall bring that representation to the

attention of the minister, although I am surprised that there can be comment on the impact of the change when the size of the change is not known.

[*Translation*]

INDIAN AFFAIRS

ESTABLISHMENT OF SEPARATE MINISTRY

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, since the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for External Affairs are absent, I direct my question to the Acting Prime Minister.

Yesterday, the Indians of Canada met the cabinet and submitted a brief. Could the Acting Prime Minister tell the House whether the government intends to create a separate Indian affairs department?

[*English*]

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Acting Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, as acting minister in the absence of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development I can assure the hon. member that the recommendations made to the Prime Minister and the cabinet yesterday were very respectfully received. They were very interesting and very constructive. The government is going to address itself to the examination of the options suggested by the Indian leaders, including that kind of recommendation, but they are so wide-ranging that some time is going to be required, as the Indian leaders fully understand, to examine all the suggestions before any decision is made.

WIDENING OF TERMS OF REFERENCE OF CLAIMS COMMISSIONER TO COVER CLAIMS OF NON-TREATY INDIANS

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): As a result of the discussions yesterday and previously, is the government considering widening the terms of reference of the Claims Commissioner to include claims of the native people—Indians and Eskimos—in areas of the north not now covered by treaty and which consequently cannot be pressed before the commission?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Acting Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): I note the hon. member's question, Mr. Speaker, and with respect, suggest that I could not add anything to the answer I gave a minute ago about the wide range of the recommendations made yesterday, all of which must be examined by the government before any pronouncement is made.

Mr. Baldwin: In view of the claims that have been advanced, including those by the native people of northern Quebec, will the minister please put this matter before the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and the government so that adequate study can be given to this very important and current issue?

ESTABLISHMENT OF CONSULTATIVE BODY

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): In view of the fact that the Indian people yesterday made two suggestions, among others, of an immediate nature, one of which related to the creation of a new consultative body mutually acceptable to both the government and the Indians to deal with certain matters because of their urgency, would the minister agree to give that a priority position and arrange to have some statement made by the government on Monday or Tuesday of next week on its response to that request?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Acting Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I could, of course, make no such commitment in my present capacity, but I shall be glad to draw the representation to the attention of the minister and ask him to provide a response at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): As a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can put the same question to the Acting Prime Minister who may have a little bit more authority.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Acting Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker. The Acting Prime Minister has nothing to add to what has been said.

POLLUTION

ABILITY OF FOREIGN-REGISTERED SHIPS TO PREVENT OIL SPILLS

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address my question to the Minister of Transport. With regard to the press conference held yesterday by Dr. Patrick McTaggart-Cowan concerning the inadequacies of many ships flying flags of convenience in being able to prevent pollution and oil spills, is the government taking steps to bring this matter before an international forum?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Yes, Mr. Speaker. In fact, we did so in Brussels in November of last year. In addition, as I have advised the House from time to time, we are presently working on considerable and substantial changes in the Canada Shipping Act which will have the effect of bringing about the improvements that Dr. McTaggart-Cowan along with others, myself included, agreed with.

Mr. Aiken: Can the minister indicate when these amendments may be ready for consideration by the House?

Mr. Jamieson: I wish I could be precise, Mr. Speaker. I would question very much if it will be possible to have the entire legislation completed during the current session. What I would hope, however, is that we could table the changes or make them public in some way so that there would be time over the next couple of months for the various interests to comment on them.

CHEDABUCTO BAY—COST OF REMOVING OIL

Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Central Nova): Are reports correct that the pollution from the *Arrow* will cost the people of Canada about $3 million?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, no final figure or assessment has been possible yet because the work is still going on. I can certainly say that not all of the amount will be a burden that will have to be borne by the Canadian people. There is a very considerable sum that we know has been earmarked out of insurance funds to offset the expenditures. The legal people in my department and the Department of Justice are now examining other routes that we might take to obtain a larger percentage of compensation from those who are responsible, once the inquiry determines in law who those people are.

CHEDABUCTO BAY—PUBLICATION OF TASK FORCE FINDINGS

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Will the research findings of the task force headed by Dr. Patrick McTaggart-Cowan be made public when the minister receives them so that we may have a chance to examine what we hope will be some important new knowledge?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, there are three companion efforts under way. One is the inquiry by Mr. Justice Hart of Nova Scotia into the cause of the grounding of the *Arrow*. Some of the evidence has been published already. Second, Mr. Justice Hart will then proceed to conduct an inquiry into the events that occurred subsequent to the grounding of the *Arrow* and, third, Dr. McTaggart-Cowan is preparing a very comprehensive report along with the other scientists who have been involved in this matter. I expect that the report in the third aspect will be available by about the first of September.

INDUSTRY

MEASURES TO ASSIST AUTOMOBILE MANUFACTURERS FOLLOWING FREEING OF DOLLAR EXCHANGE RATE

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Inasmuch as the recent unpegging of the Canadian dollar will have the effect of providing further advantages for the sale of foreign automobiles in the country and hence further aggravate the depressed condition of the automobile industry in Canada, can the minister say whether any offsetting measures are being considered to assist Canadian automobile manufacturers in light of this development and the current slowdown in the sale of passenger cars in Canada which is affecting the employment situation very considerably?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member may recall that we had a lengthy debate on this very point. Perhaps the hon. member did not receive the information he is seeking. It seems to me that if additional information is to be given at this time, it should be given to the House by way of a statement on motions.

Mr. Mazankowski: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, this matter was not dealt with in the debate. I believe it is a very urgent and pressing problem and I think that the minister—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I must say to the hon. member that that is not a question of privilege. I suggest that the information the hon. member is seeking is of a very general nature. If he has not obtained the information which he believes he is entitled to, may I suggest to him that he might ask whether it will be given to the House by way of a statement on motions. The hon. member might like to inquire whether such a statement is being contemplated.

Mr. Mazankowski: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister consider making a statement on motions to the House very soon concerning this very urgent and pressing matter which affects many automobile dealers and employees across the country?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): No, Mr. Speaker, but I hope the hon. member can find a way to ask a question to which I can answer.

Mr. Baldwin: That is impossible.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I will try to bring my question down to that level which the minister can understand.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacInnis: Does the minister consider it an intrusion on his responsibilities as Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce or on the responsibilities of any other ministers for the Minister of National Health and Welfare to go before the public and suggest that they buy foreign cars?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Mazankowski: On a question of privilege—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is now rising on a question of privilege. Although I have suggested that a statement ought to be made on motions, the hon. member for Vegreville seems to consider the matter very urgent and the minister seems anxious to reply. Possibly by agreement the minister might be allowed to reply to the question which has been ruled out of order.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, I was going to say that the advantages that Canadian automobile manufacturers and auto parts makers have gained from the auto pact are well known. Even this year exports have increased by 7.7 per cent, as reported in yesterday's *Globe and Mail*. Another very brilliant article in the same paper reported on the tremendous progress which had been made by the Industry. This article was, I am told, written before revaluation. The effects of revaluation are not yet clear. I have consulted with a number of auto parts makers, but they do not know exactly. We think that because of the advantages gained, because of the progress made in previous years and because of the government's programs for general adjustment, etc., they are, I assume, in a position to cope rather well with the new situation. We are willing and eager to help if some of them get into difficulty.

Mr. Mazankowski: I appreciate the answer of the minister. In view of the fact that sales of domestic passenger cars have decreased by 20 per cent while sales of foreign passenger cars have increased by 27 per cent, does the minister not consider this a matter of great urgency?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member's supplementary question is obviously argumentative. It is not acceptable in those terms.

Mr. MacInnis: A supplementary question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Will the minister explain to the House what advantages there are to the auto pact in the purchase of Volkswagens as recommended by the Minister of National Health and Welfare?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Again I think we are engaging in a field of debate. I respectfully suggest to both hon. members that this is the kind of information which ought normally to be included in a statement on motions.

AGRICULTURE

AVAILABILITY OF PAPER ON SUPPLY

Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent-Essex): I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Since supply forms the basis of much of the current agricultural legislation, can the minister indicate whether the paper commissioned on supply and not reported in the official task force report can be expected in the near future? Also, will it be made available immediately to the members of the House?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, when I understand more clearly what the hon. member is referring to I will see if I can obtain this paper from the task force. Following that, I will see whether it is the type of paper that should be made public.

GRAIN

PAYMENT OF ELEVATOR AGENTS FOR ASSISTANCE IN FILING OPERATION LIFT INFORMATION

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): My question is for the Minister without Portfolio in charge of the Wheat Board. In view of the fact that

elevator agents are expected to assist grain producers in the filing of necessary information for Operation Lift and in view of the fact that this additional workload comes at a time of year when the elevator agents already have a very heavy workload, can the minister indicate whether some reasonable remuneration will be made to elevator agents in recognition of their performance of these added duties?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, the matter of the work involved in completing these forms was discussed with the various elevator companies. They gladly agreed to take on this work as part of their regular customer services.

Mr. Burton: Has this matter been discussed with the employees of the various elevator companies? Have any representations been received from any employees of elevator companies or employee organizations? If so, what has been the response of the minister or the Wheat Board to the representations?

Mr. Lang: No representations have come to my attention, Mr. Speaker. I will have to check to see whether any have been received by the Wheat Board or my office that have not yet reached me. Our discussions, of course, were with the companies.

[*Translation*]

DISCUSSION WITH PREMIER THATCHER OF BARTERING OF WHEAT

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the minister.

Since the premier of Saskatchewan said that the minister was naïve regarding the present situation in Saskatchewan, has the minister had talks with Premier Thatcher about the barter of wheat against other commodities from foreign countries and has he taken a new approach to the problem?

[*English*]

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): There have been many exchanges between myself and several of my colleagues and the government of Saskatchewan, and we have not revised our position in connection with the dangers involved in certain transactions which were suggested by Saskatchewan.

WHEAT BOARD DEMAND FOR REPAYMENT OF CASH ADVANCES

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): I have a question for the Minister without Portfolio in charge of the Wheat Board following a question I asked him yesterday, now that he has had an opportunity to familiarize himself with the recent action of the Canadian Wheat Board in sending certain letters to farmers in connection with overdue accounts. Will the minister advise the House whether it is the intention of the Wheat Board to add interest on accounts due when farmers are unable to deliver wheat to repay their cash advances?

[Mr. Burton.]

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): It is not the intention of the Wheat Board to treat as in default and therefore as subject to interest charges anyone who has been delivering grain as opportunity presented. The board issued a press release affirming this situation on June 4.

Mr. Gleave: May we have a copy of the document or of the decision made by the Canadian Wheat Board? Further, will the board now write letters to those farmers of whom it demanded payment of principal and interest, pointing out to them that as long as they have wheat on hand they need not comply with the request which was made?

Mr. Lang: Without doubt there has been confusion raised in the minds of some of the producers. I will check to see whether the release by the board has adequately dealt with this confusion. It should be forcefully stated that the Wheat Board had intended to draw to the attention of producers only the amount outstanding from the 1968-69 crop year and has now affirmed that as long as producers are making deliveries they will not be placed in default.

PROVISION OF FOUR-BUSHEL QUOTA TO ALL ELEVATOR POINTS BY JULY 31

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Can the minister still guarantee a four-bushel quota by July 31 to all country elevator points?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): We have said a number of times that the four-bushel quota should be available to all producers for the crop year.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

MIDDLE EAST—CANADIAN OFFER RESPECTING PEACEKEEPING FORCE

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): My question is directed to the Minister of National Defence. In view of the offer made

by the Secretary of State for External Affairs in connection with a United Nations peacekeeping force in the Middle East, may I inquire as to the nature of the Canadian offer? Is one battalion now available or is a battalion ready on a stand-by basis? What is the extent of the offer?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): I do not know any more about this offer than does the hon. member.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Cadieux (Labelle): I believe it would be preferable to await the return of the Secretary of State for External Affairs when no doubt further clarification will be possible.

Mr. Fairweather: May we be assured that Canada will respond to requests for peacekeeping in the Middle East or anywhere else only if they originate with the Security Council and after ground rules have been clearly established?

Mr. Cadieux (Labelle): I understand that such requests generally originate with the Security Council.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Will the minister advise the House whether he has been consulted by the Secretary of State for External Affairs to ascertain whether sufficient forces are available to carry out any commitment which the Secretary of State might make or offer to make?

Mr. Speaker: I doubt that the hon. member's question is in order when he asks whether there has been consultation between two ministers. Perhaps the question might be rephrased.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): The hon. gentleman gave us to understand he was not aware of the nature of the offer. My question, naturally, is: are there sufficient troops available to carry out a commitment of the kind suggested? It has been indicated that there are not.

Mr. Cadieux (Labelle): Even though you did not allow the question, Mr. Speaker, perhaps you will permit me to answer it. I would say there are sufficient troops to take care of the kind of operation envisaged. We have discussed on many occasions—the Secretary of State for External Affairs, the Minister of National Defence and the cabinet, as a matter of fact—what type of commitment could be undertaken, what facilities would be required and the number of troops likely to be involved. I am sure the kind of offer about which the Secretary of State for External Affairs was talking could be met by the resources available to us.

TRANSPORT

NOTICE BY RAILWAYS OF INTENTION TO ABANDON PASSENGER SERVICES

Mr. Jack Cullen (Sarnia): I have a question for the Minister of Transport. Would the minister use his considerable influence to request that Canadian National Railways extend the courtesy of informing a community well in advance of its intention to cancel passenger train service and not adopt a secretive policy as is being followed in cancelling the Toronto-Chicago service which is Sarnia's only international train service?

Mr. Speaker: It is obvious that the hon. member's question has been put in the form of a submission. He will have to assume that the representation has been noted.

Mr. Cullen: May I make a supplementary submission, Mr. Speaker?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: According to the rules, the hon. member is only entitled to a related submission.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Cullen: It is related, Mr. Speaker. Would the government give consideration to the passing of legislation requiring the CNR and the CPR to return property to the people of Canada each time they reduce a service?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ABANDONMENT OF RAILWAY PASSENGER SERVICES—SUPPLYING OF EXPENSE FIGURES

Mr. W. M. Howe (Wellington-Grey): Bearing in mind the very large number of applications made by the railway companies to abandon passenger services, would the minister consider introducing amending legislation which would oblige the railways to supply all the figures with regard to expenses in connection with these applications for withdrawal of service?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): This question has been raised on previous occasions and the objections are well known to the hon. member. Figures are pro-

vided for the Canadian Transport Commission and are taken into account by that commission when decisions are made following public hearings.

TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

REFERENCE OF ANNUAL REPORTS OF AIR CANADA AND CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS TO STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): As a means of throwing further light on the question of abandonment of railway passenger service, would the minister use his good offices to ensure that the annual reports of Canadian National Railways and Air Canada are placed before the Transport Committee for consideration?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): I answered this question a few days ago, Mr. Speaker, when I indicated that it is entirely within the power of the committee to set its own schedule. I understand there is an important matter now before the Transport Committee. I do not believe there will be a long delay in getting these other matters attended to once this subject has been dealt with.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

EFFECT ON PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF FORCES ABROAD OF INCREASED VALUE OF DOLLAR

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpeque): Are Canadian Forces stationed abroad receiving the full benefit of the increased value of the Canadian dollar since it has been allowed to float? What is the situation as far as their pay and allowances are concerned?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): It is a floating situation, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. MacLean: May I ask whether Canadian Forces abroad are being paid in Canadian dollars or whether they are paid in the currency of the country concerned at the rate of exchange current on pay-day?

Mr. Cadieux (Labelle): I would have to check.

VIOLENT DISTURBANCES

MONTREAL—BOMB EXPLOSIONS—CO-OPERATION BY ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE WITH OTHER FORCES

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): My question is for the Solicitor General in his capacity as the minister reporting to the House for the RCMP. Has he had an opportunity to check the serious allegations that the RCMP is not co-operating with other police forces in connection with investigation of the outrages in Montreal in the last few days?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Yes, Mr. Speaker. Immediately I saw the story published in the paper I had this matter checked into and find—

Mr. Fairweather: Is it a canard?

Mr. McIlraith: Yes, it is. That is precisely the point, and today's newspapers so indicate.

INDUSTRY

FOOTWEAR—MEETING WITH INDUSTRY REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. It refers to a question I asked the minister earlier this week regarding a meeting with the shoe industry, at which time the minister indicated he would be having such a meeting. May I ask whether the date for that meeting has been set and whether he will be attending that meeting with an agenda?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): No, Mr. Speaker, the date as far as I know has not been set but I have asked that a meeting be arranged and I have heard noises to the effect that it was being arranged. Apparently the industry is as pleased to see the Minister of Finance and myself as we are to see the industry. The agenda has not been fixed. A report has already been published on the subject by the shoe industry but the meeting will be of an investigatory nature.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

MINISTERS' ATTENDANCE ROSTER

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Government House Leader. I welcome him back to the House and I hope he notes that in his absence we made considerable progress. Has the government officially dispensed with the revised roster issued on October 20 last, because according to that list seven ministers are absent today, or does the government intend to dispense with this phase of parliamentary activity altogether?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, with regard to the responsible departments the hon. member will realize that in particular several of my colleagues are attending the finance ministers conference at Winnipeg. I can assure him that the roster system will continue in force and that if he has any questions for any of the departments set down for today he can ask his questions.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, this question is prompted by the fact that we must be in a position to be able to prepare ourselves for this phase of parliamentary activity. Does the government intend to revise the list in light of the experience of very poor attendance as a result of the present list?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I suppose we might review it in light of the experience of the very poor attendance of the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Horner: The Leader of the Opposition is not responsible for any department.

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. R. E. McKinley (Huron): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Acting Prime Minister. Now that the government has seen fit to use closure in the committee hearings on the white paper on taxation, is this an indication that it is prepared to use closure in respect of the resulting legislation in order to get it through the House?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

HUMAN RIGHTS

ALLEGED RACIAL DISCRIMINATION AT GOOSE BAY U.S. AIR FORCE BASE

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, some days ago I directed a question to the Solicitor General regarding complaints by the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured Peoples concerning racial discrimination at the United States air force base at Goose Bay, Labrador. In view of the fact that Canadians have now expressed concern regarding the investigation by security police of the United States of Canadian girls who are dated by coloured servicemen, a fact which has now been confirmed by one of the American sergeants, I should like to ask the Solicitor General if he has looked into this matter and can give the House any report on the result of his investigation?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, this matter is being quite thoroughly looked into. I am unable to confirm or deny the hon. member's allegations or the information he has but in any event I hope to be able to have a report on the matter brought forward. I regret it has not been possible to do so before now but it is simply because the report was not completed.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN CANADA AND UNITED STATES RESPECTING U.S. GOOSE BAY AIR FORCE BASE

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of National Defence. In view of the fact that the Solicitor General the other day said that only those matters relating to Canadian jurisdiction could be looked into, would the minister undertake to table the agreement between Canada and the United States with relation to the setting up of the U.S. air force base at Goose Bay?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, if there is such an agreement between Canada and the United States I would be willing to table it, but I am wondering whether this agreement was undertaken during the war because at that time it would have been with the British government. I am not quite sure about this. Whatever document we have I am willing to table.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

SALE OF HMCS "BONAVENTURE"—OFFER BY JAMES MARTIN—DISPOSAL TO FOREIGN INTERESTS

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister of National Defence. It has something to do with a floating situation which has been pegged. It concerns HMCS *Bonaventure*. Has the government received any offers for the HMCS *Bonaventure*?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): I believe that through the Department of Supply and Services we have received a few offers. I do not know whether they are being actively considered. Some of them were quite challenging and involved things like bringing the *Bonaventure* to the western prairies.

Mr. Paproski: Mr. Speaker, would the minister please state whether he plans to accept

the offer of $500,000 by James Martin of Edmonton who plans to peg it at the west coast as a recreational centre?

Mr. Speaker: I do not think this question is in order. If the hon. member considers this to be a matter of urgency he might wish to ask the question at the time of adjournment.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I have a question supplementary to that asked a moment ago by the hon. member for Edmonton Centre. It is directed to the Minister of National Defence. Will the Minister of National Defence give his assurance that the *Bonaventure* will be sold only to Canadian interests and not to some foreign power which may use it to add to its own naval force?

Mr. Cadieux (Labelle): Mr. Speaker, it would be inconsequential if I were to give such an assurance because we have offered it for sale to many foreign governments.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

WALK-OUT BY LINESMEN AND DOCK WORKERS —ACTION TO PREVENT SIMILAR OCCURRENCES

Mr. W. C. Scott (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Speaker, this question is for the Minister of Transport. It deals with the wildcat strike called on the St. Lawrence Seaway which lasted for 36 to 40 hours and tied up 30 to 40 ships. What action is his department considering taking to avoid such an occurrence in the future?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, about the only thing we can do is ask any employees who are involved not to undertake wildcat strikes which are not known of until they occur.

Mr. Scott: Does the minister consider that any action will be taken by the companies to compensate them for the loss they suffered while their ships were tied up, probably due to the negligence of the department?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

INDUSTRY

CLOSING OF GOLD MINE, GERALDTON, ONT.— ACTION TO ASSIST COMMUNITY

Mr. B. Keith Penner (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance but in his absence I will direct it to the Minister without Portfolio from Windsor West. It was announced yesterday that the MacLeod-Mosher division of Lakeshore Mines in Geraldton, Ontario, will close its gold mining operation at the end of this month. More than 200 men will be affected by this closure and the economy of Geraldton will be seriously hurt. Company officials claim they are forced to close as a consequence of the freeing of the dollar. What steps is the government prepared to take to assist this community which will be so adversely affected?

Hon. Herb Gray (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, this matter is being looked into not only by the Department of Finance but also by the Department of Manpower and the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, and I hope to have further information for the hon. member early next week.

NATIONAL CAPITAL

COMMISSION CHAIRMAN, HARRINGTON LAKE AND OTTAWA RIVER POLLUTION

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting Prime Minister. I should like to congratulate him again for doing an excellent job.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Bell: I wonder whether the Acting Prime Minister can answer my question of last Friday and report on any progress in respect of unresolved Ottawa matters such as the Fullerton dispute, the takeover of Harrington Lake and the pollution in the Ottawa River?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, while I am aware that pollution is a very important subject before parliament, I think it would be quite improper for me to seek to give a treatise in answer to a question on orders of the day.

Mr. Baldwin: We like you when you are improper.

Mr. Fairweather: Are you having a garden party for Mr. Fullerton?

PENITENTIARIES

REQUEST FOR PUBLIC INQUIRY INTO CONDITIONS

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): My question is directed to the Solicitor General. In view of

the potentially explosive situation in the penitentiaries because of the conditions prevailing in some of these institutions across Canada and the recent suicide of a 19-year old at Prince Albert penitentiary, would the Solicitor General initiate a public inquiry into the conditions prevailing in penitentiaries and the increase in the number of suicides that have taken place there?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): I welcome the members of the House of Commons committee on Justice and Legal Affairs who have just returned early this morning, I believe, from a tour of four or five of the institutions in the penitentiary service in western Canada. I have not yet had an opportunity to obtain information from any of them as to what they found, but I will take the hon. member's suggestion under consideration after I find out what the standing committee has learned on this matter.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

INVESTIGATION OF FREIGHT TRAIN DERAILMENTS IN NEWFOUNDLAND

Mr. Ambrose Hubert Peddle (Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador): Mr. Speaker, may I raise a brief point of order before I ask my question. I was a rather heavy smoker and I just gave it up, so when I rise in future it will be to catch Your Honour's eye to ask a question.

My question is directed to the Minister of Transport. In view of the extraordinary number of CNR freight train derailments in Newfoundland in recent months, in the latest of which a number of cattle ended up as hamburger, would the minister have his department investigate and report on these derailments in the interest of saving human lives in the future?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will be very glad to look into the matter.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. May I say that once again there have been what we call usual discussions. I think it will be found there is general agreement with respect to today's debate under Standing Order 58 for the principal speakers for each party to be allowed 20 minutes and all the rest 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker: Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: It is so ordered.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 58—ALLEGED FAILURE OF GOVERNMENT AGRICULTURAL POLICIES

Mr. A. P. Gleave moved:

That this House calls upon the government to reverse its present policies which have deliberately depressed the agricultural economy of this country, causing excessive unemployment, lack of income, slow economic growth and little hope for the future, and this House urges the government to take positive measures to ensure a dynamic rural community as an essential component of Canadian society.

He said: In speaking to this motion, I may say that our objective is to bring to the attention of this House and also of the country the situation that faces farmers as well as the urgent importance of providing for the needs of farmers in this country. The recent revaluation of the dollar threw into rather sharp focus the need to take measures to protect the income of farmers and to see that they share in the opportunities for improving their standard of living within the Canadian economy. The fact that when the dollar was revalued the offering price of wheat immediately dropped some 6 cents a bushel throws into sharp relief what happens when the fiscal policies of this or any other government are controlled and directed toward objectives that often are not helpful to the farmer. The same thing happened with regard to the sale of beef. The revaluation of the dollar had a generally depressing effect on many parts of agriculture. There was intrinsically and basically good reason for the government taking the action that it did with regard to the relationship of our dollar to other currencies, but there is a great contrast between the haste with which they moved to protect the textile industry and their lack of action to protect the farming industry, more particularly the grain industry.

• (12 noon)

Undoubtedly, the same pattern will be found in our export trade. At the time the International Grains Arrangement was negotiated, and this was a transaction between governments, the minimum price established was $1.95½. The government of the day, the same government we have now, saw fit to

support the price and to guarantee it to the farmers of western Canada for a relatively short period of time. They took good care to point out that it would be supported for a relatively short period of time. I say that at this time there are even better reasons for the institution of price support to bolster and maintain farm income even at that level, and this despite the fact that costs to farmers have increased since the agreement was signed. Indeed, the task force on agriculture recommended that we do away with the regular reports of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics which reflect the cost of goods and services to farmers. Whether or not the task force was right remains open to debate. What they said was that the index is out of date and does not accurately reflect the real costs with which farmers are faced at the present time. In the light of these facts, surely there is excellent reason for supporting the price of grain, and indeed of other farm products, and for ensuring that the farmers remain at least on an even keel during this period of rapid transition.

I would say that the trade programs which we have followed have been ad hoc. From what I can see, there has not been a definite pattern in our trade programs. The Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin), on coming back from a trip to New Zealand and Australia a year ago, I believe, announced to the House that New Zealand beef and meat products would have increased access to Canada. This is what happened. According to the information which I received from the Department of Agriculture, our meat products imports from Australia increased from 9,306,000 pounds in 1967 to some 29,388,000 pounds in 1969, and from New Zealand the increase was from 5,506,000 pounds in 1967 to 74,803,000 pounds in 1969. These are pretty substantial increases, and according to press reports much of this product is moving on through to the United States. I inquired as to how much was moving through to the United States, but was unable to get any figure.

Surely we ought to have a clear, constructive approach to our trade policies. Those in farming and agriculture do not suggest that we can build a fence around Canada, with trade patterns as they exist in this day and age. That is not possible, but we could have a constructive policy, and we could have an idea of where we are going. At a point in time when we are saying to the western farmer, "You cannot seed 29 million acres of wheat each year, or 24 million acres of wheat each year, or even possibly 20 million acres of wheat each year," we have looked with approval upon an increase in the importation of meat products into Canada. Those who are familiar with the economy of western Canada know that beef and pork, especially beef, can provide an alternative use for the land which farmers are advised must be removed from wheat.

We are advised by the task force that what acreage must be reduced. The government has instituted a very severe program to reduce the wheat acreage in the west. At the same time, the task force has advised the dairy farmer in eastern Canada, in certain instances, to move from dairy production into beef production. We know that there are two markets for Canadian red meats. One of those markets is in Canada, and the other is in the United States. These are the only two markets upon which we can depend. The United States is the export market which we can penetrate, but we do not advance our farmers' cause if we permit, and even more than that encourage, importation of red meats into our domestic market, then send some of those exports into the United States. This may eventually cause some restrictions to be placed on our export of red meats to the U.S. market.

It is about time we had a more clear definition of Canada's policy on this aspect of trade, as well as on other aspects. But at the same time, and to the credit of the government, we know they are providing credit facilities in an effort to find increasing markets for our grain and wheat. Again to the government's credit, they have negotiated toward a better tariff structure with Japan so that we can move more effectively into that market with our grain. Mr. Speaker, let us put together a more complete policy covering the whole picture, so that the farmer may have some confidence as to what his objective may be, what he may aim for, and where he may safely invest money which he has to borrow at high interest rates. Let us give the farmer a clear idea of the markets available to him.

Compare this policy which I have just described with the policy which is applied to the automobile industry, and it can be seen that there is quite a contrast. In the one, we have a trade policy which permits those who are investing to have a good idea of the market potential which has been reached by agreement between countries. As a result of

that agreement with our southern neighbour, investors here can gear up to meet that market. But the western farmer who is advised by the government to move into beef production may say, "Wait a minute; what kind of imports from other countries must I compete against? What kind of costs am I to anticipate? How secure is the market?" These are questions the farmer asks himself when he tools up. What is the monetary policy of the government if I invest, and how far can I look ahead?

The government should look toward stabilizing income. Certainly, I think that it is the intention of the government, through the provisions of Bill C-197, to look toward a stabilizing factor in marketing across Canada. This will have a positive effect, but as against that when I asked the minister questions about the cash advance program I discovered that farmers who have followed this program are now facing demands for repayment, and have no way of meeting those demands. This is an inconsistency in policy which should be removed. We need a consistent approach to the type of farming which we hope to have, and to the type of capital organization that we desire in Canada. I am going a bit far afield, Mr. Speaker, but the task force on agriculture decided to deal with this aspect. It must have been within their terms of reference and they must have thought it important. Unfortunately, as I read the report of the task force I judge that they favour an increase in corporate farming, larger and larger aggregates of feed lots concentrated in certain places, and feel this would be a workable solution to the farm problem. I doubt very much that it will be.

• (12.10 p.m.)

The task force said that we should contemplate many farmers going out of farming. It talked about the older people retiring, and it talked about retraining the younger people who are in farming so that they may seek other jobs. I doubt that this is a constructive policy. It grieves me that such a policy should be proposed, and that the government may readily accept it, at a time when we have a high rate of unemployment, which is now running at about 6.5 per cent or 6.6 per cent of the labour force. I suppose if you include those who are in manpower retraining programs the level would touch 7 per cent. To suggest that we take people out of farming at this time, or at least until this economic factor is corrected, is simply not a realistic or practical way of approaching things. At a time when the problem of pollution is facing our cities and urban centres, it is impractical to suggest that we concentrate feeding and livestock activity near such centres. It takes ten times as much effort to look after the disposal of waste from a beef critter as from a human being. With 30,000 or 40,000 head of livestock in feed lots close to our urban centres the pollution in our streams and waterways would certainly be increased.

I do not think that this country appreciates the contribution of the individual farmer to its wellbeing. My serious advice to members of this House and the people of this country is to take a good hard look at what the individual farmer has done. Considering his contribution, we should take measures to see that the 400,000 or 500,000 who are left can survive and operate. I am not making a plea for subsistence farming, Mr. Speaker, I am making a plea for the ordinary farmer with workable amounts of capital who is ready to put his money and time on the line, who is ready to buck the tiger and feed the Canadian people. And they have been jolly well fed, Mr. Speaker.

The government seems to believe that the farmer can stand all kinds of competition without protection, that he can stand the winds of ill fortune and whatever is thrown at him and still come up smiling and survive. But he won't. I do not know how many of them will fail to survive the Lift program but I am sure it will be a considerable number. The government and the minister may consider the program a success but I am here to say to this House, Mr. Speaker, that the more it succeeds, the more it will fail and the greater will be the disaster.

I think the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) stated one day that the government had received the initial report of the task force some time in February. If this is so, I fail to understand why they consider doing in one year what the task force recommended they should do in three. It is unfair to force the whole impact of such a program upon the farmer in one short crop year when it would have been difficult enough for him to cope with it over a three-year period, which is what the task force suggested. In these programs the government should take into consideration not only its own objectives but the situation of the farmer. After all, farmers are people. As Shakespeare said, "If you cut me, do I not bleed?" This is where the short term

ad hoc program failed to come to grips and failed to take account of the needs of the farmer.

Let me point out, Mr. Speaker, that on the cost side the government has had some reports which offered it an approach to some of the needs of agriculture. The Barber commission report indicated that we should do something about the cost of machinery and made several suggestions. If any of these suggestions have been implemented they have not been reported to this House. One suggestion was for a reverse dumping duty but apparently the government has decided against this although this would have been a most effective tool.

Reports of the Ontario food commission stated flatly that there was payola—I suppose bribery is the proper term—in the wholesaling of food and food products of western—

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry, but I have to interrupt the hon. member since his time appears to have expired. He can continue with the unanimous consent of the House. Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

An hon. Member: Call it five o'clock.

Mr. Gleave: Fine, I don't mind. If it bores you, I am sorry.

May I make a correction, Mr. Speaker? I said the payola in western Canada, but I should have said eastern Canada since the Ontario food commission was investigating a situation that existed in eastern Canada.

Mr. Paproski: Shameful.

Mr. Gleave: They said flatly that there was discrimination against local producers in Ontario. I have no knowledge of any action by the federal government to correct this situation or to demand an investigation by the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission. The government should insist that these farmers at least have access to a competitive market, Mr. Speaker, not a controlled market. They are being denied the ordinary right of a Canadian to take their products into the marketplace and face those with whom they seek to compete.

I appreciate the House giving me this extension of time, Mr. Speaker, and in conclusion I want to say that these are the areas which require consideration—the over-all policy, costs, marketing and fiscal policy. A fiscal policy that throws hundreds of thou-

[Mr. Gleave.]

sands of Canadians onto the labour market without employment has its effect on agriculture. Agriculture is the other side of the picture and if it is in a depressed state affects unemployed people in Brantford, say, and other places in Ontario.

Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent-Essex): We, the members of the official opposition, certainly wish to support the motion put forward by the hon. member of the New Democratic Party on this opposition day. The motion indicates that the present policies of the government are far from appropriate to meet the present demands facing farmers today in all segments of the agricultural business. When dealing with agriculture policies, one is left wondering what actually is the basic policy of this government. When they took power six years ago they indicated in speeches before groups interested in the agriculture industry that they had the answers. Not only did the government have the answers, but it had the determination to make these solutions effective immediately. The government has been in power for nearly seven years and the agricultural industry of this country has had the opportunity to assess the results of this aggressive and dynamic approach to agriculture. Well, Mr. Speaker, although the government has been in power almost seven years I may say, without fear of contradiction, that every single segment of our agricultural industry today, with the possible exception of that engaged in beef and pork production, is in dire economic straits the like of which have not been experienced since the 1930's.

Mr. Olson: There are a few more exceptions, you know.

• (12:20 p.m.)

An hon. Member: The minister should resign.

Mr. Danforth: So grave is the situation that some farmers must now decide whether they will seek and be able to obtain the credit which is necessary if they are to continue farming for just one more year.

Mr. McCleave: The government ought to resign.

Mr. Danforth: The policy of the present government and its immediate predecessor has been to lower tariff barriers that have prevented the importation of food from other countries. This is the government's policy and these barriers will be lowered on a progres-

sive basis. It has said, and the process has already begun, that it will withdraw basic subsidies on farm products. Those subsidies have been built up over the years in order to make equal the lot of the farmer and those in other segments of the Canadian economy, and in order that his living standards might be the same as the standards of those who engage in industry. But the government has indicated that it will withdraw subsidies.

What has happened to the dairy industry of Canada, that industry which has always been the pride and joy of Canadians? What has happened to it? In the past five years we have seen the dispersement of, not of hundreds, but thousands of dairy herds in Canada.

Mr. McCleave: Shame.

Mr. Danforth: Farmers in Canada today are producing enough to meet demands only because, as a result of the research undertaken by the Department of Agriculture into methods of feeding and production, production per farm unit has increased. The government's dairy policy is almost beyond comprehension. Dairy farmers in Canada, especially those involved with the manufacturing milk side of the industry, are told not only how much milk to produce but are fined if they produce more than their quotas. This is the government's policy at a time when the consumers of the nation are paying the highest price for milk in the history of Canada and when we are importing powdered milk from other countries.

Mr. Alkenbrack: Shame.

Mr. Danforth: That if what is happening in the dairy industry, that industry of which Canada was so proud.

We produce the finest grain in the world and had a tremendous share of the international market. Yet the government is now bribing farmers not to produce grain. When I say "bribing" I use the word kindly, because I think that blackmailing would be closer to the truth.

Mr. Mazankowski: The government is bribing farmers with their own money.

Mr. Danforth: What has happened in the tobacco industry, that industry that is worth half a billion to us? The government is actively curbing the use of tobacco. I do not quarrel with that when health hazards are involved; but we must remember that Canada is one of the prime tobacco producers of the world. The industry is concentrated in regions of Canada where the technology of tobacco growing is second to none. Instead of condemning and selling an industry down river, is it not logical to expect the government to promote research in order that we might develop a tobacco acceptable to people which would not contain alleged harmful ingredients? This is not impossible and could be done through plant breeding and other processes. Our plant breeders with the Department of Agriculture are second to none and, if they were seized with this problem, I do not doubt that they could accomplish this. But they are not told to undertake this research, and I think the government ought to take the initiative in this regard.

What do we find in our livestock industry? Many farmers are being kept on the farm today only because they produce beef, poultry and swine.

Mr. Olson: What about corn?

Mr. Danforth: Since the livelihoods of so many depend on these commodities, you would think that the government would adopt promotional measures to make sure that these parts of the agricultural industry do not fall victim to the government's economic policies. By actually encouraging the importation of poultry, beef, pork, turkeys and even of eggs, the government is crippling the only segments of agriculture that remain on the blue side of the ledger today. I think the hon. member who preceded me was correct when he said that the agricultural industry in Canada cannot survive unless the government adopts a long-range policy that will encourage the long-range investments which are necessary if we are to carry on the type of agriculture that will meet the world demand, world prices and world competition. But this should be the task of the government.

What is happening in trade? By its actions, this government has demonstrated that it no longer thinks Canadian agriculture important. I say this advisedly. The government is doing two things which actively demonstrate my point. First, it is entering into trade agreements involving development in some of the minor nations under which we shall accept agricultural products in return for heavy equipment. Second, the government is adopting today what it calls a new policy of supply management, whatever that may mean. What the government means by supply-management is that it will curtail Canadian production to meet the needs only of our domestic consumption and our dwindling segment of

the international market. When it talks of supply-management it is talking about restricted, regimented and directed Canadian farming. Formerly, such a policy was unheard of in Canada. Farmers were free agents. They ran their own businesses and, rightly or wrongly, made their own decisions. This government feels that farmers are no longer capable of making those decisions and that those decisions must be made for them. That is the basis of the legislation we are considering today, and that is not right. In a day and age when we import almost $1 billion worth of foodstuffs a year, the government talks of restricted farming.

• (12:30 p.m.)

If we had an additional $1 billion market for our farm products, we would not have this economic trouble today. An additional $1 billion worth of trade would be a means of survival for the Canadian industry. The government talks about restricted trade, restricted production and supply management. What are their solutions to these problems? The government says we should have this policy. We should not have as many farmers as we now have. There should be a policy whereby the farmers can be painlessly removed from farming. What an easy solution for the agricultural problems today! Take the farmers out of farming and the problems will disappear.

The world is going to need more food than in the past, especially proteins. Although Canada can produce an abundance of proteins, this government wishes to take the farmers off the farms and put them into the already large and sprawling cities. They will become welfare cases. The government talks about retraining. The average age of the Canadian farmer is in the late forties or early fifties. Are these the people we are going to retrain? Are we going to give them jobs at a time when we are suffering from our highest unemployment? It is ridiculous!

We in the official opposition not only support the principle of the motion before the House today, but we endorse it. I hope that after nearly seven years, one member from the government side will come forward with even one idea as to how the agriculture industry might be served by the present government. If that is done, Mr. Speaker, it will be a first for this government.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I was quite pleased when I had a look at the motion put this morning because it states a realistic view. It says that the agricultural economy of the country is depressed and I agree with that. Indeed, this is not the complete picture. One has only to travel a bit throughout the country to realize that farmers are also depressed, not because they are unable to make their farm produce or to better manage their herd, but because, on the one hand, the production costs are constantly increasing and, on the other hand, the net income is decreasing year after year.

Mr. Speaker, businessmen in our rural areas who are used to doing business with farmers also suffer from those conditions, because the farmers are unable to buy the materials necessary to the maintenance of their farm buildings. Consequently, businessmen are worried when they see the local industry losing ground like that.

Another factor that is responsible for the considerable increase of farm production costs is the steady increase of farm implement prices. The price of spare parts keeps increasing also, but we are hoping that following the Barber report the government will take the necessary measures allowing farmers to obtain farm machinery and spare parts at a decent price.

In the province of Quebec, there is a basic industry, namely the dairy industry. I would like to speak briefly on it because demonstrations are still taking place in that province. Farmers are not that happy with the government dairy policy for the dairy year 1970-71, neither were they indeed with the policy for the year 1969-70.

Mr. Speaker, more than 80 per cent of Quebec farmers are milk or cream producers, and more than 60 per cent of their income comes from the sale of dairy products or livestock of the dairy type, and so on. That production is truly consistent with the natural avocation of our farm community and its progress reflects the unquestionable ability of a great number of our farmers in this field. The dairy policy is therefore of utmost importance for the province of Quebec, and until very recently, I was really confident that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) would agree to some changes in the dairy policy. But after his visit to Richmond, I am a little more pessimistic. However, I still ask in the name of industrial milk producers that the dairy policy for 1970-71 be reconsidered and improved so that farmers who are really engaged in dairy production, those who are

going to be true producers, will receive an income in keeping with their efforts.

• (12:40 p.m.)

Therefore, farmers are not satisfied and for the progressive producers, the dairy policy represents a step backwards because of the penalty imposed on any production increase of output, even though such an increase is often required to ensure better use of resources.

The moment the government agreed to set a fixed budget for the dairy industry and allowed that policy to retain both its economic and so-called social aspects, it had to strike at the producers who were on the path of progress. This is indeed what it did. This move is a perfect illustration of the situation described earlier. It is unfortunate, because we were under the impression that we might gradually dispel the confusion already mentioned and which, once again, dealt a severe blow at the efficient and professional producers.

The price support policy of finished products at the same level as last year is not a true indication of the actual prices paid to producers. The cut in subsidies paid to producers and the penalty imposed on any production increase will seriously affect the income of farmers who are facing increased costs.

This summer, the cost-price squeeze will thus become even tighter, because in several fields, the prices of the commodities needed by the farmers to produce during a production cycle keep going up. The state may justify its decision by pointing out the imbalance between the supply and demand of dairy products. Such is the inconvenience of managing an industry solely through a pricing policy without due regard for that industry's economy of production. Such a method is likely to cause serious injustice to some categories of producers and to a professionnal group as a whole.

There is no doubt that agriculture is an essential industry in our Canadian economy, and it is extremely important that all levels of government take the necessary steps to ensure its survival and to give producers the assurance that, not only will they be able to earn a good living, but that they will have their due share of the national income and of the benefits of a "just society" in which I still believe. I am convinced that the government will sustain its efforts with a view to establishing a "just society" before it is too late.

Recently I had the occasion in Paris, "the City of Light", to witness a demonstration that amounted to a riot. I was astonished to see how fast things happened. In fact, at 2.10 p.m. everything was quiet and at 2.15 a full-scale civil war was in progress. Barrels of oil and gas were spilled in the streets and set on fire; store windows were shattered; in a word, it was havoc. I asked one of the demonstrators why he was behaving that way. He answered that he did not know, that he was acting on his leader's orders.

Those European leaders seem to share the views of some Canadian leaders. In fact, it was reported in Montreal recently that people obey certain leaders implicitly. That is dangerous. Therefore, it is absolutely necessary to take those measures designed to improve the lot of the workers, including the agricultural workers, so as to restore their faith in our country.

A census was taken of approximately half of Canada's farms. These are involved in growing wheat and raising livestock. They include some 20,000 commercial dairy farms and approximately 10,000 smaller farms, producing grain other than wheat. About 80 p. 100 of the country's arable land is in western Canada, most of it now given over to the production of wheat, rapeseed and flax-seed.

I saw the same thing in France. I visited vast expanses and I met peasants who are unhappy because they do not get a fair deal. They do not get the justice to which they are entitled and one gains the impression that there is a climate of dissent and that the farmers are dissatisfied.

In my opinion, the government, which has always been progressive and has always been able to take the required decisions at the most serious times, and I am convinced that the members of the opposition will agree with that, should immediately take action to further develop the economy as a whole and garantee a possibility of survival, particularly to the agriculture economy, so that young people between the ages of 18 and 22 now seeking jobs may have hope in our country and the faith they need because at that age if they are not busy doing good things they will do bad ones. That is the tendency that prevails now in the province of Quebec and in other provinces as well.

As a matter of fact, not too long ago, young people sitting in the galleries unexpectedly interrupted the proceedings of the House by their yelling and their shouting. And it is my opinion that if this motion is not seriously

taken into consideration and if recommendations are not made and implemented, we are heading for a situation still more serious and more disastrous. It is likely that people will then be inclined to listen to the leader, without knowing why, and I think it is where it may become dangerous.

To turn back to agriculture and to prove that it is a basic industry, an essential one, I should like to quote a few figures. Total farming investments amount to about $22.4 billion, nearly $41,000 per worker, and break down as follows: 71 per cent for real estate, 18 per cent for machinery and 11 per cent for livestock and poultry. Crop fields cover a total of 174 million acres, of which 76 per cent are owned by farmers and 24 per cent are rented.

New capital investments amount to nearly $1 billion annually, that is approximately 8 per cent of the total of new investments in Canada. The Farm Credit Corporation, a government agency, is the main source for mortgage loans and it stands for two thirds of the total amount.

This means therefore that agriculture does not get its fair share, because farmers are obliged to mortgage their farm buildings to the Corporation for two thirds of their value.

In 1948 1,096,000 people were employed in agriculture, that is 22 per cent of the total labour force in Canada then. Today, there are about 546,000, that is 7 per cent of the total labour force.

Since 1951, the number of farm workers has remained more or less stationary at about 500,000 which, in 1968, was 18 per cent of the total labour force.

According to Mr. Furnis, an economist, the main change in Canada's agricultural economy since 1944 has been the increasing dependency of the non-farm sector on supply and services. About 338,000 people are now employed in food processing industries, tobacco plants, in the production of leather goods, machinery and fertilizers as well as in the wholesale trade of farm products.

About 18 per cent of all the products shipped by rail are farm products, thus proving the importance of agriculture. The transportation industry provides jobs for a great many workers. One fourth of all the products shipped through the St. Lawrence Seaway, are farm products. The consumption of gas, diesel oil and lubricants accounts for 17 per cent of the total sales of all fuel used by cars and trucks.

[Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse).]

In the wholesale trade, 52,000 people which means about one person out of four, are involved in the sale of farm products, food commodities and farm supplies.

In 1967, agriculture accounted for $2.5 billion or 4.6 per cent of the gross national product which totalled at that time $54 billion. Agriculture is still the main primary industry of Canada, coming ahead of lumber, fisheries, mines and oil.

• (12:50 p.m.)

Employment in agriculture represented 7.3 per cent of the total, slightly more than its contribution to the GNP. That is characteristic of the industry, the average income being slightly lower in agriculture than in other sectors.

Last year, Canadian exports of farm products amounted to $1¼ billion, roughly 11 per cent of total exports, compared with 20 per cent in the early 60s. That means that we are losing rather than gaining ground in the field of exports.

Canadian farmers paid approximately $175 million in property tax last year, of which 60 per cent in income tax. It is therefore obvious that the property tax is very unfair.

To my mind, the buildings and the land should be exempted from tax seeing they are the work tools of the farmer. The doctor who goes around with his small bag to visit the sick pays taxes on his income. The income of the farmer can be taxed, but he should not be taxed for walking on the ground or going about on the roads. Yet, he pays taxes on his income as well as on his house.

In a just society, people should not have to pay taxes on their homes, because after all they have to live somewhere. The land and the buildings should also be exempt from taxes to allow the farmers to breathe and continue cultivating their land with a view to meeting the basic needs of their family without always needing subsidies, to the extent where farmers are said to be beggars, people who are always asking the state for something.

Therefore, we should not blame those who are hungry, who wish to live—

[*English*]

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

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the hon. member might be permitted to continue until one o'clock.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues and the minister in particular, for their courtesy.

In conclusion, so as to allow hon. members to go to lunch, I should like to deal with a subject which was discussed during the last electoral campaign in the province of Quebec. I have said on three occasions in this House—and I hope that my colleagues have understood that I did so in a good Canadian spirit—that dairy farmers have been penalized as the previous speaker said—so that they would get discouraged and would curtail their production, while in another part of the country—and I want to be well understood because I have no resentment towards western farmers—the government has established another farm policy. This dual policy leads us to division at the political and national level.

In the prairie provinces, in an effort to induce farmers to curtail their wheat production, the government has decided to grant them a compensation. I am not taking exception to the fact that these people will receive money to cut down their production, however I would like very much that the same approach be used towards milk producers with regular dairy cows. The farmers are expected to produce less Mr. Minister. I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker, for addressing the minister directly. I know that this is not in order, but I would like so much the minister to finally understand my argument.

If, in order to curtail production, a subsidy is granted to take the land out of production, why not grant one to the cow so that it would not produce milk? The cow belongs to its owner just as the land does. Thus I believe we would have a more consistent policy across Canada. That would prevent incidents such as those we witnessed during the last election campaign in Quebec, when some people advocated the separation of our province from the rest of Canada by saying: You see how right we are when we want to separate from the rest of Canada. In fact, whenever western people are concerned, the government is willing to compensate them, it pays them so that they will not sow, but when it comes to eastern Canada, it levies a tax so as to penalize production and efforts.

When people are not informed enough to see the facts in their true light, attempts are made to secure the votes of those who always think that the grass is greener in the neighbour's pasture.

That is the reason why I should like this situation to be corrected so as to avoid any misunderstanding and so that we may work together harmoniously. As for me, I believe in a great Canada and I think I have a right, as a Canadian, on the entire country. The very reason of my presence in this House is to stand for those principles and those ideas, but also to point out to the government the farmers' needs, in every area, in every province and in Canada as a whole and to make demands if necessary.

That is one of the reasons that prompt me to support sincerely the motion under study so that the government will understand that we do not object for the sake of objecting, but because we want to work as all other members for the welfare of society and Canada.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being one o'clock I do now leave the chair until 2 p.m.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, in replying to the motion and the speeches that have been made so far supporting that motion, I am in the awkward position of having to take the motion as it is written and of assuming that the hon. member meant what he said in the bottom. The motion reads: "that this House call upon the government to reverse—" I repeat the word "reverse" for emphasis—"its present policies which have deliberately depressed the agricultural economy". It is not within the rules of this House for any member to question the motives of any other member, so I am not going to do that. As both you and I well know, it is not within the rules of this House for one member to question the sincerity of another member, so I am not going to do that. Having said that, I have to assume that the hon. member is sincere when he calls upon the government to reverse its present policies respecting agriculture.

Having taken the motion as it is written, I would like to remind the hon. member that, for example, the Canadian government and

the Department of Agriculture have undertaken a very extensive research program, the objective of which is to increase the efficiency and the productivity of Canadian agriculture. Of course, as a result of that, we hope to improve the income of Canadian farmers to make them more competitive in the domestic as well as the export markets. I ask sincerely, does the hon. member mean that we should reverse that policy?

We have a far-reaching program of grading and standards that are designed to improve farmers' returns through creating buyer confidence in Canadian products. That is also a very important part of the policies of the Department of Agriculture. Is the member asking that we reverse that policy? Mr. Speaker, we have a series of programs designed, and in effect, that are part of the over-all policy for the better utilization of livestock, poultry, crop seeds and so on, to promote superior performance. This is a very far-reaching comprehensive policy designed for the purpose of improving the seed and livestock that we have. Is the member asking that that policy be reversed?

• (2:10 p.m.)

We also have a crop insurance program that is a mechanism whereby farmers can protect themselves, with government assistance, against some of the vagaries of climate and other natural hazards that beset them from time to time. This crop insurance program has been built up over a number of years, and it continues to grow with other crops being added to the programs within the various provinces, and indeed with more provinces coming within the national program. Is the member asking that we reverse that program? We have a wide ranging policy dealing with a meat inspection system, and we have similar programs dealing with Canadian crops to keep them free of disease to which they would be subjected a great deal more if we did not have this kind of inspection system. Is the member asking that that policy be reversed?

We have provided protection for farmers against undue fluctuations in the market place with respect to many commodities operating under the Agricultural Stabilization Act. That act was not brought in by this government. I believe it was introduced about 1958 or 1959. There have been some modifications made since then, and I must say that the modifications have been improvements to the act. During the last ten years or so there have been many cases where the policy, taking its authority from this act, has been very useful in getting farmers over difficult marketing periods. Is the member asking that that policy be reversed? At the present time about $135 to $140 million per year is distributed to support the income of farmers from various commodities, but particularly dairy products. Is the member asking that we withdraw or reverse that program?

Throughout the years, and more recently within the last few months, we have made major changes to the Farm Credit Corporation's policy, the most recent being that we have allowed a wider range of their activities and functions to provide credit for such things as diversification and for debt consolidation. Is the member asking that that policy be reversed? I could continue enumerating policies for a long while, Mr. Speaker, but I will mention just a few more.

Some months ago we announced a feed freight assistance program that would be in effect for all of this year, from April 1, 1970 to March 31, 1971, paying a very substantial portion of the freight costs on feed that is brought from Thunder Bay into the eastern feeding regions, as well as from the prairies into British Columbia. Is the member asking that that policy be reversed?

We now have before the House Bill C-197, which has been introduced in response to the requests made over a long period of time by farmers, provincial governments and marketing boards. These requests go back at least 15 years according to my memory. Requests for this kind of legislation have been coming forward for perhaps even longer but, as I say, for about 15 years that I can remember rather vividly. Is the member asking that we reverse this policy decision? It is not a policy that is operative at the present time because certain members opposite seem to think that they can do a service to someone—I fail to see to whom—by talking this out and delaying it.

Mr. Horner: Who is delaying it?

Mr. Olson: But I know, Mr. Speaker, that the farmers of this country and their representatives want this legislation to come forward in the House, so that it may be passed to committee and if necessary be amended.

Mr. Nowlan: Bring it forward.

Mr. Olson: They talk now about bringing it forward. Mr. Speaker, we have had that legislation in front of the House on seven different days.

Mr. Nowlan: Seventeen hours.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I wonder if we can have order. Is the hon. member rising on a point of order?

Mr. Caouette: No, Mr. Speaker, I just want to know if the minister would accept a question.

Mr. Olson: If I have time at the end of my speech I will accept it.

Mr. Nowlan: We will give you time.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that hon. members opposite have become exercised at the mention of this question because apparently it has finally gotten through to them that the farmers of this country wanted this legislation a long time ago.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Horner: They did not.

Mr. Danforth: In parliamentary terms, that is a gross misrepresentation.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, I can tell by the way they respond that they have finally received the message. As I say, I could go on and on describing all the other policies that are in effect, including ones that the government inherited as well as the new announcements that have been made with respect to policy innovations and amendments to policy. But the motion asks the federal government "to reverse its policies" without saying which ones it should reverse. So, I have to take the hon. member at his word, and if farmers across the country know he is asking for all these policies to be reversed, then he will have explanations to make that will take him far longer than he has time in which to make them.

I feel hon. members do agriculture a disservice when they belittle the agricultural sector, and speak in the kind of tones and use the kind of words that we heard earlier today. I would like to remind hon. members opposite that agriculture is still one of the most important portions of our total economy. In fact, one-fifth of the total gross value of factory shipments from Canadian manufacturing industry is comprised of processed goods, the raw material for which comes from agriculture. The food processing industry alone employs over a quarter of a million workers. One-third of the freight hauled through the St. Lawrence Seaway is of agricultural origin, and about 18 per cent of all the goods moved by our railways comes off the farms. So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that hon. members opposite will not speak of agriculture any more in the disparaging tones that we heard today.

Mr. Nowlan: This speech is going to be an agricultural product. It will help a compost heap.

Mr. Olson: I am the first to admit that there have been some difficulties in certain sectors of the agricultural community within the last two or three years so far as markets are concerned. It is fair for us to examine these. The most important sector has been in the grains economy, and even there in wheat almost exclusively. In fact, if wheat and wheat alone, not even all cereals, is removed from the calculations of cash receipts to Canadian agriculture, these show an over-all increase in almost every other sector of the commodity groups. Let us look at some of the important statistics. For example, in 1968 dairy products brought the farmers $644 million. That was increased to $677 million in 1969. I do not say, Mr. Speaker, that $677 million is satisfactory. I do not even say it has kept up with some of the other changes in the commercial and industrial sector of the economy, but the disparaging remarks to the effect that everything has gone down just are not true. For example, hog receipts showed a marked increase in 1968 from $410 million to $461 million. But hon. members do not like to hear these figures. They want to paint the whole agricultural scene and everything in it black. But I think this is wrong—

• (2:20 p.m.)

Mr. Horner: Get a new speech writer, Bud.

Mr. Olson: Poultry receipts, excluding eggs increased from $228 million in 1968 to $250 million in 1969, and egg receipts from $164 million in 1968 to $188 million in 1969.

If I may digress for a moment, Mr. Speaker, there are some problems developing in the egg producing sector. It would appear that supplies are going to overrun the effective market demand fairly soon. If hon. members opposite want to do the agricultural industry a service they will get on with passing the marketing bill so that we can go ahead with the co-ordination of agencies involved in the marketing of eggs.

Mr. Horner: Bring the bill in, then.

Mr. Olson: Receipts from potatoes showed an increase of 10 per cent, from $61 million in 1968 to $67 million in 1969. Corn receipts were down slightly because there was a shorter crop year. They were down from $29 million in 1968 to $25 million in 1969. Then, we can turn to rapeseed receipts which increased almost 50 per cent from $33 million to $51 million in 1969. Flaxseed is even more remarkable, the receipts having increased from $26 million in 1968 to $57 million in 1969. Barley receipts went up from $85 million dollars in 1968 to $92 million in 1969.

I could go on and on, Mr. Speaker, but these are just some of the other important sectors of the agricultural industry. I should like to talk for a minute or two about the dairy industry, though I see my time is getting short. There have been some serious problems in that industry resulting from production overrunning effective market demand. The policies we put into effect on April 1 this year have already caused a remarkable improvement in that industry and we are beginning to see some daylight after the difficult years we had in the past.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that hon. members do not really mean what is said in this motion. If they want to reverse all of these policies, then we will have unwarranted and chaotic conditions in Canadian agriculture. What Canadian farmers want and have a right to expect, and what some hon. members opposite may have been talking about although they did not articulate or define it too clearly, is more advance planning—

Mr. Horner: You have it in your notes.

Mr. Olson: The hon. member for Crowfoot sits there making a lot of noise, and is probably going to make more in a few moments, but all this is really not relevant to the problems facing people in agriculture. I was saying that I think farmers legitimately are seeking and are entitled to as much planning, as much advance market forecasting and so on, as anyone is capable of giving them.

An hon. Member: Agreed; but can they participate?

Mr. Olson: The capability for planning has been enhanced considerably in the past few months. We announced some weeks ago that we were expanding the economic section of the Department of Agriculture. There are such things as Canfarm, a computerized system, to assist in making plans and to assess his operation, which is something that needs to be done. To say that nothing has been done in the past is not true. There have been outlook conferences in the past years where experts were brought in to try and project a year in advance what the market situation would be and what the production level ought to be to fit that situation. Perhaps this type of thing has not been publicized widely enough but the information has been circulated. In addition there is a further mid-year projection of the outlook conference published yesterday and this is expected to be helpful. There are other aspects of the market situation affecting Canadian farmers which result from decisions by other people and other countries. We do not have control over this situation, of course, but we must all respond to it.

I hope that members from all sides of the House, Mr. Speaker, will co-operate with the Department of Agriculture and the farmers in trying to improve the mechanics and the structure. These include such things as amendments to the Canada Grains Act, Bill C-197, the outlook conference and even some good advice that could come from the task force report published a few days ago. That kind of co-operation would do the farmers of this country a service rather than the disservice of these disparaging remarks which we heard from the Opposition earlier today.

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): I might say at the outset of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, that I have never listened to a minister of agriculture give such a naïve speech about the problems with which he has to deal. A number of times during his speech I said that he needed a new speech writer. If he had written his own speech I know he could have done better because of his knowledge of the agricultural industry.

I wholeheartedly support the mover of this motion, Mr. Speaker. While I had nothing to do with the drafting of the motion, I should like to point out the wording, in part, is as follows:

> That this House calls upon the government to reverse its present policies...

I am not going to read any further than that. The minister was so confused about agricultural policy that he listed a whole host of policies that have been in existence for a long time in the Department of Agriculture. He mentioned agricultural research but this is not a present policy; it has been around for quite a while. He went on to list livestock, the record of the harvest of various crops,

research into feed grains and crop insurance, which was introduced in 1960. He said the Agricultural Stabilization Act was introduced in 1958-59, but it was actually 1957. He mentioned the Farm Credit Act, but this was revised in 1959. He also mentioned debt consolidation and this is a present policy made necessary because of the mishandling of the agricultural industry by this government. He went on to mention feed grain assistance but this has been in existence since 1942, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Olson: 1944.

Mr. Horner: He could have mentioned a number of other things. He painted a vivid picture of how the opposition is holding up Bill C-197. But Bill C-197 has not been in this House since May 19, and as near as we can find out it will not be brought back until June 11. The minister talks about it going before the agricultural committee, but yesterday the chairman of that committee admitted he was having difficulty in getting a quorum. There has not been a quorum in that committee since March 26, and yesterday afternoon we sat for three-quarters of an hour waiting for a quorum. Most of the opposition members were there, it was government members who were not. Why rush this bill into committee when he knows that it cannot be dealt with without a quorum? The government has tried to tell the nation that we have been holding up legislation, whereas we have been examining it thoroughly in accordance with our duty.

Let us see whether Bill C-197 has been requested by the farm organizations. In my hand I hold a news release put out by the Alberta Wheat Pool, and this is what the president, Mr. G. L. Harrold, had to say on May 29:

• (2:30 p.m.)

Government Bills C-196 (Canada Grain Act) and C-197 (Farm Products Marketing Act) both provide for vague, sweeping authority to be vested with appointed officials. While the bills provide for consultation with, and opportunity for representation by agricultural producers, they fail to require direct policy participation by those most directly affected, the producers.

Canadian agricultural production is in the hands and under the management of about 150,000 owner-operators. They have demonstrated a desire and ability to manage agricultural production in Canada extremely well, and have rapidly improved the efficiency of the industry. Legislation affecting their markets is of extreme interest to producers. All such legislation should be based on the needs and desires of producers, who should have a direct voice in preparation and operation of such policy.

Bill C-197 will deny the farmers such a voice. The motion before the House indicates that the government ought to be prepared to listen to farmers. The government ought to reverse its present policies. What are some of them? Consider Operation Lift, which the minister did not mention. He skipped around it. It will bring about a drastic reduction in wheat acreage. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) said that this program will encourage increased production of such commodities as rapeseed and flax. I question that, Mr. Speaker. This two-headed monster running our agriculture—on a previous occasion I referred to it as a cross-eyed rooster—is thinking negatively on questions of agriculture. The two ministers responsible do not want to understand the agricultural industry. They are merely following some of the policies laid down by the task force on agriculture.

Mr. Lang: Has the hon. member any new lines in mind?

Mr. Horner: If the minister will be quiet for a minute I will mention lots of new lines of policy. And what did the task force on agriculture recommend? It recommended that we establish a transition policy to keep farmers out of wheat production. On page 35 of the report, the task force recommends that all coarse grains produced in a given crop year should be sold in that crop year. When this question was put to the grain companies, they said the suggestion was ridiculous. Yet this is what the task force recommended. That task force was headed by five academics, four of them coming from eastern Canada who probably had never seen a wheat farm. There were two members from Quebec, two from Ontario and one, a Socialist, from the University of Manitoba.

In his speech, the Minister of Agriculture said pointedly that if we could solve our wheat problem we could probably solve the problems related to other commodities. The government thinks Operation Lift will help. That operation merely shows that the government is thinking negatively. It does not want us to expand any agricultural operations whatever, but wants us all to cut back. The minister talked about growth in the entire agricultural industry. The farmers, it is said, will be better off financially. How can they be better off if their production is to be curtailed? That shows how negatived is the government's thinking. Last year 4.5 million acres were taken out of production, and now

those very same farmers are being penalized through Operation Lift. I say that because of the ignorant ruling which stipulates that July 15 is the cut-off date so far as summerfallow and forage is concerned. That ignorant ruling ought to be altered in so far as it applies to western Canada, because that is where most of our grain is grown.

The House is also considering Bill C-196, which we are told is to overhaul the grain marketing procedure. The committee was asked whether we had studied grain marketing in the United States. We said we had not yet done so but that we would. One of the elevator company representatives then said that we should only bring in a new grain marketing act after we have studied what a number of other grain marketing agencies elsewhere have been doing. The Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Lang) said that the government is setting up an extensive study program to find ways of modernizing the whole grain marketing and handling system. What are other countries doing in this respect? In his report for the Economic Council of Canada, published in January, 1970, Mr. Hudson has this to say at page 109:

Australia

Wheat Production and Disposition—The area in wheat in Australia increased every year except one since 1956 to reach a record of 10.5 million hectares in 1968—

That gives you some idea of what some of our competitors are doing, yet we have fallen behind. Between 1950 and 1954 we had something like 32 per cent of the international wheat market. In 1968, our percentage of that market had fallen to 17 per cent. We are not selling. We have agreed in the last few years not to sell, and this government will not agree to make sales in the future, because it has adopted a negative, hopeless attitude. This is what the report says at page 114 about the United States:

Wheat Production and Disposition—The area planted to wheat in the United States in 1967 was 23.9 million hectares (50 million acres), the largest since 1953, and 18 per cent higher than 1966 and the five-year averages for 1959/1963—

At page 122 of the report this is said about France:

As a result of high price supports, production has increased irregularly from an average of 9.4 million metric tons for the 1954/1958 period to 14.3 million tons in 1967...About 80 per cent of shipments of wheat out of France are to non-EEC destinations.

That gives us some idea of what our competitors are doing. The report says that the Argentine as well has markedly increased its wheat acreage.

I wholeheartedly support the thinking behind the motion we are considering, because it urges the government to take positive measures to ensure a dynamic rural community as an essential component of Canadian society. We are told that Bill C-196 will bring about a re-organization of our system of grain marketing. It seems to me that we are re-organizing our system before having studied how such systems work elsewhere. It is like putting the cart before the horse, and indicates negative thinking of the government. It cannot go quickly enough to wreck the agriculture of this country.

Mr. Olson: We are going too fast for the opposition.

Mr. Horner: At page 1 of the brief presented to the committee by the North-West Line Elevators Association and Pacific Elevators Limited, we find this:

R. J. Shepp, special advisor to the Grains Group attached to the Honourable Otto Lang, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board envisaged in Winnipeg just a few weeks ago that the country elevator system will consist of only 20 to 40 country elevators—

This statement indicates why the people across the prairies ought to be concerned. The government has failed to take positive steps to ensure that there is a dynamic rural community as an essential component of Canadian society. The Minister without Portfolio had this to say about our grain handling system. I am about to read from a newspaper clipping:

• (2:40 p.m.)

"—the West is characterized by a profusion of small elevators located on closely-spaced railway branch lines," ..substantial improvements could be made that would both reduce the costs of handling and transporting the products and shorten the reaction time of the system in moving grain—

That is, if this whole system could be reorganized. There is concern all across the country. On page 5, the brief to which I referred earlier reads:

The licencing powers of the Commission are so broad that the industry feels that the Commission can make arbitrary decisions by way of licence to control the location of elevators and thereby affect the efficiency of the grain handling system and the very destiny of Western Canadian towns.

I might say that one minister has been very closely connected with those who presented this brief. He does not want Bill C-196 to be

hurriedly dealt with by the Standing Committee on Agriculture. This morning, when the committee started to deal with a small amendment that added only three words, after a very limited amount of discussion the hatchetmen were rolled out. A motion was made that the amendment must be dealt with by way of a vote. We were told that we must move on. These are the steamroller tactics this government is prepared to use in committee. Any member of this House who is concerned with the negative attitude of the two ministers responsible for agriculture should watch very closely the willingness of the government to adopt constructive ideas presented from time to time in this House and in committees.

The minister can say, all is well and good regarding Bill C-197, but there is now a constructive amendment to this bill before the House. If it is accepted, I am sure that when the minister has enough nerve to bring Bill C-197 back into the House it will be dealt with rather quickly. The minister must not fail to give adequate assurance that Bill C-197 will provide for producer participation. As Mr. Harrold, the President of the Alberta Wheat Pool, has said, the producer should have a direct voice in the preparation and operation of such policy. There will be no hold-up in agriculture legislation if the producer is given that assurance.

Mr. Nowlan: Could I ask the hon. member a question? It is with regard to the situation the member encountered this morning in the agriculture committee when he moved this formal amendment. After 20 minutes of discussion, it was moved that a vote be taken on the amendment. I would like to know if this move was made because the government members thought they could not hold their quorum any longer, in view of the lack of a quorum since March.

Mr. Horner: That could very well be. I am not a member of the office of the Government Whip, but the rarity of the occasions on which a quorum has been present in that committee could very well be the reason.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): The hon. member for Matane.

Mr. Roberts: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): The Chair is not at liberty to permit another question.

Mr. Horner: It can be done with unanimous consent.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): Does the House give unanimous consent to a further question?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Roberts: Can the hon. member tell me whether he and his colleague rehearsed their spontaneous questions and impromptu answers before they came into the House?

Mr. Horner: When like minds are thinking on a given subject, rehearsals and speechwriters are not necessary. We speak from the heart about what concerns us.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): Order, please. I think the Chair was right in the first place.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre De Bané (Matane): Mr. Speaker, I believe the demagogy indulged in by the previous speakers for the opposition shows that they are not sincere when they criticize the present policy. As far as I am concerned, I am not saying that there will be some improvements, but I regret this demagogic manner of tackling a problem that so seriously affects the agricultural population.

Maybe I am not as competent as some of the speakers who preceded me on the subject of agricultural policy, but I nevertheless believe that it is my duty to speak on behalf of the farmers of my riding and their association, the U.C.C., more especially as I find their claims are justified in fact and in law.

The problem may be stated as follows: both levels of government and all kinds of theoreticians have geared a large part of the labour market of my province to farming for economic reasons as well as in the name of a scale of mystic and social values. I say "geared" and the unfortunate thing in that planned economy is not so much the contempt shown for free choice as the unjustified taking over by governments of responsibilities implied in that planned economy. That is the problem, the whole problem.

When a government encourages a large proportion of the labour force to take up farming, I suggest that the authorities have no right to make the agricultural class pay for their lack of foresight. In a way, it is not even a financial problem, considering the huge investments made directly or indirectly,

by the two levels of government for the benefit of the agricultural class, more especially as subsidies of all kinds are greater than the annual per capita income of farmers.

The plain truth is that after having encouraged a great number of people to take up farming, agricultural workers are less and less needed.

Such is the cruelty of a system aimed at stifling, by the mere inequality of the opposing forces, those who are completely defenceless.

I say that it is unfair to reduce grants in an irresponsible manner. I submit that responsibilities should be fully assumed and it should be readily admitted that the farming industry is no longer what it was, that it is profitable for a small number of farmers only. As for the others, they should give it up. The government should recognize that it is the sole responsible for the shaky situation prevailing and immediately invest huge sums of money to enable farmers to retrain.

In a word, the just society cannot tolerate any longer a farming policy which has remained constant through various political systems.

Agriculture is infinitely more sophisticated than has been suggested, and a number of those compelled to leave the farm will not likely be able to adjust any better to an industrial society. This makes the government's responsibilities only more tremendous.

I must say here incidentally that not only is it ill-advised but also indecent to tax eastern farmers more, while western farmers are getting more assistance. Both need help, and I think it particularly misleading to state that the subsidies paid in eastern Canada with respect to industry and exports are greater that those granted to western Canada. The farming community is involved. It must be looked after and that must be done without always taking into account the moneys given to others sectors of the economy.

In short, I want the government to admit it is the sole responsible for the present state of stagnation. If people must be retrained, nothing will be achieved by pushing them around. The just society requires that same society to pay the cost of correcting misguided efforts. Farmers must not be told that they must remain outside the affluent society and bear alone their misfortune.

• (2:50 p.m.)

I am asking the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) cordially but forcefully to make

[Mr. De Bané.]

the cabinet understand that it is not enough to recognize the heavy responsibility to assume for a particular economic sector, but that it must admit that retraining is the prime responsibility of the government, all the more as history tells us that the people who settled on farms did so with the blessing of the governments.

However, we now find that the federal and provincial governments are reluctant to tell the farmers that only a small number of them will be able to live off the farm. They are reluctant to admit that the responsibility for this situation lies entirely at the government's door and that the latter will entirely absorb the cost of retraining.

I wish to say, finally, that from now on, agriculture will only be economic for those who can run their farms according to the sophisticated methods of our time. Keeping this in mind, I feel it is imperative for the federal government to consider not only granting subsidies, but also making the services of experts available to those remaining on farms.

Finally, I would like to congratulate the minister on the various measures he has taken in related fields. I must however deplore the demagogic attitude of the opposition, particularly the official opposition, which gave the sad performance of people more interested in stirring up passions than in acknowledging the acute problems faced by the government.

[*English*]

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): After listening to the minister speak in this debate, I am left wondering whether it is the intention of the department to put forward measures of real assistance to the agriculture industry or whether it is pursuing a policy of divide and rule, the policy being followed by this Government in so far as the Indian people are concerned.

The minister tells us that there are many who will concede that certain things have been done for the good of the agriculture industry. I am equally certain that there are many thousands of producers who will indicate areas in which nothing has been done by the department or by the government despite urgent need. I am sure the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Lang) was pleased with the action of the Wheat Board in sending out letters on May 29 last demanding payment in connection with cash advances. I was pleased to hear the minister tell us today that instruc-

tions were issued on June 4 under which the letter was given a different interpretation. Of course, the farmers concerned have no possible way of paying back their cash advances, in view of the amount of grain they were able to deliver.

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) recited a long list of things his department had done for the benefit of agriculture. Fair and good. They cannot be losers all the time. Nevertheless, other policies could have been followed in an attempt to bring hope to farmers now faced with acute financial difficulties. On May 13 a letter was addressed to me by the minister with regard to the Lift program in which he said that the program was designed to improve the cash flow to farmers with grain on hand. There are many farmers in the west who do not have grain on hand. The department's letter is an example of the attempt to divide and conquer the rural community of this nation. We are all well aware that agricultural rural areas throughout the nation are in dire need of cash. Nothing has been done under present legislation to make money available to producers, to keep the communities in which they live viable.

The minister tried to suggest that we on this side would reverse the trend which the government has introduced over dozens of years. But the motion is clear. It refers only to those policies which have deliberately depressed the agricultural economy—the policies which have caused severe unemployment and lack of income resulting in slow economic growth and little hope for the future of any engaged in the industry.

What of the report of the task force which has been filed in this House? A task force was set up in France recently to report on the state of agriculture in that country. But at least it considered the problems of the industry in a positive way, realizing what a great contribution agriculture was making to the good of the nation. This is not true of the task force report which has been filed here. It states that farm policies should be oriented to the efficient producer and suggests that the federal Department of Agriculture be renamed the Department of Agricultural Industry. Big deal. It looks as though some of these people had no real contribution to make to the work of the commission so they proposed renaming the department, believing this would solve the problems to be encountered.

The report also says programs are needed to stimulate demand in markets and potential markets. We in this group have stated many times that we have complete confidence in the Wheat Board but that the Board must be given the tools with which to do its job. Canada cannot expect to produce a good sales record consistently unless we establish trade missions abroad. Instead of resting on its laurels and on its past successes, the government should set up trade missions in foreign countries so that we may sell our products more easily. The returns will flow back to the producers.

The report also said that subsidies and price supports had failed to help farmers to become more viable and should be dropped as soon as possible. Mr. Speaker, anyone who has done any reading on this subject knows that Canada is the only grain exporting nation which does not look after its producers—the only grain exporting nation which expects its producers to subsidize the treasuries of other nations. The Minister without Portfolio must be well aware of this, but he has not suggested that a basic price should be established for grain sold domestically. Even though 25 per cent is about the maximum amount used domestically, the fact remains that the domestic price could be raised without undue harm being done to the economy.

The task force further recommended that young farmers who lacked the potential to become viable operators should be moved out of the industry through welfare programs, retraining and the provision of jobs in other sectors of the economy. The young farmers in this nation today are the very ones who have attended university in many cases. They have attended agricultural courses. They are the very people who will be taking over the reins of production. Yet here we find a proposal that many of them should be moved from the farms to the metropolitan areas where they will encounter poverty and a polluted environment.

• (3:00 p.m.)

I suggest that if this government does not intend to divide and conquer the agricultural economy it should look at the rural areas and realize that any report which suggests that we should break down the rural centres is performing a disservice to the nation. Another task force report recommends, for the farmers that remain, that there should be the provision of money to stimulate management training, sophisticated information processing systems, market and price forecasts and similar management tools.

In one breath the government says that our producers are producing too much and are too efficient, and in another breath the task force comes out with the suggestion that these people should seek training in order to do a more efficient job. How irresponsible and nonsensical can such recommendations be! Again, this makes me wonder whether the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the government of the country are really suggesting to the agricultural producers that they should do their own thing and sell their own products even though there are already avenues open to them to look after the situation.

I am sure all of us appreciate the fact that Canada's agricultural industry is in a state of transition. At the same time, however, many millions of people throughout this world are in a starvation situation. Canada is faced with an increase in her bilateral food aid program. While this may take the form of outright payments in the form of local currencies, there is still a need for some concessional terms in respect of our produce. Again, we can refer to situations which exist in the United States. There they have concessional terms. With these concessional terms there is a requirement that those countries which produce wheat shall also produce commercial grain. This, of course, has resulted in Canada losing a great many of her markets.

We also know that today Canada actually lags behind the amount of $100 million in foreign aid programs. When we speak of cutting back in our produce while this situation exists, I am a little amazed. It would seem that in effect we are telling the people in these areas that we are not concerned about them even to the extent of concessional or bilateral aid and long-term credit programs.

There has been considerable debate in this House, particularly during the question period, about bartering our wheat. We all agree that the bartering of grain, if it affects the orderly marketing of grain, is not in the interests of our agricultural economy. At the same time, however, the United States has Public Law 480, title 3, which allows for the bartering of United States' grain to meet the needs of United States government agencies. If at any time this government could arrange the barter of grain with underdeveloped or even developed nations which would not affect the balance under the Canadian Wheat Board regulations, I suggest there is really nothing wrong in so doing. If it does not mean disruption of orderly marketing I should like the Minister without Portfolio to tell the House why he is so adamantly opposed to bartering in respect of grain.

There is another point which I think should be made absolutely clear. We heard the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) speak about opposition to Bill C-197. The New Democratic Party is absolutely in favour of a national marketing board. At the same time we want to make sure that the government of the day realizes there must be ample producer representation on that board. If the Minister of Agriculture, with all his great words of wisdom and criticism, today had stood up in respect of Bill C-197 and said there would be producer representation on the board, I am sure the bill would have gone to the committee, would have come back to the House and probably would be in effect at this time. That is, if the government had ever intended that it should come into effect in that way.

We have also heard many people say that there has been a belittling of the agricultural economy. If there is any basis on which the government can suggest that the opposition parties are trying to belittle the agricultural economy, the members of the government should stand in their places and say so. The fact remains that the government of the day is belittling the agricultural economy and the producers. Members of the government, particularly those from central Canada, when they make remarks about the agricultural industry in Canada generally are, in effect, belittling the agricultural economy.

I was pleased to hear the Minister of Agriculture say that agriculture is one of the most important industries in Canada. I wish he would tell some of his colleagues in the cabinet that agriculture is also important in Canada and that they should realize this fact if they do not intend to have a complete breakdown in our country at this time. We know there is an agricultural crisis in Canada. The government is also aware of this fact. When we look at the situation in central Canada of various implement manufacturing companies and automobile workers, and consider the vast amount of unemployment as well as the adverse effect this has on the agricultural economy, we should realize it is high time something was done to give some capital input to the farmers.

We know that Canada could immediately supply grain to some of her overseas markets. However, the same thing happens in that regard that has happened too often. There is a lack of selling capability on the part of our

government. I suggest sincerely that if this government is really concerned about attempting to better the conditions referred to in the motion before us today, it should not be difficult for the government to do something about it. It seems to me this is the only way Canada could become credible in the eyes of the world.

I am not an economist, but I fail to understand why Canada does not have a more flexible credit payment arrangement for these other countries. In conclusion, I say there is an urgency in respect of co-operation with other nations of the world. It is not good enough for Canada to stand on her own so far as grain sales are concerned. There should be co-operation with the other grain exporting nations of the world. But Canada could lead the way instead of alone entering into a reduction program such as Operation Lift. There is no mention of this by other countries, but they have great words of wisdom for Canada in respect of her wheat reduction program. I am sure that in this context the Canadian farmers are not pleased with the action of this government.

Mr. A. B. Douglas (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to speak briefly in this debate. I hope to use this privilege to place on the record from a farmer's point of view some of the bright spots and some of the concerns that are affecting our agricultural economy. I may also make some suggestions for government action in regard to some of the problems that undoubtedly exist.

At the outset I wish to make it clear that I cannot support a motion which suggests that the government has deliberately pursued policies designed to depress the agricultural economy. It may be true that some policies have had, and are having, some unfortunate side effects on farmers, such as the battle against inflation, tightening of credit, balancing the federal budget and revaluation of the dollar. Certainly these were not deliberately aimed at farmers. On the other hand, the government has taken positive steps to bolster the farm economy. Cash advances have been doubled in the past year or two. The price of domestic wheat was pegged at $1.95½, so that farmers are assured of that price on wheat used in Canada for human consumption. On that point it should be noted that wheat was worth about that much 20 years ago. Now that the principle of a two-price system has been established, I call upon the government to raise the domestic price of wheat to $3 per bushel to bring it more nearly in line with the advance in price levels and costs in the past 20 years.

• (3:10 p.m.)

Canadian farmers, with few exceptions, are at the mercy of world markets where often prices are subject to manipulation and subsidies by various countries. We need effective legislation to allow farmers to organize their business on a nationwide basis so that they will have effective control of their production and, subject to the forces of competition, will have much more to say about the prices they receive for their products. There is legislation before the House at present, but I suggest it may need additional safeguards to make sure that producers themselves have some control over their marketing agencies.

The supplementary estimates for 1969-70 which were approved by the House a few weeks ago are indicative of the government's concern about agriculture. Out of a total of $200 million, over $150 million went to agriculture and $48 million was voted to cover the Wheat Board deficit in meeting the initial prices of wheat, oats and barley for deliveries in the 1968-69 crop year. Over $6 million of that sum was allocated to permit the Wheat Board to make final payments on Durum wheat deliveries.

If the government had been inconsiderate of the needs of farmers, this payment would not have been made; the Wheat Board Act would have simply required the use of that money to reduce the deficit from $48 million to $42 million, to the benefit of the federal treasury. The thousands of farmers who received those payments for Durum wheat are well aware that they did so because of a sympathetic and conscious government decision to that effect. On behalf of those farmers, many of whom have written to thank me for my part in promoting the government's decision, I wish to thank the government on this occasion for that very welcome addition to the cash receipts of the western grain farmers. There was an item of several million dollars in the same supplementary estimates for the Farm Credit Corporation. The corporation is now authorized to make loans for the purpose of consolidating burdensome short-term debts for land, buildings and equipment and to spread the payments over a longer term of years at much less than current rates charged by various other lenders.

The largest item in the supplementary estimates was $100 million to finance the wheat

surplus reduction plan, commonly known as Operation Lift. While we can find some faults in this plan—as I have on occasion, notably in the debate on March 2—one must give credit to the government for being willing to use as much as $100 million for the purpose of trying to help farmers get supplies somewhat more in proportion to demand. It may well be that farmers will not participate fully enough in the program to earn all of the $100 million, but many in southeastern Saskatchewan and southern Manitoba are beginning to have a higher regard for this offer because weather conditions have prevented them from seeding wheat and thus the amount of land they will not be able to seed at all this year will be increased.

The point I want to make is that the government, in spite of its determination to control inflation by holding down government expenditures as well as by other methods, has been willing to devote over $150 million in the supplementary estimates for 1969-70 to the benefit of agriculture. This is not the action of a government which has deliberately set out to depress the agricultural economy, as suggested in the motion we are discussing this afternoon.

Many sectors of the farm economy are doing fairly well, as the Minister of Agriculture has already stated this afternoon. However, as he also said, the grain industry is in difficulty. Let me quote just a few figures for Saskatchewan, the main wheat growing province. In 1966 the income from wheat in that province, including final wheat board payments, was $629 million; in 1967 it was $642 million; in 1968 it was $553 million, and in 1969 it dropped to $318 million, about half the level of the wheat income in 1966 and 1967. Of course, this problem has largely resulted from a general decline in world wheat trade. It is quite apparent that a concerted drive for sales by the Wheat Board, supported by new government facilities, is starting to pay off in increased sales, which is the best way to solve our farm income problems.

A few days ago our dollar was set free in response to market pressures. It immediately jumped about four cents in terms of the U.S. dollar. The Wheat Board, in order to maintain our competitive position, had to immediately drop the price of wheat by six cents a bushel. The prices of other grains and export farm products have also dropped. I now call again on the government to support the price of export wheat at $1.95½, which was the agreed minimum in the International Grain Arrangement. The IGA is a government agreement which was broken by government action, but farmers seem to be expected to carry the burden. Now that the burden will be even heavier because of the revaluation of our dollar, it is more than ever the government's responsibility to support the price of wheat as stated in the IGA.

There could, of course, be some minimal benefits to agriculture as a result of the reduced prices of imports which should follow the value of the change in our dollar. I call on the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford) to take steps to ensure that any such reductions in prices of imports are fully and promptly passed on to the consumers of Canada, many of whom are farmers who probably have to purchase much more goods than the average consumer.

The task force on agriculture has now made its final report. Canada has never, under any government, had a comprehensive, national agricultural policy. I am sure the government will lose no time in devising, in close consultation with farmers and farm organizations, policies to promote a vital, progressive and economical agricultural industry in this country. I cannot agree with some of the things the task force has recommended but I certainly approve of their suggestion that farm policy should be directed toward improving the per capita farm income in Canada. Nearly half of our farm families are suffering from below normal incomes. I am sure that the government, with its demonstrated sympathetic concern for the welfare of agriculture, can be relied upon to produce long-term policies which will continue to benefit this important industry. I urge them to lose no time in coming to grips with this important responsibility.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I will not follow it with a motion and I do not raise it for the purpose of inviting debate. I do it because under the rules of the House I must raise it at the earliest possible opportunity. It involves an issue which I consider to be a breach of privilege.

I have just been advised through press reports and otherwise that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) has issued a statement in Winnipeg with regard to the imposition of wage controls and other pertinent measures. I rise first to object strongly to this being done in a place other than this House and, second, to point out that in the face of a number of

questions which were directed to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) yesterday and to the Minister of Finance the day before regarding this particular issue, and in respect of which there were in fact denials, the Minister of Finance now, without regard to what are his responsibilities to the House, has done what he said he was not going to do and has not done it in the House.

I raise this question now, although it probably will be our intent to raise it again at a later date, because I must now file it by way of a caveat to indicate my strong resentment at this course of action.

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): What the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) has just told the House is another example and a clear illustration of the problems that are inflicted on this country.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) has raised a question of privilege which he qualified in two ways, first by saying that he was not prepared to move a motion—which of course makes the raising of a question of privilege clearly out of order—and second, which perhaps made the question of privilege partly acceptable, by saying that he was not going to pursue the matter now and that his question of privilege was based on indecisive and inconclusive press reports. It seems to me it would have been more proper for him to suggest that he would wait until Monday before pursuing the matter further. It is certainly out of order for any other member to allude to this matter as if it were a statement of fact.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, I listened to the speech of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) earlier today and thought it was pretty vacuous and vague. Now the Minister of Agriculture, after I have had a chance to utter about six words, anticipates and conjectures that there may be no question of privilege in what I am going to say. This confirms to me how vacant, vague and negative is the mind of the Minister of Agriculture on this occasion, if there is any mind there at all. I used to listen to the—

• (3:20 p.m.)

An hon. Member: Oh, get on.

Mr. Nowlan: The young man from Calgary South can always speak from his seat, where his brains are, but he very rarely gets up—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): Order. The Chair recognizes that there is nothing before the House at the present time but the motion. I would ask the hon. member to proceed with his speech within the allotted time.

Mr. Nowlan: I would be only too happy to proceed, but the point is that I was dumbfounded when the Minister of Agriculture stood in his place to raise a question of privilege on something I had not even said. If that is the type of prognosis we can expect from the Department of Agriculture—and it is corroborated when you have a Lift program, which is supposed to free so many acres from wheat, and then we try to find out how much wheat we really have—it is an indication of the mentality of the minister.

The first six words that I was able to get out before the heckle-reckle of the vegetable computers over there were that the statement of the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) was just another example of the uncertainty that there is in this land about government policy, including agricultural policy. We have statements made in this House one day, two days or three days ago and then in a press conference in the corridor at a press conference in Halifax or at a press conference such as was held in Winnipeg this afternoon we have statements that either complicate or run counter to the substance of statements in this House.

The best example of that was the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson), who sits right in front of the Minister of Agriculture. Perhaps one has infected the other in their parliamentary prognoses. Anyway, the Minister of Finance stood in his place on Wednesday last and said no, there would be no change in the floating exchange rate when the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Ritchie) asked that simple question.

I just love to hear from the hon. member for Prince George because the people of B.C. do not hear much from him at all. If he wishes to speak, I will resume my seat. So far as the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Lang) is concerned, I have a few things to say to him. Do you want to ask a question, Otto?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): Is the minister rising on a question of privilege or a point of order?

Mr. Lang: Does the hon. member not realize that when a member asks such a stupid question with respect to what the rate of

exchange for the dollar is going to be, he should expect not to be answered or to be answered in the simple negative?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): Order. I would ask hon. members to come back to the subject matter of the motion. As the House realizes, this is taking up the time of the hon. member.

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, it is my time, but I appreciate the problem you have. That problem is confounded and compounded when the Minister without Portfolio stands up and starts to rationalize the simple answer of the Minister of Finance to a question by the hon. member for Dauphin about a floating exchange, a flat exchange or a high exchange, which was the same answer the Minister of Finance gave to me in the Finance and Economic Affairs Committee when he said that the policies of the government are for the stability of the dollar. The Minister of Finance was caught out. He made a stupid answer to a very important question and now he is trying to weasel around it. But he does not not need the Minister without Portfolio to help him weasel. That minister has enough problems to weasel around Operation Lift and other agricultural programs.

Be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, this afternoon in the quiet hours of Friday we are speaking on an opposition motion under the new rules, directing attention to the agricultural problems of Canada. Oh, there is another voice. Is that the voice from Algoma East? Since the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) walked out of the chamber we have not heard much. We heard some sound from the hon. member for Algoma East, but he is a nice fellow and we don't want to get him involved.

An hon. Member: You are all heart.

Mr. Nowlan: Well, I have a big heart. There is the member from Lanark. He preaches outside this House and makes noises inside the House, but he very rarely makes speeches inside the House. I don't mind hearing him. Actually, he can contribute. I have heard some of his speeches and they are not too bad.

This is a motion presented by one of my good friends in the NDP, although they are not my political friends. On this occasion I support as far as I can the principle behind this motion which is trying to direct the attention of the government to agricultural problems. Unfortunately, under the new rules—and I think Parliament should look at them in the context of the experience we have had in the last session or two—there is no vote on this motion. The bite is taken out of the motion. It is like a dog without a bark. That is why we have to try to make a little sound, so that people outside may hear. We hope others may listen and respond to some of the things that are said here today on agriculture, because if there was ever a basic industry of Canada that needed some response and a receptive hearing, it is the agricultural industry from coast to coast. I do not care whether you are representing the chicken interests of Fraser East or the apple growers of Annapolis Valley—all segments of agriculture are in trouble, are bothered, concerned and most uncertain about the future. And they are not helped by some government policies of the immediate past.

On that basis I have no hesitation in speaking to this motion. In doing so, I agree completely with what the Minister of Agriculture said earlier today, that the farmers of this land want some planning, some organization, some direction and some co-ordination. Of course they do, but they do not want to lose their voice. It is the only thing they have, other than the soil they work and the products they grow. They have a voice and a vote. The vote comes once every four or five years. But surely this Minister of Agriculture, representing a government that practices something called, in those long ago days, participatory democracy, does not want to take away the voice of the man of the soil who wants to contribute at least his voice to the direction of those policies?

I put it to you, Mr. Speaker, and to any government member of this House—and I have not yet had it contradicted—that Bill C-197 does in fact take the direct voice away from the farmer. I say "farmer," but let us not just talk about the farmer on the farm because Bill C-197 affects every individual and group involved in the agricultural community of Canada, right from the seed to the sale of the product. With respect to Canadians who live in the city and who think they are not going to be affected by the bill, I ask what happened to them when the Dairy Commission was set up? Did the price of milk go down? No, the price of milk went up and the price of other commodities has gone up.

If Bill C-197 could give co-ordination and direction, we on this side would be all for it. But we are also for producer participation at some stage in the formulation of the policies

that affect the producer and the consumer. We are absolutely opposed to a bill superimposing on all segments of agriculture a board appointed by the government. No matter how well-intentioned or sincere the government or the minister may be, that is still bureaucratic control of a basic industry and we are not prepared to swallow the underlying principle of Bill C-197 without getting into a debate, not on semantics but on the question of whether this is socialization of the most sophisticated kind of the agricultural industry of Canada.

If the government thinks this type of bill is good for agriculture, it may soon ask why is it not good for another primary product. Why is this type of bill not good for the oil industry? Oil is another primary product. The government may well say, "Let us take it away from the Energy Board and put it under a marketing board." Let us speak about lumber in British Columbia. What would happen if they had a board which first of all determined who could grow the product or cut the trees, and then how many trees could be cut down? That is the purport of Bill C-197, Mr. Speaker.

• (3:30 p.m.)

I think the Minister without Portfolio is a young minister with some promise, although the promise has become tarnished with the responsibilities of his office and with the load of the Lift program—that is not meant to be a pun—which is unfortunately breaking the back of the young Minister without Portfolio from Saskatoon. This is the time of year when he could have been marking exam papers at the law school of Saskatchewan. No doubt he would find that task much lighter than trying to support the Lift program.

The thing that amazed me and indicated his inexperience—just the same as the hon. member for Lanark and Renfrew (Mr. McBride)—was when he uttered a few comments on the whole parliamentary process, saying in answer to a member on this side of the House that there was a filibuster on Bill C-197. Regardless of the principle of Bill C-197 on which hon. members can honestly disagree, because my interpretation may be extreme and others may have an interpretation equally as extreme, let us look at the facts involved which make hollow and hypocritical the words of the Minister without Portfolio when he uttered "filibuster" a few minutes ago, and the words of the Minister of Agriculture when he said "filibuster" some time ago.

Mr. Olson: I said that sincerely.

Mr. Nowlan: That shows how sincere the minister is, if that is how he looks at it. But I am too good a friend of his in the House or away from the House—or I was—to accept his standard of sincerity. If that is his standard of sincerity, then I have to watch what I say to him outside the House because you cannot be serious, Mr. Minister—I say this through you, Mr. Speaker—in talking about a filibuster on a bill as important as C-197 when there have spent a total of 17 hours—

Mr. Olson: Seven days.

Mr. Nowlan: Oh, no. Let me come to that, Mr. Speaker, and see if the minister disagrees with these facts. There has been a total of 17 hours, spread over nine weeks, ranging from a minimum of a half-hour debate to three or four hours of debate on any one day.

Mr. Lang: With no one saying anything new.

Mr. Nowlan: Seventeen hours spread over nine weeks! If the Minister without Portfolio had ever been exposed to Parliament before he walked out of the ivory tower of law school and got seated by the seat of his pants on the treasury benches, he would know what filibuster means. When I put to him, as I put to the minister, that the task force which they both swear by—or swear at, maybe—says that 10,000 agencies, committees and commodity groups will be affected by Bill C-197, and 120 marketing agencies will be directly affected by it, then I refuse to accept the minister's saying he was sincere when he said it was a filibuster on such a basic bill involving such a basic industry.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question?

Mr. Nowlan: Yes, certainly.

Mr. Olson: I should like to ask the hon. member if he is prepared to accept the responsibility and face the farmers if he will not lift the blockade on this bill so that it will get through the House this session.

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, I am in no position to commit anybody, but I say to the minister that this bill has not been in this House since May 19.

Mr. Olson: It has been in here for seven days.

Mr. Nowlan: I say that if the minister has the guts of his convictions—or if he has any convictions, because he may not have any guts—and brings that bill to the House he may be rather surprised at what happens to it. We may get it into committee. Bring it here so we can talk about it. It has not been here since May 19. I can understand the Minister without Portfolio because he does not know any better, but the minister was very experienced in procedural debates when he spoke for the Social Credit Party. He is now seated on the treasury bench, so when he tells this House that he is sincere in saying there has been a filibuster on Bill C-197, I say that remark is as hollow as his policies on agriculture.

We have been in this House 138 days since last fall and have spent a total of 17 hours on Bill C-197, which I think is the most important bill affecting agriculture to come before any Parliament that I have been in. The minister has more experience than I have. I wonder if he would answer this question, Mr. Speaker. Has there been any more important bill on agriculture than Bill C-197?

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, to stay within the rules of this House I have to ask the hon. member a question. I cannot reply to his questions during this period so I should like to inquire if he is now prepared to give an undertaking that his party will pass the bill if we bring it out again, because we have had it out seven different days already.

Mr. McBride: Answer the question.

Mr. Nowlan: The hon. member for Lanark and Renfrew is good at talking from his seat, where his brains are. If he would get to his feet we might find that he has no brains. In answering the minister, who did not answer my question, I would say when the bill comes back I do not want to participate again in the debate. I do not know what other members of my party will do. For the last few days we have been asking you to get the bill back to committee. I ask the minister if he knows of any more important bill than Bill C-197. If he does and can answer that question—

Mr. Olson: I agree.

Mr. Nowlan: It is the most important bill on agriculture?

Mr. Olson: It is very important. We only bring in important measures.

[Mr. Olson.]

Mr. Nowlan: I would point out, further, that if it is one of the most important and in 17 hours in this chamber over a nine-week period—the minister talked about nine days, but on one of those nine days there was a half-hour debate and the minister knows it, and let us not get into these canards of the Prime Minister—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired. Does the House give unanimous consent to the hon. member to continue?

Some hon. Members: No.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): There is not unanimous consent.

An hon. Member: It hurts.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Annapolis Valley (Mr. Nowlan) has raised the question of the definition of "filibuster." He is right that I have not been in this House long enough to have witnessed some of the classic filibusters that have taken place, but I have been here long enough to hear a great deal of nonsense spoken by members opposite. I have also been here long enough to recognize, when hon. members opposite speak hour after hour on the same matter, repeating the same words, that they are accomplishing nothing except delaying the passage of legislation and delaying the business of this House.

Mr. Aiken: Is that your idea of democracy? Is that your idea of debate?

Mr. Lang: It is passing strange, Mr. Speaker, that we can see a situation where spokesmen for all parties express their support of the principle of the bill, which is the issue on second reading if I understand procedure correctly, and then they speak on and on and on instead of allowing the bill to go to committee where it can be dealt with clause by clause.

Mr. Danforth: We have had experience with some of your material.

Mr. Lang: I have heard questions this afternoon about where farmers stand on this bill. I should like to bring to the attention of hon. members a release from the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture of May 12 in connection with Bill C-197.

• (3:40 p.m.)

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It is a well-known rule in this House that when we are engaged in one debate we are not permitted to take part in another debate. Bill C-197 is not before us now.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): I agree with the hon. member.

Mr. Olson: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the motion before the House clearly sets out the idea that hon. members question government policy in this field. Bill C-197 is part of that policy and certainly comes within the ambit of the language of the motion.

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what I was about to say in referring to Bill C-197 , which is part of government policy.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The minister's remarks would still be out of order.

Mr. Lang: Hon. members opposite have raised the point as to where responsibility lies for the fact that this bill is not moving forward. Reference was made by hon. members opposite to the opinions of farmers on this issue. I wish to refer to this statement by the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture of May 12, which says:

> We are extremely disappointed that the opposition has moved an amendment to Bill C-197 asking for the establishment of an agency only upon a successful national plebiscite and election of agency members.
>
> We believe such a move is not at all consistent with their respective party policies of developing a national agricultural policy for Canada.

They go on to ask, "Why do you not allow the bill to go to committee, where it can receive study clause by clause and where representations may be made?"

Mr. Aiken: Will the minister permit a question?

Mr. Lang: After I have finished, if the hon. member does not mind.

Mr. Danforth: The minister will be finished shortly.

Mr. Aiken: I shall certainly ask a question then.

Mr. Lang: When the opposition moves a motion such as the one before us, it is of course showing that it is unwilling to look at the positive things the government is doing in terms of coming to grips with the agricultural problems of this country. I must say that the final words of the motion, that the government ought to "take positive measures to ensure a dynamic rural community as an essential component of Canadian society," are words that we agree with completely because they are basic to our whole policy in this area.

Hon. members opposite, however, insist on ignoring the many things we have done and are doing in our attempt to produce a dynamic agricultural society in this country. We are taking action on almost every front, and hon. members opposite know it. Recently, on another occasion I indicated the things which are being done from a financial point of view to assist the Canadian agricultural community at this time.

Reference was made by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) to cash advances. The interest on those will cost the treasury of this country $12 million this year. The Temporary Wheat Reserves Act, brought in by a Liberal government will be costing the treasury the estimated $72 million to be spent in assistance to the agricultural industry. The food aid program, which the present government has significantly increased as compared with the program of the previous period, will amount to nearly $70 million worth of wheat and flour. The recent sale of about 22 million bushels to India is an example of what this program means in terms of moving our farmers' grain to markets abroad.

Also, within the last year and a half, annual additional credit facilities have been made available for the expanded marketing of Canadian grain. An item of $12 million appears in the estimates of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce to allow for an aggressive grain sales approach by the Canadian Wheat Board. As a result of this, sales recently have been made to Peru, Syria, the United Arab Republic and, most recently, to Brazil. This will clearly and definitely assist in moving Canadian wheat and grain to markets. The movement of grain from the prairie regions will be at near record levels in the next several months and wheat and barley will be moving in record proportions. The movement of rapeseed and flaxseed has been very good throughout the year. The movement of rapeseed will reach new record levels.

This does not mean, of course, that the cash position of farmers has been put right or that

our whole agricultural situation in the grains industry has been put right. On the transportation side, this government has recently witnessed the creation of the block system, with co-ordinators at Thunder Bay and Vancouver to ensure the most efficient use of the existing transportation system. We have stepped up the activity and participation of trade commissioners throughout the world who are involved in the wheat selling process. Hon. members opposite frequently seem not to know how much freedom of action the Wheat Board has, or about its agents throughout the world who are involved in the selling of wheat on its behalf. We have recently examined a report from the quota system committee. It has looked at the quota system which has a direct effect upon the efficiency and therefore income of the grain farmer. The system had not been looked at for many years and it deserved looking at. Action will be taken.

We have set up additional studies into the research facilities available. We have faced up to the question of inventory. Hon. members opposite are extremely unready to even face the question of whether it is right to ask what the inventory of grain and the level of grain storage in Canada ought to be. We saw that it was necessary to ask those questions and to have them answered. The government saw fit to make available $100 million to assist in the attempt of bringing down the inventory of wheat, which was particularly large, to reasonable proportions.

The sum of $100 million is not an insignificant amount, although hon. members opposite have referred to it as a small crumb. The Lift program will put many millions of additional dollars into the hands of prairie farmers this year. There will be a very marked reduction of wheat acreage and a marked increase of minimum maintenance and forage acreages to take up the money which is available under the Lift program. This money is in addition to the money which otherwise would go to the grain farmers from the expected sales of their products, because these sales of grain will be coming forward with ever-increasing vigour. In these ways the income position of farmers is being improved. But above all, we are facing the question of how to tackle these problems properly.

One of the major issues now before us for consideration is the question of the transportation and handling system. Yet once again, Mr. Speaker, I gravely fear that opposition members will be taking a negative and fear-sowing approach to this matter instead of attempting to see what ought to be the best approach to the issue of transportation and handling. Some of the references which have been made to the press and statements indicate that. Hon. members opposite surely must agree that we are taking the right approach. We say that we ought to analyse the cost of alternative systems of transportation to propose to producers, that they ought to know what the costs of the alternatives are, that we should in every way pass on to the producers the benefit which can flow from an alternative system. The producers have the right to know the differences between the existing system and the proposed system. Hon. members opposite would sooner see us remain static and never change. They do not want us to face the issue of studying the question at all.

I do not believe that is good enough. I do not believe the grains industry can afford to carry 500 million bushels of wheat above any commercial need at a probable cost to the industry of $50 million a year. Do hon. members opposite think that money should be thrown away and not go to the agricultural producers? I do not think those producers will want to throw away cents per bushel on an inefficient handling system if an efficient handling system is available to them. Surely hon. members realize that we are simply seeking the opportunity to present to producers an analysis of what alternatives are available and what the benefits will be.

• (3:50 p.m.)

I wish to underline that there should be no doubt about this. It is my firm belief that we must examine the alternatives in handling systems. We must analyse the possible costs and benefits to the producers. Because the producers will have to accept any changes in the system which may ensue, it is up to them to decide which system is right. It is also important that the benefits from a changed system flow back to the producers. The catalogue of what we are doing to solve the problems that exist should surely convince members opposite, as step by step it is persuading the farmers, that the government is trying to come to grips with the real problems facing the grains industry of this country. Surely this should make hon. members opposite want to withdraw words that appear in this motion

which suggest that there is anything but the very best intentions on the part of this government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Speaker, will the minister accept a question? It relates to his statement about getting Bill C-197 into committee. Will the minister advise the House what amendments in principle, if any, the government will permit in the Standing Committee if the bill reaches that committee? I have never seen any amendments in principle allowed by the government.

Mr. Lang: I do not have the advantage of having served in this House very long. I certainly do not have the obvious advantage of the hon. member opposite. I thought the majority on a committee could approve any amendment.

Mr. Aiken: The majority in the committee are Liberal members.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain (Mr. Southam).

Mr. Aiken: You are admitting that there will be no amendments.

An hon. Member: No.

Mr. Aiken: Of course you are.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure and duty to take part in this debate this afternoon as the representative of a western riding in which I am deeply involved in the economic welfare of agriculture. I wish to commend the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave) who moved the motion and brought this serious problem of the agricultural industry to the attention of this House. I wish to read the motion to refresh the memory of hon. members:

> That this House calls upon the government to reverse its present policies which have deliberately depressed the agricultural economy of this country, causing excessive unemployment, lack of income, slow economic growth and little hope for the future, and this House urges the government to take positive measures to ensure a dynamic rural community as an esesntial component of Canadian society.

This motion is very basic in content. I compliment the hon. member for Kent-Essex (Mr. Danforth) for the very capable way in which he placed before the House the support of our party with respect to this motion. I also congratulate the hon. member for Annapolis Valley (Mr. Nowlan) and the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) for following up that support. Every member who represents a rural riding, regardless of his political affiliation, should support the motion presently being debated. It appears that the present government's agricultural policies, such as they are, are designed to provide cheap food at the expense of the producer.

On Monday last the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) announced the unpegging of the Canadian dollar. What will this do to our agricultural industry? If the Canadian dollar floats up to par, it will cost Canadian farmers untold millions of dollars per year. For example, if we sell 350 million bushels of wheat in the next crop year, it will cost the farmers $21 million if our dollar reaches par and remains there. The moment the dollar increased 4 cents, the price of wheat was immediately lowered by 6 cents a bushel in order to compete in world markets. If the dollar should rise even higher, wheat prices will drop still further. These facts apply to all other export grains such as oats, barley, rye and oilseeds plus the many millions of dollars worth of livestock or livestock products that Canadian farmers export from year to year.

I listened with interest this afternoon when the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) listed the long catalogue of legislative items dealing with agriculture. Most of what he referred to goes back 10 or 12 years to the good Progressive Conservative agricultural legislation. No matter how good this legislation may be, we need more legislative programs to meet today's needs. On Tuesday of this week, as recorded at page 7602 of *Hansard*, I directed the following question to the minister:

> I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the serious plight of agriculture, a situation aggravated by the unpegging of the Canadian dollar on Sunday, may I ask when we can expect the long-awaited announcement on the government's over-all agricultural policies?

The minister replied as follows:

> There have been many policy announcements made from time to time and the aggregate of these announcements is the over-all policy, which may be amended again from time to time.

This is not good enough. It is what we have heard from this minister ever since he took office, as well as from previous ministers. There does not seem to be any co-ordinated policy. As far as agriculture is concerned, we have a piecemeal situation. From time to time there are announcements based on whatever

the minister has in mind. From time to time some new legislative programs are introduced. These appear out of a blue sky. The Lift program was thrown at the farmers without first consulting them. Only two weeks ago the Premier of Saskatchewan, who does not lean to the side of the official opposition, stated on a television program that he had not been able to find five farmers in Saskatchewan in favour of the program. Why should members of the official opposition be criticized for condemning the government for their piecemeal, ill-conceived and ill-thought out agricultural program when a Liberal provincial Premier is so critical?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Southam: To add insult to injury, this afternoon the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Burton) referred to a telegram he had received in connection with Operation Lift. I have received two such telegrams. I wish to refer to one received from Mr. W. G. Gilbey of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool Employees Association. This telegram points out the serious problem of the elevator agents in western Canada, who are trying to fulfil their duties as agents and assisting the government as best they can by moving all the grain they can before the end of the crop year, having to stop work to assist farmers to decipher the Lift program. In spite of the thousands of dollars that have been spent, and the hundreds of thousands of pieces of literature available with respect to this program, the farmers still do not understand the government's intentions or the rules and regulations. The elevator agents spend half their time trying to explain, and in some cases to excuse the government for its ineptitude.

• (4:00 p.m.)

Nevertheless, here is a bona fide complaint involving a thousand or so elevator agents. I suggest, as did the hon. member for Regina East this morning, that the government should take note of the situation and amend the regulations so as to compensate these people for the time required to administer this ill-conceived program.

Much has been said about the two bills before the House at the present time, C-196 and C-197. I support what my hon. friend from Crowfoot said this afternoon in criticism of the proceedings in committee this morning. I have the honour to be a member of that committee. We were dealing with amendments to Bill C-196 and we on this side were hoping to advance an important amendment which would have clarified an important point in the bill. Before there had even been a chance to debate the motion put forward by the hon. member for Crowfoot, a member on the government side moved that the question be put.

This is the answer to the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Lang) when he talks about a democratic approach. To my mind, what took place this morning was one of the most undemocratic procedures I have ever witnessed—an attempt to steamroller an opposition which was only trying to do its duty. Perhaps that bill is not as controversial as Bill C-197, but if it is the intention of the government to follow a similar course with regard to that legislation I am sorry for the poor farmers because the legislation will fall far short of what the industry expects from the House of Commons or of what members of the opposition would like to see.

There are several things seriously wrong with Bill C-197. Some commitment must be forthcoming from the government with regard to certain of its principles. Producer participation must be provided for. If a commitment to this effect could be obtained from a spokesman for the government, we would be content. In the last debate which took place on the subject of agriculture a speech was made by the hon. member for Fraser Valley East (Mr. Pringle), a government supporter, a member of the Standing Committee and a man very knowledgeable in the field of controlled production. He was seriously concerned about Bill C-197 and made critical comments to this effect in an article which appeared in the April issue of the *Canadian Poultryman*. I feel he was justified in making these comments.

The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) also expressed critical views about this legislation and advocated some changes in basic principles. There was a measure of altercation in the House the other night on the subject—some cross-fire during the debate—and once again the hon. member for Fraser Valley East was involved. The issue arose because the hon. member had accused the opposition of filibustering and had sent out some literature to this effect, literature which would mislead the average farmer because it suggested that basic principles were capable of being amended in committee. It is my understanding of the rules that this cannot be done; that the principles have to be agreed on by the House before a bill goes to

committee for clause by clause study. In this case the official opposition is willing to co-operate with the government if the government is ready to be honest and fair with the agricultural industry with respect to the serious questions which have been raised.

Another basic principle, and I am thinking particularly of Bill C-197, is that there should be written into the legislation a right of appeal. There has been a misconception with regard to our demand for a producers' plebiscite. The demand is not that there should be a national plebiscite before the bill takes effect; producers in many areas have already had successful experience with provincial marketing boards. What is suggested, and I want to make this clear for the record, is that if an when this legislation becomes effective and a certain group of producers feel it is not acting in their interests, those producers should have the right to call a plebiscite within their industry and be permitted to withdraw in certain circumstances. I feel such a right should be granted under our democratic system in Canada. Here again is a matter of basic principle which should be agreed on before the bill goes to committee. Certain changes can, of course, be made during a clause by clause study but the basic principles of the bill may not be changed.

I could go on at greater length, Mr. Speaker, but I should like at this point to quote part of an article which appeared in the Winnipeg *Free Press* of June 2, 1970, with reference to Bill C-197. It says:

> Agriculture seems destined to become one of the most controlled industries in Canada.
>
> The days of the independent farmer making his own decisions and not checking with some bureaucrat, or reporting to some inspector to find out what he can grow and where and for how much, are numbered.
>
> This trend emerges in the findings of the federal government's task force on agriculture. Main principles of its recommendations call for sharp reductions in surpluses and those surpluses brought under control. If necessary there is to be a drastic reduction in production.

The general public is now beginning to understand the reason for the stand taken by the official opposition with regard to these proposals. We are in favour of legislation which would add to the well-being of agriculture, but if we are to maintain a democratic form of government and if people are to live happily under a democratic system it is essential that all sectors of the economy should have a right to be heard. The traditional channel of the expression of their opinion is their elected representatives in the House of Commons, where they can expect that their wishes and views will be translated into legislation likely to be of benefit to them. I trust the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister without Portfolio will take note of the principles involved in today's motion and will govern themselves accordingly.

Mr. Bruce Howard (Okanagan Boundary): Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word or two about the motion which is before the House today. I suppose we should not be too surprised at the things which are said about agriculture by members of the opposition. We regularly hear a forlorn tale from them on the subject, though there are very few positive suggestions made. I often hear sad stories from one of the hon. members who spoke in the debate today; he is a very wealthy farmer from Alberta who tells us about the troubles he is having.

I am not saying there are no problems in agriculture. As long as the rains come late or do not come at all, as long as the sun gets too hot sometimes, as long as the winter frost is more severe than it ought to be, or as long as there is intense competition in world markets there will always be problems in agriculture. What really matters is not so much the problems themselves as the way in which we approach them. I am surprised by this opposition motion. A rumour has been circulated by the New Democratic Party that it is the progressive party in Canada.

• (4:10 p.m.)

An hon. Member: That is just a rumour.

Mr. Howard (Okanagan Boundary): Yes, as one hon. member has said, it is just a rumour. It is a strange rumour. It seems to me that the only thing that is progressive about the New Democratic Party is that when the government suggests the minimum wage should be $1.65, we can count on members of the New Democratic Party saying, "Let us make it $1.70". That is how original and progressive they are.

If there should be a government bill that would have the effect of giving away $50 million to somebody, the members of the New Democratic Party would say, "Let us make it $75 million." That is the extent of their progressiveness in Canada. In fact, the New Democratic Party is, on the political spectrum of Canada, far to the right of the Conservative Party of Canada. So it is not surprising that the motion before us today is one that would have the effect of throwing the whole

agricultural program of Canada into reverse. They want to stop everything and go backward. It is not surprising but it is distressing that the New Democratic Party should be so unprogressive.

There are problems that need to be cured. There are problems in some of the agriculture industries in my riding and there have been problems in the past. On occasion winter frost has damaged the fruit trees in the Okanagan Valley. Also on occasion the federal government has come to the rescue with financial assistance. At the present time there are problems in respect of certain types of apples. They have broken down in storage for some mysterious reason. The federal government is carrying on research to determine what has caused that breakdown in storage. There has been excessive competition this year from international markets because of over-production of apples in other parts of the world.

There are problems involving the importation of cheap concentrate juices from Switzerland and other European countries. There has been the problem of synthetic juices being masqueraded as the real thing in the Canadian marketplace. I have directed the attention of the ministers concerned to these problems and they are being investigated at the present time. I have made many appeals in private to the ministers but today I am making the appeal publicly as well because I believe these things should be said in the House of Commons.

There are always problems in agriculture. This year the Department of Agriculture has a budget of $360 million to aid the farmers of Canada in various ways. This fact is completely glossed over by members of the opposition. I suppose it would be glossed over if the figure were $360 billion. They seem to regard any effort by the Department of Agriculture as being of no significance whatsoever. If any other industry in Canada required a $100 million assistance program in one year, I wonder whether there would not be questions asked in the country about the solidity of that industry.

I say that members of the opposition continually want to ignore the facts in respect of agriculture. They complain that people are moving off the farms as if this were some reversible process. It has been going on ever since this country was formed. In 1939, 31 per cent of our population received its livelihood from agriculture. In 1941 the figure had dropped to 27 per cent. In 1951 the figure was 20 per cent, in 1961 it was 11 per cent and in 1966 it was 9 per cent. The projection is that by 1970 it will be down to 3 per cent or 4 per cent of the population.

All of us have to face change from time to time. It is regrettable that members on the other side of the House resent the fact that the world is changing, that things are changing and that people must adapt to the change. I ask hon. members opposite what they would have the people of Canada who are engaged in agriculture do. Would they have them sit on the farms and starve because there are no markets for the products they produce? Would they have us ignore the improvements in efficiency and in new machines that are available? If we did this, I ask how long would these people survive in agriculture. The only way in which any agricultural industry can survive anywhere in the world, and the only way in which we can feed the hungry people of the world, is by having an efficient agricultural industry. This requires up-to-date and modern methods. Let us be practical about this and see what can be done about it. Let us see whether there is an opportunity to channel people into productive and useful employment in other areas of our economy.

I have heard the leader of the New Democratic Party sanctimoniously say that surely with the hungry people there are in the world we should be able to give away this food and find some way to dispose of these surpluses. Well, it is a pious thing, but the leader of the New Democratic Party knows as well as I and others that there are limitations in respect of the amount of food we can give away around the world. A while ago the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Lang) mentioned that we are giving away about $75 million a year in the form of wheat flour and other wheat products. Our total food aid program this year will be about $90 million.

I should like to mention to the two members of the Conservative Party who are in the House this afternoon that this figure might be compared with the $10 million which represented the give-away in food aid when the previous Conservative government was in power. Yet we hear that we should do more. Of course we should, but the underdeveloped countries of the world are the developing countries. They are producing their own food products more efficiently.

Let us take India as an example. Now that India is producing nearly all it requires, if we were to give that country more than a certain amount it would mean that their own agricul-

tural industry would not be able to dispose of the production it produces. We would destroy their industry and reverse the process of trying to help the developing countries sustain their own economies. There are other limitations. The very effective aid programs in the world in the past decade or two have produced some remarkable developments such as in the productivity of wheat and rice.

I am sure members of the House are familiar with these developments which have been made in many countries, which have helped them become completely self-sufficient in respect of the food they require. Yet we still hear sanctimonious statements such as those made by members of the New Democratic Party. They suggest that surely we can find someone who will dispose of our surplus food. They would seem to suggest that all we need do is find someone to take it and then find enough taxpayers in Canada to put up the hundreds of millions of dollars required to do it.

So I suggest to the members of the New Democratic Party who proposed this motion today and to other opposition members that it would be more reasonable to face the facts as they exist. These facts are that the population required to produce the necessary food in Canada is declining. So I say, let us turn the people into productive employment in other areas of our economy. Many jobs will be required in western Canada and in agricultural areas to absorb the rural population and the people who will be shifted out of the agricultural industry. Let us do something about this. Perhaps we should have looked at the $100 million we gave in the form of an emergency payment to the grain growing industry on the Prairies. Perhaps we should have decided to put this money into a long-term program to develop employment for these people so that instead of giving them a relief program for one year we would be giving them a program that would have long-term benefits in respect of employment year after year.

• (4:20 p.m.)

This is the area in which we must strive. There are good things that can be said about agricultural development in Canada and that need to be said. It is not just a matter of decline. We all know that the livestock industry is growing very rapidly and will need to grow if it is going to keep up with demand. We all know that the oilseed industry is growing very rapidly, and we will need all that production. But there is increased competition from abroad. The socialist states are beginning to become a little more productive in their economies and they will be more competitive with us. They will require less of our products. We are going to face increased subsidization of agriculture in some intensive manufacturing countries of Europe and elsewhere.

Let us face these problems realistically. Let us hear some constructive suggestions from across the way. Let us hear the ideas which the opposition has on how to tackle these problems, instead of hearing their condemnations and suggestions that all we should do is go in reverse. I hope that in the weeks ahead and in the session next fall we will not be treated day after day to cries of lament from the opposition who refuse to face the facts of life and refuse to face the economy as it exists today. I hope that we will hear some progressive and helpful suggestions from them. I sit on the Standing Committee on Agriculture, and I also listen to them in this House, but I seldom hear any such suggestions. I hope that in the months ahead we will have something along that line that will aid the people of Canada and especially the farmers of this country.

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I think it is very timely that the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave) introduced this motion today because it covers a number of very important matters that affect the future of rural Canada. In the first place, the hon. member made reference in his motion to the fact that there are policies which are depressing the agricultural economy of this country. In the second place, he made reference to the economic impact of the situation facing the agricultural industry on other sectors of the economy as well as the total economy of Canada. He made reference to the fact that this is causing excessive unemployment, lack of income, slow economic growth and little hope for the future. Finally, he went on to urge the government to take positive measures to ensure the survival of a dynamic rural community as an essential component of Canadian society.

I was really quite amazed by the contributions made by the two ministers in the debate this afternoon. First of all, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) trotted out the same speech that he has made on I do not know how many occasions in the House. It is the same tired, old record about the things that

the government is doing, and he simply cannot understand why the opposition does not appreciate everything the government is doing. He said the agricultural industry is doing quite fine. He trotted out a number of income figures.

True enough, he quoted a number of figures regarding rapeseed income, flax income, potato income and several other items on which in 1969 there was some increase. But regardless of these selective statistics which the minister used, he cannot escape the fact that the farmers' cash income in 1969, as shown by DBS, dropped by $167 million for Canada as a whole. For my own province of Saskatchewan it dropped by more than that amount, by $177 million. In Alberta it dropped by $77 million, and in Manitoba by $12 million. That of course means that there were other areas in Canada where there was some increase in the cash income. Nevertheless, I think it can be illustrated that across Canada as a whole there is in fact a very serious situation facing the agricultural industry, and this has profound implications for Canada.

Of course, the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Lang) tried to show the House that the government is moving on every front in dealing with the problems that face agriculture in rural Canada. He went on to say that a new quota system was recommended by a special committee. But of course he failed to make any mention of the fact that these recommendations were totally ignored when the government came forward with its program for the coming crop year. I could give other examples to illustrate the inconsistency of the Minister without Portfolio.

There is one particular matter that I drew to the attention of the House this morning which I think illustrates some of the approach and attitude of the government on many matters affecting agriculture. When I asked the minister if any consideration was going to be given to the elevator agents who will have to do a great deal of extra work in dealing with the administrative aspects of Operation Lift as it was introduced by the government, the minister informed me that they had obtained an agreement with the elevator companies to look after this particular matter. He gave no indication, in answer to my question on the matter, that there had been any consultation with the employees of the elevator companies or indeed the employees' organizations. According to my information, there is no question that the elevator companies do look after the permit books. With respect to the other forms, I am not familiar with the complete picture. However, I understand that there is a good deal of confusion and there is certainly a grey area which requires further examination.

I think the elevator companies and their employees are not happy with this aspect of the program. The fact is that the farmer does go to his elevator agent for advice. This is a time-consuming activity. The question might be asked: Why not use the PFAA man? The PFAA personnel have been designated as the people to administer this program. Why are they not the ones to act as liaison? Why is it that the municipal secretariat throughout western Canada who were asked if they would look after the job refused to do so? Finally, they secured some sort of an O.K. from the elevator companies and agreed to their employees looking after some aspects of this program. This is a further example of the administrative bumbling which has been a feature of just about every aspect of the government's agricultural programs over the past two years that I have been in the House.

I think it is timely that we have a debate on agriculture today in view of the fact that the task force on agriculture has at last produced its report or, I should say, at last the government has made the report public. There are many recommendations in this report which require a great deal of study. Time does not permit me today to go into all these matters. However, I would like to know why there is apparently a considerable degree of hesitation involved in its recommendations to deal with agriculture as an industry rather than from the viewpoint of the people who are making their livelihood in it, from the viewpoint of the communities and from the viewpoint of Canadian society as a whole.

I think there is still some redirection of emphasis required if we are going to find adequate solutions to what are admittedly difficult problems. In addition, as has been noted, there is legislation before the House at the present time on this matter. The Canada Grains Act is designed as a vehicle to enable the introduction of a protein grading system at some time. The government had this item on its list of legislation a year ago and it was not introduced. This year it was again on the list of legislation to be introduced but the government held off for months and months before introducing it. Apparently they had to carry on consultations with the Canada

Grains Council and other groups, following which they finally produced the legislation.

This idea has been kicking around for over 20 years but the government was not able to come forward with legislation until a very late stage in the session. Now it appears very doubtful that the legislation will be passed in time to be introduced effectively during the coming crop year. This is one of the most pressing needs in the total grains picture if, in fact, we are going to improve our marketing prospects in the worldwide picture. We also have the farm products marketing bill before us, again introduced at a late stage of the session.

• (4:30 p.m.)

There has been some controversy about who did what and who didn't do what. I do not intend to get involved in that question. I simply want to make it clear that my party supports the principle of this bill. We want to see it pressed forward. We feel some changes should be made in the legislation, but we are wholehartedly in favour of its principle. We feel there is need for machinery whereby farmers can be involved more effectively in the operation of the legislation.

It is also timely to discuss some of these matters today in view of the crisis which is faced in western Canada. Operation Lift can only be termed a disaster. There is a lack of guarantees and of underwriting with respect to some of the very unstable features in the agricultural situation of western Canada.

We have seen a great deal of administrative bungling by the government over the past two years. Examples have been given of it on many occasions in this House and I do not intend to go over that ground again. But it is important to know something of the government's approach, which leaves something to be desired. It seems that the government is taking the attitude, "We know what is good for you." This is best illustrated in Operation Lift, when the government devised its own program in fundamental variance to that which the task force on agriculture is recommending. This has become clear since publication of the task force report. Nevertheless, the government has bulled ahead with its program regardless of objections from every quarter in western Canada. In the marketing legislation bill the government is taking the attitude, "You are not going to have any say in your own affairs. We are going to do this whether you like it or not." Throughout this whole series of agricultural programs and other programs affecting rural Canada there has been insensitivity and callousness displayed by the government to the detriment of the public good.

I want to make specific reference to one matter involving exchange rates, something which has been debated during the current week. Certainly members of the NDP approve the government's measure in principle. We feel it is in the national interest that there be a floating exchange rate, but it does not solve all our problems. It simply provides new opportunities to deal with some of our serious economic problems. As I indicated in my statement on behalf of the NDP in reply to the minister's statement on Monday, there are of course problems. There are bound to be, in an economy as complex as Canada's. The problems created for the export industries must be taken into account. In his statement during the emergency debate on Tuesday the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) indicated that consideration would be given to special cases where problems have been created. In answer to my question as to whether he considered the 6-cent drop in the price of wheat, which took place the next day, to be a special case that should be considered, the minister said yes. I welcome his statement in that regard and I hope he will come forward with action and a program to deal with this problem in the very near future.

This step is going to hurt western Canada. The farmers of western Canada should not be expected to bear the load of this particular policy when the policy is in the national interest. If it is in the national interest, and if problems are created in particular sectors, then those sectors of the economy should be compensated. I also note the impact that current conditions are having on the urban economy and indeed on the entire Canadian economy. In my own province of Saskatchewan, where there is a serious economic situation, we have experienced within the past year a decline of 18,000 in our population. This reflects the over-all state of conditions in the province. Retail trade, to take one economic indicator, was down by more than 9 per cent in the first three months of this year. In my own city of Regina well over 100 businesses were forced to shut down during the past year. Other centres in Canada are feeling the effects of this situation. Brantford, where the farm machinery industry is locat-

ed, is affected. Oshawa, where a great deal of automobile manufacturing is carried on, is also affected.

I acknowledge the need for adjustment in agriculture. Technology and the economics of the situation dictate that change must take place. In the past this was always accompanied by a degree of hardship, suffering and privation. The only answer of some people is to depopulate the rural areas, to move farmers off the land. It seems to me that the task force has partly adopted this attitude. I agree that some changes have to take place, that some adjustments have to be made, but we must be concerned about the future of the rural communities of Canada. Much of our rural life is undergoing change. This change is taking place throughout all levels of the rural community. The entire rural pattern of life is breaking down. I am not referring to a change in the old traditional way of doing things; I am referring to the whole pattern of community life, of serving the economic and social needs of people. We must be concerned with this. Farmers and rural people today demand services of the same calibre and type as are enjoyed by urban people. Skills are involved in the provision of those services.

Many of our rural people centre their activities on communities which provide modern services, but we have seen many examples where farm machinery agencies, automobile agencies and other businesses dependent upon such communities have been forced out of business.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

[*Translation*]

Mr. C. A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in rising on the motion now before the House, which reads as follows:

That this House calls upon the government to reverse its present policies which have deliberately depressed the agricultural economy of this country, causing excessive unemployment, lack of income, slow economic growth and little hope for the future, and this House urges the government to take positive measures to ensure a dynamic rural community as an essential component of Canadian society.

• (4:40 p.m.)

I first wish to congratulate the mover of that motion, because I do not think that a motion has ever been so much to the point. It is useless to say that we, in the Ralliement créditiste, support such a motion.

[Mr. Burton.]

This afternoon, when the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) rose in support of a policy that I would term "untenable", I was quite surprised to hear him accuse the opposition of questioning the integrity of a government member. I wonder now, having witnessed all what happened in the farm sector in Quebec and in other provinces as well, if we should not challenge the integrity of a private member or that of a whole government.

Our farmers are so revolted that they no longer know whom to blame. The minister is defending his farm policy by pointing out the measures adopted, such as the studies, the inquiries, the surveys, the classifications to improve cattle, etc. He has even alluded to the Crop Insurance Act to which the farmers contribute. However, the minister is forgetting that the farmers do not only live from royal inquiries, scientific studies and technical surveys but from the production of their farm operations.

Today, we should deal with what the farmers are complaining about. Now that they have done what they were asked to do by great government technocrats, that is build up economic units, and now that they have gone into debts for several years to mechanize their operations or to increase their livestock in order to meet the government's requirements, the farmers are penalized for their good work.

This is how this government is rewarding those who are working towards our economic development. Here again, we hear some Liberal members say that the motion moved today is retrograde. I am wondering if it is not more so to destroy what has been built, to reduce to nothing our lands, to drive our farmers into the cities and to say to them: Go and ask for welfare—as it is done in my own riding and elsewhere, where more than 50 per cent of the farmers must apply for welfare—all in the name of reform. At least, the government should put an end to that nonsense and find more logical reasons.

What has happened to the requests, demands, representations made by the farmers here in Parliament, outside as well as inside, during committee meetings? I shall simply quote an extract from an article published in the farmers' paper of my riding called: *La Terre de Chez-Nous*:

Telegram to Prime Minister Trudeau.

In a telegram to Prime Minister Trudeau the Quebec Federation of Industrial Milk Producers objects to the dairy policy for 1970-71 and asks that its enforcement be suspended immediately.

The producers, says the telegram, have given serious consideration to the problems of overproduction and, at their annual general meeting held on April 22 and 23, voted for a quota system in marketing. Therefore, they want new talks with the federal government—

At present all doors are closed.

I remember that last year, some farmers were still able to discuss quotas with representatives of the Canadian Dairy Commission but this is no longer possible because the door has been double-locked.

Consequently, the farmers call for the reopening of negotiations with the federal government in order to establish a fair and just dairy policy. Besides, here is the text of a telegram from the Quebec Federation of Industrial Milk Producers:

The Quebec Federation of Industrial Milk Producers, at its general meeting in Quebec City on April 22 and 23, 1970, objects publicly to the dairy policy of the federal government—Requests your intervention in order to suspend immediately this policy which unfairly penalizes the dairy producers of Quebec. These producers, who have just voted for the adoption of the quota system for their production are asking for new negotiations in order to establish a fair and just dairy policy, considering this new situation.

These are farmers from Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean. We must not forget that those from the Lower St. Lawrence and from Nicolet are making the same request and are against the government policy. I will not have time to read the whole article but I will say that not only farmers from Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean but also those from the province of Quebec as a whole are not satisfied.

When hon. members from western Canada take the floor in the House, they talk about wheat. It is natural since it is the West's main production.

As for us from Quebec, milk is our main product. Unfortunately, when it is the subject in the House, the members from Quebec remain seated or they rise to try to defend an indefensible dairy policy.

Mr. Speaker, it is about time to stop that nonsense. We must no longer remain silent, but show that we represent an area which needs to be defended. This is why I am speaking this afternoon, because once again I want to point out to the government the injustice that prevails in eastern Canada, particularly in the province of Quebec.

The minister said earlier that the government is paying about $140 million to help dairy producers. I wish he were in the House, because I would ask him to tell us how much money he takes from farmers through that penalty of $1.25 per hundredweight of milk.

• (4:50 p.m.)

One hand gives what the other takes back. Then, it is said that something was given. Why? Because farmers cannot stop the cows from giving milk. Indeed, the cows are not used to regulations. They give milk just the same and that is why farmers are imposed a penalty of $1.25 per hundredweight. When they get assistance, it amounts to 26 cents per hundreweight. The maximum is 56 cents.

However, when it comes to the penalty, farmers have to pay $1.25 per hundredweight. No small amount. It is absolutely ridiculous! I have no doubt that if western wheat producers had had to pay $1.25 per hundredweight, they would have marched on Ottawa with guns.

Western farmers are paid not too produce. I am not envious. I feel they should receive more money, and once again I ask the minister to think sincerely about that injustice. Subsidies are paid to channel production in another direction, and this is all right.

Western Canada receives a lot in proportion to its population. Indeed, the three Prairie provinces have less than 3 million inhabitants. They take advantage of the act providing assistance for grain marketing which gives them a large return in addition to another $40 million which they had obtained before receiving those last $100 million granted by the government. Even if they received $500 million, we would be pleased.

But the 6 million inhabitants of the province of Quebec should at least get a third or half of the assistance granted by the government. On the contrary, they are deprived of $100 million. They are penalized instead of being helped.

If milk producers were allowed a decent price, they would be ready to channel their production in another direction, although at the government's urging they made the mistake of getting into debt for 10 or 15 years to mechanize their operations and today they have to give up.

They are no longer in a position to pay their debts and the government, behind the scene, collects its $1.25 dollar at the source. It will not lose that amount.

This is the reason for the surpluses and our farmers want to take steps to streamline their production. The government should help them instead of stifling them. The government

should pay them yet on their feet again instead of imposing new burdens on them.

What matters is that hon. members should appreciate this unbearable situation. People say: The Quebec farmers demonstrate and shout in the streets. No wonder that they indulge in such demonstrations when they are the victims of such glaring injustices. If the same thing were to be done in the western provinces, we would soon witness a rebellion, but in the province of Quebec, we are used to be abused, and—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his time is expired.

[*English*]

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, for a few moments this afternoon I should like to speak in this debate which concerns agriculture and the problems of rural people. Fortunately, many of the debates which take place in this House refer to agriculture and farmers. Although the percentage of farmers in our country is declining steadily and we are becoming an urban people, we must not underestimate the importance of this industry to our country. Surely many of us have a background related to the rural areas of Canada. Urbanization in our country has taken place in recent years only.

As our country changes, so must agriculture change. Many of these changes are catalogued and predicted in the task force report on agriculture. These changes will effect us all, especially the people living on the smaller farms and those of advanced years in life. The responsibility for smoothing this transition from farming to other jobs or retirement will fall on government, and especially the federal government. The Canfarm system, which is a farm management data system, is an example of co-operation between provincial and federal governments and universities to bring the advantages of technology to aid the practical commercial farmer. In the old days when a farmer had a half dozen cows, a few chickens and a team of horses this sort of technical assistance was not necessary, but it is today when you see more specialization and larger farm units.

However, for every farmer going into farming in a larger way and requiring tools like the Canfarm data system there are many more going out of farming. The federal government has just signed a new agreement with the province of Ontario for some $60 million over the next five years under the ARDA program. This program will give assistance in retiring marginal farms in many areas of the province. It will also consolidate small farms on good land, regroup them and lease them back or sell them to viable farmers with viable units. A good provision in this agreement is that many of these farms can be leased, instead of purchased, for a period of ten years. Improvements to the land can be made with ARDA funds. The big advantage of this program is that the farmer does not have to raise the capital for these farms but can simply lease the land at very reasonable rates for a period of years.

An important new provision in the Ontario-Canada agreement is that for special assistance to farmers retiring from uneconomic farms. There are so many areas of our country with farmers of advanced years who have not enough assets to retire on. If they sell their farm, often they do not realize enough out of it to buy a house in town to which to retire. The program, I hope and trust, will bridge this gap.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that our production technology has gone far beyond our marketing ability. We can produce too much food but we cannot sell it at a price that enables the producer to obtain a decent return on his investment, management and labour. All too often he does not even get reasonable wages, let alone anything for his management or as return on investment. I trust that out of the task force report on agriculture will come a comprehensive farm policy which will bring a better life for our friends and neighbours on the farms of Canada. Indeed, one of the reasons for establishing the task force was so that a comprehensive national policy could be designed comprising of new structures and plans for orderly marketing which would bring reasonable returns to producers.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. It being five o'clock, it is my duty to inform the House that pursuant to section 11 of Standing Order 58 the proceedings on the motion before the House are deemed to have expired.

Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the House would agree to revert to motions in order that I might make a short announcement about the tragic situation in Peru. The message to the House is brief.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Is there unanimous agreement?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

PERU—ASSISTANCE TO EARTHQUAKE VICTIMS

Mr. James E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the House is aware of the tragic situation now faced by the government and the people of Peru in the wake of the devastating earthquakes which spread through that country a few days ago. Since that time the Canadian government has been examining on an urgent basis the requests of the Peruvian government for relief assistance in an effort to determine the quickest and most effective way in which Canada could come to the assistance of the victims of what will certainly prove to be one of the greatest calamities of this century.

Hon. members will recall that the Prime Minister indicated in this chamber a day or so ago the immediate cash grant of $25,000 to the Canadian Red Cross Society for relief purposes in Peru. The Prime Minister now wishes the House to know that the government has this afternoon authorized the immediate dispatch to Peru of six Canadian armed forces aircraft for use in ferrying relief supplies into the affected areas. Five of these aircraft are of the Caribou variety designed for operation in challenging airstrip conditions. The other is a Hercules transport which will act as a mother-ship for the navigational assistance of the Caribou. These aircraft will depart from their bases in Canada during the course of the evening and will be available to the Peruvian authorities immediately on their arrival in that country early next week. The government is continuing its examination of other means by which it can come to the assistance of the earthquake victims.

I wish to thank hon. members, Mr. Speaker, for their courtesy in permitting me to revert to motions to make this statement on behalf of the Prime Minister.

Assistance to Peruvian Earthquake Victims

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpeque): Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the government for seeking practical means of expressing in a practical way the humanitarian feelings of the people of Canada for the citizens of Peru who have suffered this catastrophe. I think that the Canadian people will be pleased to know that some of our armed forces aircraft have been dispatched to render aid in this situation.

• (5:00 p.m.)

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, the members of this party also welcome the statement that has just been made. I must say that we felt a bit embarrassed the other day when it was announced that only $25,000 was being given. This amount seemed terribly small in the wake of the tremendous suffering in Peru. We realize now that that was only an immediate response. As the seriousness of the situation was impressed upon the government, the government realized that the Canadian people wanted to do everything they could to come to the assistance of these people in Peru. This action has our support. The government will also have our support of any further steps it may take to help these unfortunate people.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I wish to confirm the business for next week. Monday will be an opposition allotted day. On Tuesday we will call first Government Order 87, third reading of Bill C-202 with respect to Arctic waters pollution prevention. This will be followed immediately by the completion of second reading and committee stage of Government Order 98, Bill C-215 with regard to the Elections Act. On Wednesday we hope to complete the Elections Act bill. On Thursday in any event we will call Government Order 6, Bill C-4 regarding the Corporations Act.

At 5 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, June 8, 1970

The House met at 2 p.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. BALDWIN—MR. KNOWLES (WINNIPEG NORTH CENTRE)—MAKING OUTSIDE HOUSE OF PROPOSAL RESPECTING WAGE RESTRAINTS

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege in respect of which I gave Your Honour notice and also filed what might be called a caveat on Friday afternoon. It has to do with statements made by the Minister of Finance over the weekend in the face of his refusal to deal with the same matters in the House.

During the last week in particular a number of questions were directed to the Prime Minister, the Minister of Finance and others. Today I have read and reread these questions and answers, and the only impression to be derived is that the government had no intention of making any announcement or moving toward any specific proposals to deal with the problems of inflation and unemployment. I have a number of these quotations here, but I will not take the time of the House to read them.

Mr. Trudeau: Why not?

Mr. Baldwin: They include questions and answers on June 1, May 25, May 29, and twice on June 4. The Prime Minister, it may be, did not have time over the weekend to read them, but I have read and reread them with some interest. In the face of this we have now witnessed the extraordinary spectacle of the Minister of Finance and other government people involved making proposals at the Federal-Provincial Conference of Finance Ministers in Winnipeg over the weekend in which they advocated very specific wage restraints and controls, with a hint that such may well be the subject of sanction and enforcement. Thus, what we heard during the past week in response to our questions was only an exercise in a sly and furtive form of deceit—an attempt to keep from this House facts and proposals it is entitled to hear at first hand.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (2:10 p.m.)

Mr. Baldwin: This House and the country have been remarkably patient with respect to the government's stumbling and blundering. We in the opposition, because government members have sat silent and helpless—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baldwin: —have attempted to obtain some idea of what the government proposes to do. The question of the wisdom or not of these proposals is irrelevant to the issue I am now raising. The sad and pitiful spectacle emerges of a government which does not know where it wants to go, and even if it did it does not know how to get there. We have known this for some time. The country is finally waking up to the fact.

There is a responsibility upon the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) and others to be frank and honest in the House in connection with this serious problem. Solutions will not come about unless there is confidence and trust between government and Parliament and government and the people. Unless the government responds frankly to proper questions in the House, the present lack of confidence will increase in the country and the possibility of a solution will be even less than it is today.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Before the Minister of Finance responds I have to mention that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre also filed a notice somewhat along the same lines as the one which was filed by the hon. member for Peace River. Perhaps the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre might be allowed to express his views before the Minister of Finance speaks.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, thank you for giving me this opportunity to carry out the intention which I indicated to you in the notice I sent to your office this morning. I raise this matter as a question of privilege and I may say, Mr.

Speaker, that I am resolved to do it in what is sometimes referred to as a low key. Nevertheless, I feel that this is a very serious matter.

I draw Your Honour's attention first of all to words from May, which you have frequently drawn to our attention, as to the true meaning of parliamentary privileges which according to May, it is as follows:

> Parliamentary privilege is the sum of the peculiar rights enjoyed by each house collectively as a constituent part of the High Court of Parliament, and by members of each House individually, without which they could not discharge their functions—

I contend, Mr. Speaker, that one of the rights without which we cannot discharge our functions in this House of Commons is the right not to be misled, the right when government statements are made to us to believe that they are true. If that situation does not obtain, not only are we prevented from the proper discharge of our functions but this House can well fall apart.

Sir, because I seriously ask you to find that I have a prima facie case of privilege I wish to make it clear that I am not alleging that there was a deliberate misleading of the House, and accordingly I am not asking you to find that there was deliberate misleading of the House last week. But I do assert, and I ask you to find, that what went on last week raises some very serious questions that ought to be gone into by a standing committee of the House.

The hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) has already referred to a number of days on which questions were asked and answers were given. In order to pinpoint the matter I am content to confine my references to Tuesday, June 2, and Thursday, June 4. On Tuesday, June 2, the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas), after having asked about wage restraints, asked the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) if it was the government's intention to cover the entire field of other incomes, "particularly profits, interest, rents and prices." The minister's reply was:

> I had not thought of making that request of the provinces.

When newspaper reports persisted that something like this was going to happen at Winnipeg on Friday my leader, the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands, raised the matter again on Thursday, directing his questions to the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister gave us various statements which made it clear that in his view what the Minister of Finance had said on Tuesday was correct, that the government had no thoughts along these lines.

An hon. Member: What page?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): When the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands pressed the matter with the Prime Minister, as reported at page 7714 the reply was:

> Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member would save a lot of his time and the time of the House if he were to take the word of the Minister of Finance against that of a canard.

An hon. Member: What a word!

Mr. Trudeau: "Imposition of wage controls"—read the question.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have done a lot of reading over the weekend. I am quite prepared to become a member of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections for the purpose of this reference where we can go into the matter in full. The whole impression given to us was that the government had no thought of going to Winnipeg with proposals for wage restraints, wage controls, guidelines, or what have you. Hon. members are aware of the fact that even as late as Friday afternoon at least one Ottawa paper was still reporting that the Prime Minister had said this would not happen—

Mr. Trudeau: I did not.

An hon. Member: Oh, oh—touchy, touchy!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I said that at least one Ottawa newspaper was still reporting that the Prime Minister was saying this would not happen. The Press Gallery was only doing what we were doing, believing the answers we were getting from the government side of the House. Yet at Winnipeg a program of wage restraints or controls was announced.

I know, Mr. Speaker, before anybody mentions it, that it was announced in the form of an appeal from Dr. Young, the Chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission. I know it will be argued that this was not an announcement of government policy. But this is a fiction that it is getting pretty hard for any of us to believe. I draw attention to the fact that in a report in the Saturday *Globe and Mail* by David Crane from Winnipeg there are several references to Finance Minister E. J.

Benson and his remarks. In particular, I should like to quote the following:

> Mr. Benson said the decision to try a new approach, through wage and salary guidelines, was taken after the Canadian Labour Congress convention in Edmonton last month showed no willingness on the part of labour to support the voluntary restraint program of the Prices and Incomes Commission.
>
> It would be unrealistic to expect such guidelines would attract support from any substantial segment of organized labour.

Mr. Speaker, I know that two explanations can be advanced. One is the usual course of picking the exact words, the exact question asked by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands and the exact reply, and saying, "See, it really was not incorrect; it really stands up if you examine it." I know that the other explanation or defence will be that the announcement was not made by the government but by Dr. Young.

Mr. Speaker, surely we are old enough around here to know that the Prices and Incomes Commission now speaks for the government. We are old enough to know that it would be impossible for the Minister of Finance not to have thought of these things on Tuesday of last week and yet by Friday be ready to agree with Dr. Young.

If I have gone a little farther than I intended in documenting the question of privilege, I ask Your Honour's forgiveness because I do not want to put Your Honour in the position of having to decide from the Chair today that, ipso facto, there was a case of deliberate misleading. But I do plead with Your Honour, because of the fact that there was all this confusion last week, because there is a real difference between what was said in the House and what happened in Winnipeg, to agree that we have a question of privilege, and that a committee should go into it. I go back to what I said when I first got to my feet, that one of our basic rights is the right not to be misled, the right, when the government makes a statement on the floor of this House, to believe it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): If that right is destroyed it will be pretty hard for this place to carry on. In view of last week's developments I believe that the people involved should be asked to appear before the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections so that we may go into this matter and clarify it. Accordingly, if Your Honour should rule that I have presented a prima facie case of privilege I would be prepared to move the following motion:

> That the apparent conflict between statements on income restraints made by the government on Tuesday and Thursday, June 2 and June 4, in the House of Commons, and the position taken by the government on Friday, June 5, at a federal-provincial conference of finance ministers at Winnipeg, be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, so that the said committee may call witnesses and take whatever steps it deems necessary to clarify this situation.

• (2:20 p.m.)

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I agree with the two previous speakers that it is important that the House be not misled.

An hon. Member: You do it all the time.

Mr. Trudeau: I am afraid both of them have misled the House as a result of their inaccurate reading. They have misled the House by indicating that my answers in some way had been less than truthful. Well, Mr. Speaker, in order for them to establish a prima facie case it would be important for the hon. members to read the questions to which I gave the answers. As the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) indicated, I have not spent the weekend reading *Hansard*, but I did—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: —while they were talking look at the questions that were asked of me. In every case they were talking to the imposition of taxes on wage gains or to compulsory measures. The hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) on page seventy-seven twelve, in the right-hand column, is asking—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): It is page 7712.

Mr. Trudeau: It is seventy-seven twelve or 7712. I do not think there is much difference.

Mr. Sharp: They think we are misleading the House.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: He asked if there was to be "a proposal for imposing a federal tax on wage gains in excess of the guidelines", and so on. The next question he asked was a repetition. He asked about "a proposal for a tax on any wage gains in excess of the guidelines", and so on. The hon. member for Peace River lower in the same column

asks about "any scheme for imposing wage and price controls".

Mr. Baldwin: Read it all.

Mr. Trudeau: If you flip the page instead of flipping your top you see that on page 7714 the Leader of the NDP comes in with another question "regarding the imposition of wage controls or the imposition of any tax on wage gains to keep them in line—".

There were not in Winnipeg, as far as I know, any such proposals. I fail to see how either hon. member can establish a prima facie case by saying, "No, we had no knowledge that there would be such an imposition", because in fact there was none.

Mr. Baldwin: There are no extenuating circumstances.

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I should like to go a step farther than that because I was asked a question earlier in the week about whether the government was going to make proposals with respect to wage guidelines and so on, and I indicated that the government was not. The situation is that Dr. Young is the head of the Prices and Incomes Commission which has done a very useful job in Canada in obtaining commitments on the side of business and has tried to obtain commitments on the side of Labour. As an independent commissioner he also approached governments, and I specify here not only the government of Canada but the governments of the provinces as well, and made a proposal which he presented at Winnipeg and which this government chose to accept.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): And the government did not know of it before?

Mr. Benson: One of the things the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has tried to say is that the Prices and Incomes Commission is directed by the government of Canada.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): And are they not?

Mr. Benson: This is not the case.

Mr. Orlikow: That is a lie.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Benson: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, somebody has called me a liar.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

[Mr. Trudeau.]

Some hon. Members: Withdraw!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. No member has the right to say that another member, whether he is a minister or not, has uttered a lie.

As hon. members know, the Minister of Finance has the floor. If there are interventions which do not come to the attention of the Chair, it is difficult to call on the member to give an explanation or withdraw. As far as the Chair is concerned, the Minister of Finance has the floor. If someone rises and suggests that another member has told a lie he must, of course, withdraw that statement. If any member rises and does this, he will be in contravention of the rules of the House and called upon to withdraw. For the moment the Minister of Finance has the floor.

Mr. Benson: I wish to indicate that the intervention was by the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow).

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Benson: I request that the hon. member withdraw that intervention.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, I am the member to whom the minister is referring. I recognize that the language I used was not parliamentary and I will withdraw it. However, I say to the minister that I do not believe—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It is the hon. member's right to believe or disbelieve statements made by other hon. members, although as a community we are required to accept the truth of statements by members.

Mr. Benson: The plain fact, Mr. Speaker, is that Dr. Young made proposals to each of the provincial governments and the federal government. The federal government chose at Winnipeg to accept those proposals. I reiterate that this is an independent commission. It is not controlled by the government. We did not make suggestions to the commissioners as to the proposals they should make. They consulted the government in the same way they consulted the provincial governments. I am pleased, for the sake of Canada, that all the governments to a degree are going to support the proposals of Dr. Young.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps we should not get involved in the substance of the matter referred to by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and the hon. member for Peace River. The decision to be made on the subject before the Chair is purely procedural. The

Chair has to decide in the circumstances whether there is a prima facie case that ought to be referred to a committee or which requires action of some kind.

The matter raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is essentially the same as that raised by the hon. member for Peace River, except in the case of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre there is a proposed motion.

On examining closely the point raised by the hon. member for Peace River it appears that he has endeavoured in his notice filed with the Chair, which he has reiterated in the course of his presentation, to bring two aspects of the question before the House, namely, that certain statements, because of their nature, ought to have been made in the House and that replies given in response to questions in the House have misled and deceived hon. members.

The first point, namely, that certain statements ought to have been made in the House, is a question that has been raised from time to time over the years. It is a difficult problem, one that has tried the wisdom of many of my predecessors, and one for which I fear it is difficult to provide a solution.

It has been raised by hon. members during this Parliament on a number of occasions. I have ruled from time to time, whenever the matter has been raised, that it was not really a question of privilege which justified a motion being put to the House for debate and on which a vote would eventually be taken to decide whether the matter would be referred to a committee.

I must acknowledge my greater difficulty in dealing with the second point raised by the hon. member to the effect that replies given to questions in the House have misled and deceived members. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and the hon. member for Peace River have indicated that they do not propose to suggest there has been wilful misrepresentation to the House. They suggested that the matter might perhaps be cleared up after further study by a committee of this House.

• (2:30 p.m.)

If the intent of the proposed motion were to establish a deliberate deception by a member or by members, the Chair must consider the often-cited statement on that point made by my distinguished predecessor, Mr. Speaker Michener, which is to be found at page 584 of the *Journals* of 1959, in the following words:

> In my view, simple justice requires that no hon. member should have to submit to investigation of his conduct by the House or a committee until he has been charged with an offence.

If the Chair were to accept the motion proposed by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, and if the matter were sent to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, what would be under consideration there except the conduct of a minister? I suggest that this is what would be under consideration, and that this could be done only by adopting the procedures and measures which have been suggested on a number of occasions by the Chair, particularly by Mr. Speaker Michener in the ruling to which I have just referred.

It does seem to me that implicit in the question raised by the hon. member for Peace River is a dispute or a misunderstanding arising between members as to allegations of fact. The Minister of Finance has interpreted the situation as he sees it. Obviously, he is in disagreement on this point with the hon. member for Winnipeg North, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and the hon. member for Peace River. As stated in citation 113 of Beauchesne's fourth edition:

> A dispute arising between two members, as to allegations of facts, does not fulfil the conditions of parliamentary privilege.

I have to rule in the circumstances that the motion proposed by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre does not fulfil the requirements for a prima facie case of privilege and I cannot accept it to the extent of putting it to the House at the present time. I have to rule there is no prima facie case of privilege.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

FINANCE

REPORT ON WINNIPEG MEETING OF FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL MINISTERS

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I would like to report to the House on the meeting of the Federal-Provincial Committee of Ministers of Finance and Provincial Treasurers in Winnipeg last Friday and Saturday.

There were some significant developments during the course of this conference which have an important bearing on current eco-

nomic conditions in Canada and which I would like to outline in some detail for the information of hon. members.

In my remarks to the conference regarding the economic situation, I reminded provincial ministers that the fundamental objective of the federal government is to halt the inflationary spiral of costs and prices in order to pave the way for a return to the path of strong but stable growth. At the same time I emphasized it is vitally important that we should remain flexible enough to meet changing conditions in order to maintain a sound economic balance.

As the provincial ministers were well aware, the necessity of maintaining flexibility was sharply underlined by the recent massive build-up of our foreign exchange reserves and the resulting decision of the government to allow the exchange rate to float above its fixed margins.

I advised the conference that we fully recognized that any appreciation of the Canadian dollar for an extended period of time would tend to add a further measure of restraint to the economy. I said that further restraint would not be appropriate and that we would offset by other measures any such restraining effects on the economy. Nevertheless, the problem of inflation remains a matter of fundamental concern. Nothing that has happened up to this point suggests that we can let up in our fight to break the inflationary spiral of costs and prices.

As I told the conference, there is a considerable danger that a continuation of the current substantial increases in wages and salaries will seriously undermine the initial progress we have made in slowing down the rate of price increases. Most members of the House will already be aware that Dr. John Young, Chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission, proposed to ministers that the federal and provincial governments join in supporting the adoption of guidelines to establish reasonable upper limits on wage and salary increases in present economic circumstances.

At their conference last February, the first ministers of the federal and provincial governments endorsed a set of proposals adopted at the National Conference on Price Stability. These proposals were aimed at establishing a yardstick against which to measure the reasonableness of price increases in relation to costs. I believe the agreement reached at this national conference has played a significant part in restraining the rise in prices to date this year. It has also restrained profits, which in the first quarter of this year were down 3.8 per cent from the total in the same period last year.

We have been greatly disappointed that the leaders of organized labour have declined to join representatives of other sectors of the economy in helping to work out the terms of an agreed approach which held some reasonable promise of being both fair and effective. For some time after the National Conference on Price Stability we continued to hope that organized labour—appreciating its own self-interest in the maintenance of strong and stable growth—would at least evolve some way of its own of co-operating with the national undertaking launched by the Prices and Incomes Commission. The attitude evident on the part of delegates who attended the recent convention of the Canadian Labour Congress in Edmonton now makes it abundantly clear that it is no longer realistic to expect such co-operation to be forthcoming.

At the conference in Winnipeg, the provincial finance ministers and treasurers generally indicated strong support for this new proposal put forward by the commission and all of those present agreed to put it before their respective governments for consideration. For our part, Mr. Speaker, I made it clear that the federal government is prepared to give its full support to the kind of wage and salary guidelines outlined by Dr. Young.

We agree the time has now come to establish a yardstick against which to measure the reasonablness of wage and salary increases in relation to productivity and other relevant factors in an effort to end the relentless and damaging cost-price spiral which continues to plague the economy. I acknowledged that it would be unrealistic to expect such guidelines would attract support from any substantial segment of organized labour. But these proposed criteria would provide important guidance for those in both government and private sectors responsible for decisions about granting wage and salary increases, as well as for mediators and arbitrators. Equally important is the fact that such guidelines would provide the Canadian public with a yardstick against which to judge the reasonableness of future wage and salary settlements in relation to the public interest.

We agree that in the interests of equity it is also important that provincial governments should intensify their efforts to curb the upward climb of rents in many urban centres and to use their influence to restrain increases

in the fees of the professions. The success of the new program proposed by the Prices and Incomes Commission depends in a vital way on the degree of co-operation forthcoming from all levels of government, institutions, the private sector and the general public.

I want to make it perfectly clear that the federal government remains determined to break the back of inflation. We are hopeful that this further measure will prove effective, together with existing policies, in halting the cost-price spiral. If it does not, then the government is fully prepared to consider other measures which may have to be adopted to eliminate this threat to the well-being of our economy and of all Canadians.

The conference also dealt with questions involving the financial relationships between the federal and provincial governments, which have an important bearing on their respective fiscal positions and their impact on the economy.

I agree to accelerate by one month the payment to the provinces of taxes the federal government collects on their behalf. The practical effect of this proposal is to make available to provinces other than Quebec, which collects its own taxes, approximately another $150 million during the current fiscal year.

Our estimates for the current fiscal year originally provided for a payment to the provinces of $867 million for net equalization and estate tax payments. As a result of new statistical data which has since become available, it is estimated the payment for the current year, together with adjustments for 1968-69, will actually amount to more than $920 million. This represents an increase of around $60 million.

As a further means of easing the tight cash position of the provinces, I also proposed a change involving grants for technical and vocational training schools. After provision is made for capital grants during the current fiscal year, the credit remaining to the provinces for this purpose is approximately $150 million. I suggested that we should seek to work out conditions providing for the payout of the remaining $150 million credit in cash over a two-year period commencing in the current fiscal year.

• (2:40 p.m.)

Taken together, these three measures, plus some minor adjustments in other payments, would make available to provincial governments $300 million more than originally provided for in the current fiscal year.

In March, I anticipated a budget surplus of $250 million, which included an estimated drop in federal revenues as a result of imposition of consumer credit controls of around $50 million. Since it has been decided not to proceed with this measure, the surplus as calculated in the budget would be revised upward to $300 million. This would now be reduced to a surplus of $150 milliion on the basis of the developments I have just outlined.

In the budget, I estimated that our net cash requirement for the current fiscal year would amount to $525 million, excluding that needed to finance foreign exchange transactions. The net increase in the budgetary expenditures of $100 million, after allowing for the change relating to consumer credit controls, plus the further $150 million required as a non-budgetary item to cover accelerated tax collection payments, would increase our net cash requirements by a total of $250 million to a total of $775 million.

On the basis of the national income accounts, I estimated that the surplus in the federal sector, excluding the Canada Pension Plan, would decline from $570 million in the last fiscal year to $130 million in the present fiscal period.

Excluding the loss of revenue expected as a result of establishment of consumer credit controls, the federal surplus would amount to $180 million this year in terms of the national income accounts. The net effect of the budgetary measures which I have outlined would be to reduce this surplus to around $30 million. These figures may be altered somewhat by the detailed revision of the national accounts, but given the margin of error in those statistical estimates the basic situation remains unchanged.

This reduction in the projected surplus in the federal sector will provide an important new stimulus to the economy, which we consider to be warranted in the present economic circumstances.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I want first of all to thank the minister for having sent me a copy of his statement in advance so that I could see what it did not include. A very important conference has just been held between the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) and his colleagues and their counterparts in the provinces. That conference covered more than one subject. Inflation and wage restraint did not represent

the total scope of the conference, and to this extent the minister's report today fails to disclose what was the subject of the greater portion of the discussions at the conference, namely, the reaction of the provinces to the white paper on tax changes. I deliberately say tax changes and do not use the word "reform" because it is becoming more and more apparent as the public reacts that the public does not consider the proposals in any way a reform.

In any event, I would have liked the minister to indicate, in view of the attitude of the provinces to the white paper, what were their reactions to it. After all, it is absolutely implicit and goes to the very heart and core of any income tax system in this country that there be the closest degree of co-operation between the federal government and the provinces. At the moment it looks as though the federal government has decided to go into an orbit of its own and that the provinces, frankly, could not care less.

I will make the prophecy that it will be a long time before the white paper can be implemented if the present attitude of the government to the provinces in regard to these tax proposals is continued. There has to be a much greater modification of them and conciliation shown by the federal government toward the provinces and their proper aspirations in regard to our tax system.

Having said that, I want to turn to what was said in connection with the other part of the conference. I think it is quite right to say that we agree that the reaction of the provincial governments was in keeping with their responsibilities. After the provincial representatives have referred the matter to their colleagues and the provincial governments have taken an official attitude, I trust the provinces may be able to bring forward some suggestions that will assist in making the attempt to fight inflation more successful. I suppose that inflation is internally the most serious problem facing Canada today, though I would say it will be soon overtaken by the problem created by the increasing degree of unemployment.

I also feel it is unfortunate that organized labour, presumably through the spokesmen of the CLC and the CNTU, has so far failed to show any real initiative in making the fight against inflation a common cause. I would have thought it would be better on their part to participate in dialogue with the government in the fight against inflation, even if they do not agree with the views of the other side—

[Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West).]

and they are fully entitled to their opinions—instead of merely standing on the sidelines and taking what I suggest is a purely negative stance.

I come now to a further point, one emphasized by the Minister of Finance this afternoon. I refer to his insistence that Dr. Young acts completely independently of the government. I should like to know what is the government's stand. The country is facing the problem of inflation, and the responsibility of fighting it is the government's. Yet they are standing idly by, presumably offering Dr. Young as a sacrificial lamb in this instance.

I say that a degree of leadership is now called for on the part of the government of Canada. If this independent commission dealing with prices and incomes is unable to get all the parties together, is the solution merely to throw up one's hands? I would say that the duty of the government is clear. From this point on the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) must make every effort to get organized labour to participate with him and members of the cabinet in a meaningful dialogue in order to fight inflation. Let them get down to talking instead of insulting one another from a distance. I would say that this is the essence of leadership. If inflation is left as a problem for Dr. Young and his colleagues to resolve, the government is abdicating its own responsibility.

The minister indicated, as some slender reed of success or claimed success on the part of the Prices and Incomes Commission, that there has been a decline in business profits and that this was brought about voluntarily. The minister has to be much more credible than that. There is no evidence that in the first quarter of this year or in the first month of this year the decline in business profits has been attributable to voluntary restraint. All I ask the minister to do is to look at the figures for lagging retail sales, for auto sales and at the slump in the construction industry. Let him look at the wholesale decline in the issuance of building permits and the 40-odd percent decline in new housing starts.

Then the minister has obviously forgotten the decline in agricultural incomes that has now worked its way into the system and which is why we now see that business profits have declined. They have declined because they are just not there. To say that this has been the result of voluntary restrictions by businessmen, and is therefore evidence of the success or partial success of the Prices and Incomes Commission, I suggest is really stretching the point.

• (2:50 p.m.)

The minister claims that the government must now establish a yardstick against which to measure wage increases. You know, this being converted to the idea that wages must be somehow related to some productivity, is even later than Saul going to Damascus. This particular administration has a responsibility too. It cannot divorce itself from the actions of its predecessor administration which took us through the settlement in respect of the dock workers in Montreal and the seaway workers. These 30 per cent and 35 per cent wage settlements of course set the pattern. Frankly, I would suggest one would think that the workers in other industries had completely lost any sense of proportion if they did not go along with the same sort of settlement encouraged three, four or five years ago by the government.

The government says it intends to break the back of inflation but, strangely enough in our position, we find that inflation is international. We import inflation or at least it is influenced by other countries. In part in many instances inflation does come to us to the extent that we buy goods from countries where there is inflation. We have responsibility too. The hon. member who wanted to make a quip from his seat rather than from his head might look at the consequences of releasing the dollar.

The minister says that imports will come in in greater quantity and that therefore prices will be reduced. It is all very well to hope that this will be the result provided there is no inflation elsewhere, but if the countries with which we deal in such great quantities do not have any control over their inflation we will only be bringing it into this country. Particularly there is the comparison of prices. There is always, shall we say, the long-range goal of parity in respect of wages with the United States. If there should be high or severe inflation in the United States we will feel that push too. It all boils down, however, to unemployment at the end of the road in the decline of Canadian industry. This is where the problem lies. If we are to fight inflation by releasing the dollar and getting imports which crowd out Canadian production, of course there will be unemployment. And so we fight the fight.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Edmonton West I am sure will not mind my reminding him of the provisions of the Standing Order. I always hesitate to interrupt an hon. member when he is commenting on a ministerial statement, particularly on such an important matter. There is, however, a Standing Order which provides that comments by spokesmen on behalf of opposition parties should be brief. I am taking into account the importance of the matter and the interesting comments of the hon. member, but I would ask him to keep in mind the limitations imposed by the Standing Order.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I was endeavouring to reply to an eight-page statement which raises important points. I trust that the importance of the subject will not be detracted from perhaps rather lengthy remarks. If the remarks hurt hon. members opposite, that is fine; they must bear with them. In any event, the burden is being placed on the backs of the workers of this country.

The budgetary proposals made by the minister, the accelerated payments, presumably will help the provinces. This is a once-in-a-lifetime measure. It is not a measure which can be re-used. He cannot go on accelerating things which he has not got. I hope this will help some of the provinces, but I repeat that it is not a long-term solution but is rather a stop-gap solution at the very best.

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, on page 4 of the minister's statement he says:

> I acknowledged that it would be unrealistic to expect such guidelines would attract support from any substantial segment of organized labour.

By these words the minister condemns his own policy. How does the minister propose to carry this policy into effect? Does he intend to do so at the point of a bayonet? Does he think he can make a labour force work when that labour force feels it is unfairly discriminated against and feels that the measures he has brought in are unjust? Surely the minister must realize that unless he has the co-operation of labour and that unless labour feels that the policies brought in affect not only them but other segments of the economy his policies cannot be made to work in a free society.

It is not necessary for me to remind the minister that we often give up one freedom in return for greater freedoms. We accept certain actions in the interest of society but we do this only when we think we are being called upon to make our contribution while other people are making their contribution as well. But when the minister brings in guidelines which apply to labour alone and points his finger at labour as the villain in the whole

piece of inflation, he is simply condemning his own policy. He cannot in this way obtain the co-operation that is essential if we are to have any restraint at all in this country.

The comments of hon. members opposite, Mr. Speaker, are very typical of how they treat a serious problem of this kind with flippant remarks. I think it might do them a lot of good if they would delay their remarks for a little while instead of sitting there and throwing these inanities into the air.

The government has created a bias against labour ever since it took office. If we go back and examine the record we can see that from the very day this government came into power there has been an attempt to point the finger at labour. In his last budget speech the minister virtually invited the employers of this country to put their people out on strike. We saw this again in the attitude of the Prices and Incomes Commission in respect of its unrealistic approach and cry that labour should co-operate when the commission knew that the kind of thing it was asking organized labour to do was impossible. The commission knew that the CLC could not say to every union in the country that it must go along with this. There are democratic principles involved in these organizations. They reach decisions on their own. Often they reject the advice of their leaders. The commission has asked the leaders of the trade union movement to do something or to accept something which they could not do. Now we see the culmination of this kind of arrangement.

The minister points out that there has been compliance and acceptance by the business sector. That must surely be the greatest misstatement not only of the day but of this whole year. What sort of voluntary acceptance was it that the Prices and Incomes Commission suggested? It asked business not to increase its profits to any great extent. As the hon. member who preceded me pointed out, one of the reasons business profits are not higher than they are now is not because of the admonition of the commission but because those businesses which were in a position to take a profit had already done so. It is simply because the economic climate is such that the profits in some sectors of the economy are not there.

We want to see something done about inflation. We recognize that it is a problem, although it is not the greatest problem this society has to face. Anyone who can recall the hungry thirties, the unemployment and the grief that were created, knows that certainly the degree of inflation we have today is not the worst problem our society has to face.

[Mr. Saltsman.]

• (3:00 p.m.)

But since we do have to take some action along this line I suggest to the minister that he accept the suggestion put forth at the conference by the government of Manitoba for an incomes policy that would deal with all forms of income, a policy that would look into professional fees, into rents, into profits and into the various ways in which people get their rewards in our society. Unless he does this, I cannot see any hope. But if he is prepared to accept the position of the Manitoba government, and if he is prepared to put forth to the country through Parliament a fair way of assessing and calling for sacrifices on the part of everyone in our society, then he will find that labour will be the first to agree with him.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, we are quite willing to see the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) and the government take steps to fight inflation and we recognize that the minister is sincere when he talks about his anti-inflation policy, but we have serious doubts as to the means he is taking to attain that goal.

First of all, we should get a clear understanding of what is meant by the words used. When the Minister of Finance talks about inflation, he refers to prices being inflated, for if we look it up in the dictionary, it is stated that inflation is an abnormal increase in available currency and credit beyond the proportion of available goods.

However, this is not the situation prevailing today. It is not that there is too much money in circulation in ratio to production for if this were so we could only advise that the government continue its fiscal policy in order to drain off such a surplus.

The present "inflated prices", a more appropriate description of the inflation the Minister of Finance would have us believe in, result from increased production costs. Before establishing the Prices and Incomes Commission, the minister should have appointed a commission to determine the causes of these "inflated prices", which would probably have made it possible to take more realistic action, more likely to correct the situation.

For example, a few years ago the government lifted all restrictions on interest rates on mortgage loans and now it is twice as expensive to finance construction projects generally.

That is an example of inflated prices which contribute directly to inflation.

Furthermore, the tax on building materials has inevitably caused inflated prices.

Those are two direct causes of inflation, or rather of inflated prices. If we really wanted to fight inflated prices, we should take measures against what causes them.

Each year, there is a gap of about 20 per cent between the goods available and the purchasing power of Canadians who want to buy those goods, and to buy them, they need wage increases which infallibly result in inflated prices.

Another source of inflation and inflated prices is the fact that Canadians lack purchasing power. The previous speaker suggested establishing minimum wages for all Canadians.

As reported on page 4 of his statement, the Minister of Finance thinks we should establish, and I quote:

—a yardstick against which to measure the reasonableness of price increases in relation to productivity—

This point is important to determine whether prices are at a normal level or whether wage increases will produce a proportional increase in production. Today, the high unemployment rate is still a factor of reduced productivity and therefore, higher retail prices of products.

We do not have enough time to suggest all the remedies to fight inflation. Unfortunately, we note that those applied by the government up to now have been completely ineffective. Indeed, it does not tackle the real causes of inflation.

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REPORT ON ROME MEETING OF NATO FOREIGN MINISTERS AND SUBSEQUENT VISITS BY MINISTER

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I should like to report briefly to the House on the recent Rome meeting of NATO foreign ministers which I attended and on the visits I paid after the meeting to Yugoslavia, Roumania and Ireland.

First of all, I should like to table English and French texts of the communiqué and declaration issued by the NATO ministers with the suggestion that they be printed as an appendix to *Hansard.*

Mr. Speaker: Is this agreed?

NATO Foreign Ministers' Meeting

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: For text of communiqué and declaration referred to see appendix.*]

Mr. Sharp: Discussions are already under way between various NATO members and individual Soviet bloc countries on such important east-west problems as the limitation of strategic arms, Berlin, and the Federal German Republic's relations with its eastern neighbours. At Rome, NATO ministers met to discuss what further steps the alliance and its members should take to promote improvement in east-west relations.

One possibility examined at Rome was the idea of a move in the direction of broader multilateral discussions, either in the form of a large conference or series of conferences, or a standing commission on east-west problems. Canada took the position that the idea of a conference at the right time and in the right circumstances would be most useful. We felt, however, that the actual decision to convene such a meeting should not be taken until an east-west consensus had emerged on the aims of a conference and on the subjects which could usefully be discussed, and until a conference had reasonable prospects of success. Similarly, we saw merit in the idea of setting up a standing commission, although we thought that the time was probably not yet right for it. It is our view that progress in the individual east-west talks which I mentioned a moment ago would be a good yardstick for determining when the time had come to broaden discussions out into a general multilateral forum. We must keep in mind the primary importance of moving ahead on the substance of outstanding issues.

Canada placed emphasis at Rome on the desirability of broadening the range of specific subjects under discussion with the other side. In 1968 and 1969, NATO had already indicated its interest in the possibility of mutual and balanced force reductions in central Europe, but as yet there has been no formal Soviet response. At Rome, Canada urged NATO to go beyond its previous position and make a clear and forthright offer to explore with the members of the Warsaw Pact how to start negotiations on force reductions. To demonstrate the seriousness of NATO's approach, we said that the alliance's offer should include suggested guidelines for the reductions, and a precise procedure for communications with the other side. A forthcoming, explicit offer of this kind would, in our view, have the best chance of obtaining a positive reply.

NATO Foreign Ministers' Meeting

Our two main preoccupations in Rome were, first, to urge that the alliance adopt a positive but realistic position on the subject of multilateral discussions, with emphasis on the substance of the issues at stake and, second, to have NATO make a firm offer to talk on balanced force reductions.

In both of these respects, the outcome of the meeting was very satisfactory to Canada. On the first point, the meeting agreed that "in so far as progress is recorded as a result of...ongoing discussions—in particular on Germany and Berlin—the allied governments...would be willing to enter into multilateral contacts with all interested governments. One of the main purposes...would be to explore when it would be possible to convene a conference...." This reasoned, step-by-step approach to the question of a conference is in line with our own thinking. The communiqué also refers to the possible establishment of a permanent body in due course, as one way of starting multilateral negotiations.

• (3:10 p.m.)

On our second point, NATO's declaration on balanced force reductions explicitly invites interested states to hold exploratory talks on the subject and suggests four specific considerations which the allies would put forward in such talks. The Italian Foreign Minister was asked to transmit the offer to the other side, and in fact has already done so.

I think members will agree that the positions adopted by the alliance in Rome represent a clear step forward in the search for better relations with the east. I was also struck by the mood of co-operation and willingness to compromise displayed by all at the meeting.

We shall watch carefully for evidence that the other side is willing to respond positively. Early results may not be forthcoming, but in the months ahead Canada and other members of the Alliance will be exploring actively the prospects both for an eventual conference and for talks on balanced force reductions, so that the momentum which has now been developed is maintained.

While in Rome I called for the first time on the Secretary of State of the Vatican.

From Rome I went to Belgrade and then to Bucharest at the invitation of the Yugoslav and Roumanian governments. In Roumania, I flew over some of the flooded areas and was able to see for myself the desolation caused by the tragic national disaster that has taken place there, and to appreciate what it means in terms of human suffering and as a major setback to the Roumanian economy. On the way home I paid a brief official visit to Dublin.

In each case I had talks with the President, the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister on a wide range of bilateral and international questions including the results of the NATO ministerial meeting. I should like to table the communiqués issued on my visits to Belgrade and Bucharest. In Dublin the talks were less formal and no communiqué was issued.

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, the minister was kind enough to make a copy of his statement available, and I thank him for this courtesy. I must tell him that we have had a somewhat difficult time keeping track of his progression across Europe.

We were alarmed, falsely as it turned out, by the implications of France's alleged refusal to grant overfly privileges for the minister, only to be very much relieved by the Prime Minister's assurance that it was all a canard. No sooner had we checked our dictionaries to enable us to understand that word than we were having to respond to the minister's offer of a Canadian peacekeeping force for the Middle East. This generosity sent us scrurrying to the military experts to see, if the Canadian offer were taken up, whether enough troops would be left in Canada to enable us to assert our northern sovereignty or, as a matter of fact, any other sovereignty that the government has in mind to assert. When the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Cadieux) was asked about the offer, he did not say it was a canard. He simply said he did not know anything more about the offer than I did. Perhaps we will learn a little more about this generosity as the week progresses, but I would like to submit to the minister that peacekeeping, of course, is a useful role for Canada provided the Security Council is able to establish clear and unambiguous ground rules for its operation.

The NATO ministerial meetings in Rome took place amidst ongoing initiatives—the Soviet and United States talks on strategic arms limitation, the Geneva disarmament conference, the initiatives in Berlin and by the Federal Republic of Germany, the proposal for Warsaw Pact-NATO meetings and the possibility, as the minister explained to us, of mutual force reductions. Personally, I think the minister is correct in hesitating about institutionalizing, by way of a commission,

east-west problems. Surely, the world has institutions aplenty, but what seems to me to be lacking is the will to make these institutions work with any degree of effectiveness.

Brooding over NATO must be the paradox of partnership with the cruel and repressive government of Greece and the colonial posture of Portugal, which spends its fortune not on improving domestic conditions but on continuing its colonial African empire of Angola, Mozambique and Portugese Guinea. These are issues which will not die, despite how much easier it might be if we did not have to face them. Future historians of this age may well wonder if lack of communication procedures was not, in fact, the most obvious gap in the efforts that governments make to lessen the danger of conflict and war. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if NATO ministers do nothing else during 1970 than find a technique for east and west to talk, they will have accomplished something of very great value.

The contacts the minister made in eastern Europe can only be useful. It is to be hoped that Canada will soon be able to announce the dispatch of a Canadian ambassador to Roumania. We are in the embarrassing position of having a Roumanian ambassador here, and I think it is important that we clear up this anomaly. The flood which has caused so much death and anguish in that country evoked an obvious and speedy response from Canada, both in cash and in food. We hope that the generosity of this country, and of other nations, will find its way quickly to those in need and will not be diverted, as we have some reason to believe might be happening, into state agencies for use for their own purposes.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I could not help but be struck by the whimsical understatement in the one sentence in the minister's statement about his visit to Dublin: "On the way home, I paid a brief official visit to Dublin." I imagine the minister will agree that the Prime Minister of Eire has a little more on his plate just now, gracious as he would want to be to the minister, than visits from Canadian officials at this difficult time in that country.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to welcome the minister back to Canada from his European trip. I am particularly glad that he was able to pay visits to Yugoslavia and Roumania, and perhaps I should not forget to mention Ireland. These first two countries, while they are on the other side of the so-called Iron Curtain, can, like Canada, play a positive role in the complicated task of avoiding the disasters that would arise out of conflict in Europe or in the Middle East.

With regard to Roumania, I can only hope that the Secretary of State for External Affairs was not too embarrassed that there was no Canadian ambassador in Bucharest. I remind him and the House that Roumania is an important country. It has often shown an example to the world in its courageous stance of independence in relation to the super powers. If this absence of a Canadian ambassador in Roumania is due to what has been called "Trudeau austerity," as the minister seems to have hinted, it is a senseless manifestation of it.

To me the minister's statement on NATO smacked, as usual, of perhaps too much ministerial caution. While favouring a European security conference, the ministerial statement indicated that the conference should not take place until an east-west consensus had emerged on just about everything, or until the conference had a reasonable chance of success. I suggest that such hedging about of the proposal with preconditions may well mean that it will never come about. Would it not be better to risk failure than not to try at all? We think that the western allies should show their readiness to talk about anything that might lead to an end to the dangerous, highly armed confrontation in Europe. In our view, our attitude should be positively positive.

I am pleased that the proposals for a balanced forces reduction seem to have taken a step forward. They should be pressed with vigour and dispatch.

I deeply regret the absence in the minister's statement of any reference to the NATO situation vis-à-vis Greece. The NATO charter refers to the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law. These are supposed to be the keystones of the alliance. The foreign ministers of Norway and Denmark both raised the incongruity of these principles with the conduct of one of the NATO countries, namely, Greece. For two years, an iron dictatorship has held down the people of that country by torture and the denial of human rights.

• (3:20 p.m.)

Why was the minister so silent, as apparently he was, when this issue was raised? Are we to accept the suggestion that NATO is merely a military alliance? Are the words of

the NATO preamble simply eloquent hypocrisy? If so, how can our government or any other government in NATO justify to its people, and particularly to its young people, continued adherence to an instrumentality which is used to cloak tyranny of the rankest type? I hope the minister will break silence and line up Canada with our Norwegian and Danish friends on the side of democracy.

CRIMINAL CODE

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING RELEASE OF ACCUSED PERSONS FROM CUSTODY BEFORE TRIAL OR PENDING APPEAL

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-220, to amend the provisions of the Criminal Code relating to the release from custody of accused persons before trial or pending appeal.

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

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

CAPE BRETON DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION—PRE-RETIREMENT PROGRAM

Question No. 1,510—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys):**

1. Has the Prime Minister received a letter from Mr. Daniel Bonnar, 100 Fraser Avenue, Sydney Mines, Nova Scotia, dated February 7, 1970, protesting in general the pre-retirement program of the Cape Breton Development Corporation and also the fact that men who were willing to continue work were forced to go on a pre-retirement allowance at sixty years of age?

2. What was the nature of the reply from the Prime Minister's Office?

3. Was a copy of Mr. Bonnar's correspondence forwarded to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion and, if so (a) what attention has been given by the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (b) what was the nature of the reply, if any, forwarded by the Minister to Mr. Bonnar?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Prime Minister's office and the Department of Regional Economic Expansion as follows: 1. Yes.

2. The reply, dated February 16, 1970, acknowledged receipt and informed Mr. Bonnar that his presentation had been noted and was being brought to the attention of the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion.

3. Yes. (a) The Minister wrote to Mr. Bonnar on April 6, after receiving a report from the Cape Breton Development Corporation. (b) The reasons for the pre-retirement plan were explained.

RESEARCH—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Question No. 1,587—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. What research studies have been carried out by, or on behalf of, the Department of Justice during each year 1960 to 1969 inclusive?

2. What research studies are now being carried on and/or are contemplated during the next five years?

3. What was the cost of each of the research studies completed in each year 1960 to 1969 inclusive?

4. What is the estimated cost of each of the studies now in being or contemplated during the next five years?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): 1 and 3. See reply to Question 618 answered on March 11, 1970.

2 and 4. The planned Legal Research Section of the Department of Justice has not been established yet. Consequently, it is not possible to forecast what, if any, research studies are proposed nor to assign a cost figure to them.

NCC—ACQUISITION OF LAND FROM E. B. EDDY COMPANY

Question No. 1,619—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. Has NCC acquired parcels of property from E. B. Eddy Company and, if so, which ones?

2. In each case, what was the price paid?

3. Does E. B. Eddy Company occupy land owned by NCC and, if so, what are the rental or other financing arrangements in each case?

4. Does NCC rent any land from E. B. Eddy Company and, if so, what are the financial arrangements?

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): 1. Yes one parcel comprising approximately 6 acres in the City of Ottawa (bounded by Oregon, Booth and the Ottawa River).

2. $1,010,000.

3. No.

4. No.

PUBLIC SERVICE—DAY-CARE CENTRES AND SPECIAL LEAVE FOR CHILDBIRTH

Question No. 1,630—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. Is the government now considering the provision of day-care centers at the place of employ-

ment to assist the many female employees in the public service with small children?

2. (a) Is there now a provision for a male employee of the federal public service to have time-off with pay on the occasion of his wife having a baby and, if so, what is the basis for it (b) is there any provision for a female employee of the federal public service to have time-off with pay for the childbirth (c) is the government considering the grant of leave with pay for such women?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): 1. No.

2. (a) Yes. Except where there is no provision in a collective agreement, a male employee in the public service may be granted special leave with pay up to a maximum of one day on the occasion of the birth of his child. This provision has come about as a result of negotiation in collective bargaining. (b) No. (c) No.

THE HAGUE CONFERENCE—RATIFICATION OF AGREEMENTS SIGNED BY CANADA

Question No. 1,705—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. Were the three agreements signed by Canada during the eleventh session of The Hague Conference ratified and, if not, for what reasons?

2. What action is the federal government taking to ratify the agreements concerning provincial legislative jurisdiction?

3. When is the next session of The Hague Conference to be held and what is the agenda?

4. What progress has been made in the studies of this subject mentioned at page 8298 of *Hansard* of May 5, 1969.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. As they are still under study, Canada has neither signed nor ratified the three conventions resulting from the eleventh session of the Hague Conference on Private International Law.

2. Two of the conventions (that on the recognition of divorces and legal separations and that on the law applicable to traffic accidents) are the subjects of detailed questionnaires sent to all provinces. No such action has yet been taken with respect to the third convention on the taking of evidence abroad in civil or commercial matters.

3. The twelfth session of the Hague Conference is tentatively scheduled for October 1972. The agenda will probably include as subjects (1) the responsibility of manufacturers for their products, (2) succession to property (especially as relates to the administration of estates) and (3) maintenance obligations relative to adults.

4. The studies concerning the conventions on the recognition of divorces and the law applicable to traffic accidents are well advanced. Study of the convention on the taking of evidence abroad in civil or commercial matters is at a more preliminary stage.

[*English*]

FEASIBILITY STUDY OF CANADIAN OCEAN-GOING FLEET

Question No. 1,740—**Mr. McCleave:**

1. Is there a feasibility study of a Canadian ocean-going fleet being made and, if so, has it been instructed (a) to regard the permanent sea-lift requirements of such Canadian corporations as MacMillan-Bloedel Limited, the Aluminum Corporation of Canada, the Canadian Pacific System and Imperial Oil Limited, as an existing Canadian chartered ocean-going fleet (b) to establish how many foreign flag ships are chartered now by these and other Canadian corporations?

2. Would the government consider extending to Canadian corporations the same tax treatments extended to corporations in other prominent marine powers such as the United Kingdom and Norway for the purpose of operating ocean-going ships?

3. Has the inquiry made a comparative study of current world labour rates and, as Canada now has no ocean-going fleet under its own flag, has the inquiry approached Canadian labour leaders to establish what rates and working conditions would be acceptable to Canadian seamen if Canada did have an ocean-going fleet?

4. How long has such inquiry been in progress, who are the personnel carrying it out, and when does it expect to make its report?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The Canadian Transport Commission advises as follows: 1. As announced in the House of Commons on June 3, 1969, (*Hansard* p. 9380), a "Canadian Merchant Marine Feasibility Study" is being made and the terms of reference explicitly require the identification and quantitative forecast of major Canadian ocean-borne export and import trades.

2. The consideration of fiscal and other measures must await the findings of the study and an analysis of the cost/benefit effects upon the Canadian economy.

3. A detailed comparative analysis of labour costs is explicit in the terms of reference.

4. The study commenced about one year ago and the report is expected about September 30, 1970. As noted in the announcement referred to in the answer to question No. 1, the contract for the study was awarded to: Hedlin Menzies & Associates Ltd., Winnipeg, Toronto & Vancouver who have subcontracted parts of the study to

Questions

George G. Sharp, Inc., New York, and Gibson Transportation Ltd./Gibson Shipbrokers Ltd., Vancouver and Montreal.

INDIAN STUDENTS ATTENDING UNIVERSITY

Question No. 1,744—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Of Indian students attending university in each year since 1967, how many of those who began the first year completed the full course in each year?

2. How many Indian students attending university in each year withdrew before the end of the academic year?

Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1 and 2.

Year	Enrolment	Completions	Withdrawals
1967-68	225	184	41
1968-69	293	245	48
1969-70	337	262	75

CANADA ARTS COUNCIL

Question No. 1,788—**Mr. Skoberg:**

Are there any members on the Canada Arts Council from Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and if so, who are they?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): Yes. Miss Kathleen Richardson is from Winnipeg and Mr. Louis A. Desrochers is from Edmonton. Another member, from Saskatchewan, will be appointed soon.

[*English*]

UNEMPLOYMENT—RESPONSIBILITY OF LEADER OF ORGANIZED LABOUR

Question No. 1,802—**Mr. Robinson:**

What degree of responsibility must the leader of organized labour assume for the growing unemployment and declining industrial production in Canada?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): It is not possible to determine the degree of responsibility of any person or institution.

QUEBEC—NATIONAL PAROLE SERVICE

Question No. 1,803—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. How many parole staff (positions) have there been in the Province of Quebec for the years 1961-62 to 1969-70?

2. How much, on the average, has it cost to maintain each position?

3. How much was the total annual budget of the two National Parole Service offices in Quebec (including staffing) for each year 1961-62 to 1969-70?

[Mr. Loiselle.]

4. How many cases has the parole staff had under their supervision in Quebec for each year 1961-62 to 1969-70?

5. How many cases has the John Howard Society or any other voluntary agency of Quebec had under its supervision for each year 1961-62 to 1969-70?

6. What has been the parole grant to the John Howard Society or any other voluntary agency for each year 1961-62 to 1969-70?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): 1. Parole staff positions.

Fiscal Year	Parole Officers	Support Staff	Total
1961-62	8	6	14
1962-63	9	6	15
1963-64	9	6	15
1964-65	12	6	18
1965-66	16	12	28
1966-67	16	12	28
1967-68	20	15	35
1968-69	24	15	39
1969-70	30	17	47

2. Average annual costs

Fiscal Year	Parole Officers $	Support Staff $
1961-62	6,940	3,250
1962-63	6,940	3,250
1963-64	7,180	3,370
1964-65	7,360	3,370
1965-66	8,132	3,501
1966-67	8,682	3,972
1967-68	9,362	4,357
1968-69	10,082	4,655
1969-70	10,804	4,906

3. Information not available in form requested as, until the current fiscal year, budget allocations were not computed on a geographical or activity centre basis.

4. Cases under direct supervision of Parole Staff

Fiscal Year	Number of Cases
1961-62	248
1962-63	286
1963-64	351
1964-65	358
1965-66	427
1966-67	430
1967-68	578
1968-69	771
1969-70	834

5. Cases under supervision of John Howard Society or Other Voluntary Agency

Fiscal Year	Number of Cases
1961-62	725
1962-63	597

1963-64		656
1964-65		503
1965-66		665
1966-67		827
1967-68		758
1968-69		749
1969-70		981

6. Parole grants

Fiscal Year*	John Howard Society	Other
1961-62	$2,750	$32,150
1962-63	3,100	36,300
1963-64	4,400	32,700
1964-65	4,450	27,995
1965-66	4,892	43,337
1966-67	5,130	46,280
1967-68	7,860	52,835
1968-69	9,635	45,305
1969-70	9,395	52,786

*Computed as of end of fiscal year.

NOVA SCOTIA—NATIONAL PAROLE SERVICE

Question No. 1,804—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. How many parole staff (positions) have there been in the Province of Nova Scotia for the years 1961-62 to 1969-70?

2. How much, on the average, has it cost to maintain each position?

3. How much was the total annual budget of the two National Parole Service offices in Nova Scotia (including staffing) for each year 1961-62 to 1969-70?

4. How many cases has the parole staff had under their supervision in Nova Scotia for each year 1961-62 to 1969-70?

5. How many cases has the John Howard Society of Nova Scotia had under its supervision for each year 1961-62 to 1969-70?

6. What has been the parole grant to the John Howard Society of Nova Scotia for each year 1961-62 to 1969-70?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): 1. Parole staff positions

Fiscal Year	Parole Officers	Support Staff	Total
1961-62	1	1	2
1962-63	1	1	2
1963-64	1	1	2
1964-65	1	1	2
1965-66	3	2	5
1966-67	3	2	5
1967-68	3	3	6
1968-69	4	3	7
1969-70	5	4	9

2. Average annual cost

Fiscal Year	Parole Officers	Support Staff
1961-62	$ 7,440	$3,450
1962-63	7,440	3,450

	Questions	
1963-64	7,680	3,570
1964-65	7,860	3,570
1965-66	8,832	3,801
1966-67	9,382	4,272
1967-68	9,962	4,657
1968-69	10,882	4,955
1969-70	12,304	5,206

3. Information not available in form requested as, until the current fiscal year, budget allocations were not computed on a geographical or activity centre basis.

4. Cases under direct supervision of Parole Staff

Fiscal Year	Number of Cases
1961-62	5
1962-63	29
1963-64	20
1964-65	17
1965-66	18
1966-67	54
1967-68	82
1968-69	128
1969-70	173

5. Cases under supervision of John Howard Society

Fiscal Year	Number of Cases
1961-62	93
1962-63	84
1963-64	83
1964-65	66
1965-66	96
1966-67	88
1967-68	95
1968-69	116
1969-70	126

6. Parole grants

Fiscal Year*	John Howard Society
1961-62	$3,900
1962-63	3,500
1963-64	3,450
1964-65	3,680
1965-66	5,634
1966-67	6,335
1967-68	6,780
1968-69	8,915
1969-70	7,811

*Computed as of end of fiscal year.

ONTARIO—NATIONAL PAROLE SERVICE

Question No. 1,805—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. How many parole staff (positions) have there been in the Province of Ontario for the years 1961-62 to 1969-70?

2. How much, on the average, has it cost to maintain each position?

Questions

3. How much was the total annual budget of the two National Parole Service offices in Ontario (including staffing) for each year 1961-62 to 1969-70?

4. How many cases has the parole staff had under their supervision in Ontario for each year 1961-62 to 1969-70?

5. How many cases has the John Howard Society of Ontario had under its supervision for each year 1961-62 to 1969-70?

6. What has been the parole grant to the John Howard Society of Ontario for each year 1961-62 to 1969-70?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General):

1. Parole staff positions

Fiscal Year	Parole Officers	Support Staff	Total
1961-62	7	7	14
1962-63	9	8	17
1963-64	9	8	17
1964-65	9	8	17
1965-66	12	10	22
1966-67	13	11	24
1967-68	19	15	34
1968-69	23	17	40
1969-70	31	22	53

2. Average annual cost

Fiscal Year	Parole Officers	Support Staff
	$	$
1961-62	6,900	3,250
1962-63	7,040	3,250
1963-64	7,380	3,370
1964-65	7,660	3,470
1965-66	8,632	3,601
1966-67	9,182	4,072
1967-68	9,862	4,457
1968-69	10,482	4,755
1969-70	11,104	5,006

3. Information not available in form requested as, until current fiscal year, budget allocations were not computed on a geographical or activity centre basis.

4. Cases under direct supervision of Parole Staff

Fiscal Year	Numbers of Cases
1961-62	43
1962-63	24
1963-64	43
1964-65	81
1965-66	76
1966-67	76
1967-68	119
1968-69	256
1969-70	588

[Mr. Orlikow.]

5. Cases under supervision of John Howard Society

Fiscal Year	Numbers of Cases
1961-62	308
1962-63	269
1963-64	227
1964-65	237
1965-66	330
1966-67	390
1967-68	378
1968-69	415
1969-70	536

6. Parole grants

Fiscal Year*	John Howard Society
1961-62	$11,850
1962-63	13,700
1963-64	12,200
1964-65	15,585
1965-66	22,682
1966-67	27,955
1967-68	29,133
1968-69	32,720
1969-70	34,194

*Computed as of end of fiscal year.

MANITOBA—NATIONAL PAROLE SERVICE

Question No. 1,806—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. How many parole staff (positions) have there been in the Province of Manitoba for the years 1961-62 to 1969-70?

2. How much, on the average, has it cost to maintain each position?

3. How much was the total annual budget of the two National Parole Service offices in Manitoba (including staffing) for each year 1961-62 to 1969-70?

4. How many cases has the parole staff had under their supervision in Manitoba for each year 1961-62 to 1969-70?

5. How many cases has the John Howard Society of Manitoba had under its supervision for each year 1961-62 to 1969-70?

6. What has been the parole grant to the John Howard Society of Manitoba for each year 1961-62 to 1969-70?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): 1. Parole staff positions:

Fiscal Year	Parole Officers	Support Staff	Total
1961-62	2	2	4
1962-63	2	2	4
1963-64	2	2	4
1964-65	2	2	4
1965-66	3	3	6
1966-67	3	3	6
1967-68	4	3	7
1968-69	4	3	7
1969-70	7	4	11

2. Average Annual costs

Fiscal Year	Parole Officers	Support Staff
1961-62	$ 7,440	$3,350
1962-63	7,440	3,350
1963-64	7,600	3,470
1964-65	7,960	3,470
1965-66	8,832	3,601
1966-67	9,382	4,072
1967-68	10,062	4,457
1968-69	10,782	4,755
1969-70	11,504	5,006

3. Information not available in form requested as, until the current fiscal year, budget allocations were not computed on a geographical or activity centre basis.

4. Cases under direct supervision of Parole Staff

Fiscal Year	Numbers of Cases
1961-62	24
1962-63	33
1963-64	19
1964-65	26
1965-66	17
1966-67	14
1967-68	20
1968-69	49
1969-70	64

5. Cases under supervision of John Howard Society

Fiscal Year	Numbers of Cases
1961-62	59
1962-63	88
1963-64	108
1964-65	90
1965-66	102
1966-67	129
1967-68	144
1968-69	136
1969-70	115

6. Parole grants

Fiscal Year *	John Howard Society
1961-62	$ 3,200
1962-63	4,200
1963-64	6,800
1964-65	5,837
1965-66	6,316
1966-67	9,035
1967-68	10,135
1968-69	9,430
1969-70	8,690

* Computed as of end of fiscal year.

Questions

SASKATCHEWAN—NATIONAL PAROLE SERVICE

Question No. 1,807—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. How many parole staff (positions) have there been in the Province of Saskatchewan for the years 1961-62 to 1969-70?

2. How much, on the average, has it cost to maintain each position?

3. How much was the total annual budget of the two National Parole Service offices in Saskatchewan (including staffing) for each year 1961-62 to 1969-70?

4. How many cases has the parole staff had under their supervision in Saskatchewan for each year 1961-62 to 1969-70?

5. How many cases has the John Howard Society of Saskatchewan had under its supervision for each year 1961-62 to 1969-70?

6. What has been the parole grant to the John Howard Society of Saskatchewan for each year 1961-62 to 1969-70?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): 1. Parole staff positions

Fiscal Year	Parole Officers	Support Staff	Total
1961-62	2	2	4
1962-63	2	2	4
1963-64	2	2	4
1964-65	2	2	4
1965-66	3	3	6
1966-67	3	3	6
1967-68	5	4	9
1968-69	6	5	11
1969-70	6	5	11

2. Average annual costs

Fiscal Year	Parole Officers	Support Staff
1961-62	$7,340	$3,350
1962-63	7,340	3,350
1963-64	7,580	3,470
1964-65	7,960	3,470
1965-66	8,732	3,601
1966-67	9,282	4,072
1967-68	10,062	4,457
1968-69	10,982	4,855
1969-70	11,204	5,006

3. Information not available in form requested as, until the current fiscal year, budget allocations were not computed on a geographical or activity centre basis.

4. Cases under direct supervision of Parole Staff

Fiscal Year	Numbers of Cases
1961-62	16
1962-63	5
1963-64	5
1964-65	5
1965-66	3
1966-67	9

Questions

1967-68	30
1968-69	58
1969-70	98

5. Cases under supervision of John Howard Society

Fiscal Year	Numbers of Cases
1961-62	53
1962-63	72
1963-64	71
1964-65	81
1965-66	63
1966-67	104
1967-68	144
1968-69	155
1969-70	125

6. Parole grants

Fiscal Year*	John Howard Society
1961-62	$3,400
1962-63	4,600
1963-64	5,300
1964-65	7,695
1965-66	11,089
1966-67	9,690
1967-68	12,800
1968-69	13,925
1969-70	8,391

*Computed as of end of fiscal year.

BRITISH COLUMBIA—NATIONAL PAROLE SERVICE

Question No. 1,808—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. How many parole staff (positions) have there been in the Province of British Columbia for the years 1961-62 to 1969-70?

2. How much, on the average, has it cost to maintain each position?

3. How much was the total annual budget of the two National Parole Service offices in British Columbia (including staffing) for each year 1961-62 to 1969-70?

4. How many cases has the parole staff had under their supervision in British Columbia for each year 1961-62 to 1969-70?

5. How many cases has the John Howard Society of British Columbia had under its supervision for each year 1961-62 to 1969-70?

6. What has been the parole grant to the John Howard Society of British Columbia for each year 1961-62 to 1969-70?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith: (Solicitor General): 1. Parole staff positions

Fiscal Year	Parole Officers	Support Staff	Total
1961-62	4	3	7
1962-63	5	3	8
1963-64	5	3	8
1964-65	6	5	11
1965-66	12	9	21
1966-67	13	9	22
1967-68	16	11	27
1968-69	18	12	30
1969-70	20	13	33

2. Average annual costs

Fiscal Year	Parole Officers	Support Staff
1961-62	$7,340	$3,350
1962-63	7,340	3,350
1963-64	7,580	3,470
1964-65	7,860	3,470
1965-66	8,632	3,601
1966-67	9,282	4,072
1967-68	9,962	4,457
1968-69	10,682	4,755
1969-70	11,204	5,006

3. Information not available in form requested as, until the current fiscal year, budget allocations were not computed on a geographical or activity centre basis.

4. Cases under direct supervision of Parole Staff:

Fiscal Year	Numbers of Cases
1961-62	55
1962-63	50
1963-64	70
1964-65	103
1965-66	130
1966-67	152
1967-68	370
1968-69	544
1969-70	695

5. Cases under supervision of John Howard Society

Fiscal Year	Numbers of Cases
1961-62	138
1962-63	151
1963-64	158
1964-65	167
1965-66	194
1966-67	208
1967-68	165
1968-69	128
1969-70	138

6. Parole grants

Fiscal Year*	John Howard Society
1961-62	$4,800
1962-63	5,400
1963-64	6,700
1964-65	8,035
1965-66	7,238
1966-67	8,380
1967-68	8,025
1968-69	5,225
1969-70	4,525

*Computed as of end of fiscal year.

ALBERTA—NATIONAL PAROLE SERVICE

Question No. 1,809—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. How many parole staff (positions) have there been in the Province of Alberta for the years 1961-62 to 1969-70?

2. How much, on the average, has it cost to maintain each position?

3. How much was the total annual budget of the two National Parole Service offices in Alberta (including staffing) for each year 1961-62 to 1969-70?

4. How many cases has the parole staff had under their supervision in Alberta for each year 1961-62 to 1969-70?

5. How many cases has the John Howard Society of Alberta had under its supervision for each year 1961-62 to 1969-70?

6. What has been the parole grant to the John Howard Society of Alberta for each year 1961-62 to 1969-70?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General):

1. Parole staff positions

Fiscal Year	Parole Officers	Support Staff	Total
1961-62	1	1	2
1962-63	2	2	4
1963-64	2	2	4
1964-65	2	3	5
1965-66	5	5	10
1966-67	5	5	10
1967-68	7	6	13
1968-69	8	6	14
1969-70	10	6	16

2. Average annual costs

Fiscal Year	Parole Officers	Support Staff
1961-62	$7,440	$3,350
1962-63	7,440	3,350
1963-64	7,680	3,470
1964-65	7,960	3,570
1965-66	8,732	3,701
1966-67	9,282	4,172
1967-68	9,862	4,557
1968-69	10,582	4,855
1969-70	11,604	5,206

3. Information not available in form requested as, until the current fiscal year, budget allocations were not computed on a geographical or activity centre basis.

4. Cases under supervision of Parole Staff

Fiscal Year	Numbers of Cases
1961-62	3
1962-63	—
1963-64	7
1964-65	6
1965-66	1
1966-67	23
1967-68	44
1968-69	76
1969-70	174

5. Cases under supervision of John Howard Society

Fiscal Year	Numbers of Cases
1961-62	163
1962-63	149
1963-64	142
1964-65	115
1965-66	39
1966-67	163
1967-68	185
1968-69	184
1969-70	238

6. Parole grants

Fiscal Year *	John Howard Society
1961-62	$9,650
1962-63	8,700
1963-64	8,400
1964-65	9,120
1965-66	10,686
1966-67	12,280
1967-68	15,645
1968-69	13,890
1969-70	17,419

*Computed as of end of fiscal year.

ELK ISLAND NATIONAL PARK—CAPITAL EXPENDITURES

Question No. 1,818—**Mr. Mazankowski:**

1. What was the total amount spent on capital expenditures in Elk Island National Park during the fiscal year 1969-70?

2. What are the details of expenditures?

3. How are surplus materials disposed of?

4. What was the declared surplus in 1969-70?

5. What was the total amount of surplus declared?

6. How much was realized?

7. What capital expenditures are considered for the fiscal year 1970-71?

8. What are the details of these expenditures?

Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. $109,929.

2. Detailed expenditures

Development Recreation Area	$46,952
Beaver Exhibit	5,789
On Site Aspen Exhibit	6,530
½ ton Trucks—3 Replaced	6,786
3 ton Trucks—2 Replaced	10,632
Fence Boundary	17,696
Replace Radio Equipment	899
Miscellaneous Equipment	10,684
Trailer Asphalt Equipment	3,961
Total	$109,929

Questions

3. Through the Crown Assets Disposal Corporation.

4. Redundant and worn out machines and appliances.

5. $10,086.83.

6. $2,415.27.

7. $27,000.

8. Details of Expenditure

Reconstruct Boundary Fence	$ 7,000
Replacement—3 ton Truck	7,000
Replacement—½ ton Truck	2,300
Fire Equipment	500
Signs	5,000
Green Cutting Equipment	900
Replacement—One Ton Truck	3,000
Miscellaneous Equipment	1,300
Total	$27,000

LEGISLATION TO PROTECT CANADIAN MEMBERS OF INTERNATIONAL UNIONS

Question No. 1,819—**Mr. Robinson:**

Will the federal government consider the feasibility of passing legislation whereby international unions in the United States will be made liable to their Canadian members for total wages lost when a strike by the union in the United States results in loss of jobs to the Canadian membership?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): The government is always willing to consider the feasibility of any legislative proposals but it is not likely, for a number of reasons, that such consideration in this case would have a useful result.

STATUS OF ACTION AGAINST JOHN C. DOYLE FOR PAYMENT OF TAXES

Question No. 1,837—**Mr. Coates:**

1. What is the status of the action initiated by the federal government against John C. Doyle for payment of taxes?

2. On what date was the action taken by the federal government and what is the amount of the unpaid taxes claimed by the federal government?

3. If the settlement has been reached, what was the amount accepted by the federal government in settlement?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister of National Revenue): 1 and 2. A Writ of Extent was issued out of the Exchequer Court of Canada on July 8, 1963 for the sum of $3,410,130.90, with the Government's claim being registered against assets valued in excess of the income tax liability.

3. No settlement has been reached. The tax assessments have been appealed to the Exchequer Court and the appeal is scheduled to be heard starting May 25, 1970.

[Mr. Honey.]

FIRST CLASS AIR TRAVEL BY FEDERAL OFFICIALS

Question No. 1,843—**Mr. Coates:**

1. What officials of the federal government are allowed to travel first class on airways in Canada and outside Canada?

2. On what occasions do federal government officials fly first class and what was the additional cost for the transportation of federal government officials in first class accommodation in the past fiscal year as compared with the cost of economy flights?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): 1. Deputy Heads and Heads of Agencies. Senior Executive Officers where first class air travel is authorized by their deputy head.

2. On Government business travel when approved as in 1 above and when economy class is not available. Less than 5% of government business travel by air is first class. Cost information is not available.

QUEBEC—GRANTS TO INDUSTRIAL MILK PRODUCERS

Question No. 1,884—**Mr. Gauthier:**

1. What grants were paid to Quebec industrial milk producers for the years 1967, 1968 and 1969?

2. What amounts were withheld for marketing costs or for over-production penalties from Quebec industrial milk producers during the years 1967, 1968 and 1969?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): 1. Net subsidy payments to Quebec industrial milk and cream shippers are as follows: 1967-68, $41.2 Million; 1968-69, $44.4 Million; 1969-70 (incomplete), $36.7 Million.

2. Amounts withheld from subsidy payments towards the cost of exporting surpluses were: 1967-68, $4.5 Million; 1968-69, $7.2 Million; 1969-70 (not final), $13.6 Million.

INDIVIDUALS PAYING INCOME TAX ON INCOMES UNDER $3,000 1968-1969

Question No. 1,894—**Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse):**

What was the number of individuals with an income of less than $3,000.00 who paid income tax during 1968 and 1969?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister of National Revenue): 1968: There were 1,630,704 individuals with total incomes of less than $3,000 before exemptions and deductions who paid income tax during 1968. 1969—Information not available.

REPRESENTATIONS BY CLC REGARDING ITS SOCIAL ACTION PLAN

Question No. 1,895—**Mr. Yewchuk:**

1. Has CLC made any representations to the Canadian Government concerning its social action plan recently revealed at the national convention?

2. If any such representations were made, would the government be willing to work with CLC in organizing certain under-privileged members of Canadian society?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): 1. No.

2. A reply to this could be determined only if and when such representations are made.

ASSISTANCE TO CHILDREN OF PRAIRIE FARMERS TO ATTEND UNIVERSITY

Question No. 1,896—**Mr. Yewchuk:**

Will the government consider giving social financial assistance to children of Prairie farmers who are currently experiencing economic difficulties in order to permit them to attend university in the next academic year?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): The Canada Student Loans Act provides for assistance to all full-time university students who can demonstrate financial need. The criteria used in determining the amount of loan to be granted include the income of the parents of a dependent student. Thus, any change in the income of a student's family will be reflected in the amount of aid available to the student. Lending in the three prairie provinces under this program has shown an increase to date this loan year compared to the last full loan year (July 1 to June 30) as follows:

	1968-69 (whole year)	1969-70 (10 months to April 30th)
Alberta	$8,340,345	$10,744,249
Sask.	$6,564,848	$ 8,421,671
Man.	$3,448,789	$ 4,326,396

NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN CANADA AND RED CHINA—TRANSPORTATION COSTS

Question No. 1,911—**Mr. Coates:**

1. What has been the cost to the federal government for transportation provided to members of the government service who have participated in the negotiations presently underway between Canada and the Government of Red China in Stockholm?

2. What are the names of the persons who were required to fly to Stockholm for these negotiations, from what location did they fly to attend the meetings at Stockholm, on how many occasions and, in each instance, did they fly economy, first class or by government aircraft, either the full distance or a portion of that distance?

3. Were these transportation costs included in the $7,402 indicated by the government as the additional assistance provided to the Embassy at Stockholm in connection with the negotiations and if they were not included as additional costs, for what reason?

Mr. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. Approximately $3,325.

2. (a) John M. Fraser; (b) Ottawa; (c) Five; (d) Economy class commercial flights for full distance in all cases.

NATIONAL PARKS—EXPANSION OF ACCOMMODATION FACILITIES

Question No. 1,922—**Mr. Noble:**

1. Is it the intention of the government to expand accommodation facilities to meet the requirements of an increasing number of visitors to the National Parks by acquiring suitable areas now available for such new park development?

2. In considering additional areas for National Parks, would the government give serious consideration to acquiring the area now available with the closing of the Meaford Tank Range?

Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. Yes.

2. When the Department of National Defence declares land surplus, its potential for use by other governmental agencies is examined. Due consideration will be given to the park potential of the Meaford Tank Range.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

MANPOWER AND IMMIGRATION CONSULTANTS

Question No. 987—**Mr. Noble:**

1. How many consultants not associated with the Public Service of Canada have been retained by the Department of Manpower and Immigration since its establishment?

2. What are (a) the names of the firms or individuals retained (b) what was the reason in each instance for retaining the service (c) what was the cost in each instance where a firm was involved (d) what was the fee and expense where an individual or individuals were involved?

Return tabled.

MANPOWER AND IMMIGRATION CONSULTANTS

Question No. 1,042—**Mr. Coates:**

1. How many consultants, not associated with the Public Service of Canada have been retained by the Department of Manpower and Immigration during the present Parliament?

2. What are the names of the firms or individuals retained, what was the reason in each instance for retaining the service and what was the cost in each instance where a firm was involved and what was the fee and expense where an individual or individuals were involved?

Return tabled.

VETERANS AFFAIRS—RESEARCH STUDIES

Question No. 1,777—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. What research studies have been carried out by, or on behalf of the Department of Veterans Affairs during each year 1960 to 1969 inclusive?
2. What research studies are now being carried on and/or are contemplated during the next five years?
3. What was the cost of each of the research studies completed in each year 1960 to 1969 inclusive?
4. What is the estimated cost of each of the studies now in being or contemplated during the next five years?

Return tabled.

HIRING OF MESSRS. ROBIDOUX AND AUSTIN BY DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Question No. 1811—**Mr. Laniel:**

Were Messrs. Robidoux and Austin, currently working in Vimy and Beaumont-Hamel, hired as locally engaged employees by the Department of Veterans Affairs and, if so (a) on what date were they hired and at what salary at the time of employment (b) what was their respective salary at the end of December, 1968 (c) what is their salary at present (d) what other benefits are attached to their position at present, and are they similar to those they had prior to January 1, 1969 (e) what were their duties and responsibilities prior to January 1, 1969 (f) what are their present duties and responsibilities (g) what are their normal channels of communication within the Department in the discharge of their duties for submitting recommendations, suggestions or claims (h) what job security do they have?

Return tabled.

Mr. Crouse: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, concerning question No. 513 in my name on the Order Paper. It is a simple question concerning the procedure followed by the government. It has stood on the Order Paper since November 19 without being answered. I again respectfully ask, through you, sir, that the government endeavour to give me a reply to the question.

Mr. Forest: Mr. Speaker, I have made representations to the Department of Public Works and I expect an answer soon.

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—GOVERNMENT POLICY RESPECTING WAGE AND SALARY RESTRAINT

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), to move the adjournment of the House under Standing Order 26 for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely, the federal government's policy to implement a restraint program against the wage and salary earners of this country as announced on Friday at the federal-provincial conference in Winnipeg. Any policy which seeks to hold down the incomes of one group of the economy, while leaving the incomes of other groups unrestrained, is discriminatory and inequitable and should be resisted by this Parliament.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo has filed the required notice and I have had an opportunity to give serious consideration to the proposed motion for the adjournment of the House. Under the terms of Standing Order 26 the hon. member suggests that this House should adjourn to consider "the federal government's policy to implement a restraint program against the wage and salary earners of this country." The hon. member goes on to argue his case by suggesting that such a policy "is discriminatory and inequitable and should be resisted by this Parliament."

There are a number of serious considerations which militate against the proposed motion. First, I remind the hon. member that the business which he seeks to displace is a supply motion under the terms of Standing Order 58, notice of which was given last Friday. In other words, we have already in actuality, set aside government business for the purpose of discussing a supply motion. I would find it difficult to pre-empt the supply motion in favour of a motion under Standing Order 26, even if under the provisions of Section 9 of Standing Order 26 the debate suggested by the hon. member for Waterloo might be postponed.

The second difficulty stems from the very nature of the subject matter proposed for discussion. Although it is one of extreme importance, and of national concern and interest, it seems to me it is one that will be the subject of continuing discussions and negotiations extending over a period of time. In such circumstances, I suggest that the Standing Order cannot apply.

The third difficulty I see in the motion as proposed is that it is rather in the form of a condemnation of a proposed government policy. A debate of this nature is normally put before the House by way of a no-confidence motion rather than by virtue of the provisions of Standing Order 26.

For these reasons, I do not agree with the hon. member's proposal that this matter be debated in the House under the provisions of Standing Order 26.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

TAXATION

WHITE PAPER ON REFORM—SUBSTITUTION OF CO-ORDINATED EFFORT BY FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS TO WORK OUT POLICY

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister. Because of the obvious need for close co-ordination between federal and provincial tax policies, and because of the wide differences of opinion expressed in the conference during the weekend by the provincial and federal governments on the important question of tax reform, and because all Canadians are equally affected by provincial and federal tax policies, would the government seriously consider the possibility of substituting for its present proposals as listed in the white paper a co-ordinated effort between federal and provincial governments aimed at working out a policy in the best interests of all Canadian taxpayers?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the Ministers of Finance and provincial treasurers met in Winnipeg at the weekend. Three submissions were made by the provinces which had not been reviewed by the federal government up to that time. The Ministers of Finance and provincial treasurers agreed that we should analyse the submissions which had been made and discuss them at a later time. We intend to do this.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—PROPOSED SIX PER CENT WAGE INCREASE LIMITATION

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): I have a related question for the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker. As the federal government has no plans to enforce the 6 per cent wage guideline which was outlined at the Winnipeg conference, and as the President of the United Automobile Workers, the body which sets the pattern for wage agreements on the North American continent, has stated flatly that his body will have nothing to do with the government's 6 per cent limitation on wage increases, does the government have any reason to believe that its present proposal in the form of the 6 per cent guideline has any better chance of success than various other proposals put forward to organized labour over the past year through the Prices and Incomes Commission? If it does so believe, what are the reasons?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Well, Mr. Speaker, these reasons are very simple to give. We believe in the democratic process and we believe that there is some merit in appealing to people when the public interest is at stake.

An hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: We think that by explaining—

Mr. Hees: You have one fan, at least.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I see that there is not very great support for this on the other side of the House. Apparently those hon. members do not trust democracy to work. They think you have to use a big stick and statutory measures to force people to act for the common good. On this side of the House we believe in taking the first step first and appealing to the people to use their own sense of voluntary co-operation in order to combat the evil of inflation. We hope that the people will understand what the public interest means better than the opposition does.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, the opposition is even more anxious for this approach to be successful than is the government.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, as this is the same approach that the government has been failing with during the past year, time after time, I simply ask the Prime Minister, when does Alice expect to emerge from Wonderland into the hard, cold world of reality?

Mr. Baldwin: When is she coming forth from blunderland?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member's supplementary is, I suggest, argumentative.

INFLATION—MANITOBA PROPOSAL FOR RESTRAINT ON ALL FORMS OF INCOME

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Finance? In view of the presentation of the government of Manitoba to the federal-provincial conference in Winnipeg for a policy of restraint on all forms of income, including rents, profits, interest and executive

salaries, can the minister indicate whether it is his intention to support and accept the position of the government of Manitoba in the interest of fairness?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the steps that were taken at the previous meeting of first ministers, and again at the meeting of federal and provincial finance ministers and treasurers, were to request that the provinces should take every step possible to make sure that rents do not rise too quickly and that professional organizations would be dealt with by them. There was general agreement that they should move in this direction, and many of them indicated that they had moved in this direction.

Mr. Saltsman: Can the minister assure the House that the proposed guidelines stated at the conclusion of the federal-provincial conference, and the indications the minister gave us today, will not be implemented until a committee of the House of Commons has had an opportunity to examine the entire proposal?

Mr. Benson: No, Mr. Speaker.

INFLATION—PROPOSED SIX PER CENT WAGE INCREASE LIMITATION—CONSULTATION BY DR. YOUNG WITH GOVERNMENT

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Although the minister has said that the government and the Prices and Incomes Commission are at arm's length, is it not a fact that at Winnipeg he was fully aware of the nature and details of the proposals by Dr. Young before he commenced his speech and made his statement?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, Dr. Young, I understand, was in contact with all the governments before the meeting at Winnipeg for informal discussions in which he stated the suggestions he had in mind so that they could be considered before the meeting took place.

Mr. Hees: A supplementary question to the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker. Does the Prime Minister seriously intend to leave the impression with the House that the Chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission does not consult very intimately with members of the government before he comes out with any proposal or policy? Does he expect us to believe that he acts completely independently and on his own?

[Mr. Saltsman.]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It is very difficult for the Chair to accept the question as asked. The question was asked in an argumentative way. Perhaps the hon. member would like to rephrase the question.

Mr. Hees: As you know, Mr. Speaker, I hate to be argumentative, so I will ask my question in a straightforward and unargumentative way. Does the Prime Minister intend to leave the impression with the House that the Chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission makes his decisions and comes forward with proposals and propositions to the Canadian public completely on his own, without very close consultation with ministers of this government before he does so?

Mr. Baldwin: Does he do it in splendid isolation?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, on the contrary, there is consultation with the government. There was consultation with all governments before the Chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission made his February proposals to the private sector of the economy. He also consulted with business and with labour. He follows the same procedure with governments, including our own. His aim, I take it, is not to come up with a proposal which will catch the authorities by surprise. He wants to test them first. He wants to see how far they are prepared to support him. In this sense he has consulted us but he has consulted us with a view to seeing how we would react to one thing or another, and then he goes on and acts on his own authority.

INFLATION—PROPOSED SIX PER CENT WAGE INCREASE LIMITATION—APPLICATION TO OLD AGE PENSIONS

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Finance. Will the proposition that the 6 per cent ceiling be imposed on all increases be adhered to with respect to increases for old age pensioners?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Well, Mr. Speaker, the question of old age pensioners was dealt with in a debate in the House not too long ago. The old age pensioners have the sympathy of this government and no government in the history of Canada has done more for our old age pensioners than we have in the past several years.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Hees: There speaks 30-buck Benson.

INFLATION—SUGGESTED LIMITATION OF BANK PROFIT INCREASES TO SIX PER CENT

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary to the Minister of Finance. Inasmuch as five chartered banks have now reported profit increases averaging some 22 per cent, can the minister indicate to the House whether the government is considering imposing a 6 per cent limit on the profit increases of the chartered banks, such as is proposed for workers?

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Of course not.

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, at the meeting earlier this year of the Prices and Incomes Commission, the banks made an agreement with regard to restricting their profits. I trust that the Prices and Incomes Commission will make sure they are adhering to this and, if they are not, I trust that the commission will bring it to the public's attention.

INFLATION—PROPOSED SIX PER CENT WAGE INCREASE LIMITATION—APPLICATION TO POSTAL UNION DISPUTE

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Finance. In view of the support given by the government to the Chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission with respect to the recommendation for compulsory wage and salary guidelines, would the minister say if the exact timing of this announcement has anything to do with the current issue before Treasury Board involving the postal unions?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Not at all, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

INFLATION—ADOPTION BY PROVINCES OF SIX PER CENT LIMIT ON WAGE INCREASES

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance a question. As the provinces seem to have accepted at the Winnipeg meeting the request of the government for a 6 per cent wage increase ceiling, would the minister be prepared to tell the House whether the provincial governments have committed themselves to pass legislative measures to implement a 6 per cent wage increase ceiling?

[*English*]

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, at Winnipeg the Ministers of Finance indicated that they sympathized with the proposition, that they would take it back to their governments and report to the Chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission.

INFLATION—PROPOSED SIX PER CENT WAGE INCREASE LIMITATION—NOTIFICATION OF MINISTER BY DR. YOUNG

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland-Colchester North): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister of Finance inform the House on what date the Chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission first informed him of his intention to present the proposal he presented to the Federal-Provincial Conference of Finance Ministers at Winnipeg?

Mr. Baldwin: Who spoke to whom?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, it was last week some time. I shall have to check and make sure of the exact time. The chairman of the commission approached our government at the same time as he approached other governments in this country.

Mr. Baldwin: Nuts!

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. How is the minister able to reconcile his answer with that of the Prime Minister, that the Chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission of course consults closely with government ministers? The proposal as put forward certainly would have been in that general area.

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission came to the government and put forward his proposal just before the conference. I am not sure of the exact date, but I will check it. He informed us that he was approaching other governments at the same time.

Mr. Baldwin: How naïve do you think we are?

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, would the minister advise the House when the government told the Chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission to bring forward this suggestion?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Benson: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The minister seeks the floor on a point of order. He shall have the floor in a moment. Obviously, we

are now entering the field of debate and perhaps we might go to another subject. Since the minister has risen on a point of order, I will recognize him.

Mr. Benson: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I simply wish to point out to my hon. friend, as I did earlier today, that we do not give instructions to the chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission.

Mr. Hees: Nonsense; we do not buy that.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

MIDDLE EAST—USE OF CANADA ARMED FORCES IN PEACEKEEPING ROLE

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Can he enlighten his colleagues and the House about his proposal regarding Canadian participation in a peacekeeping force in the Middle East?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, when I was in eastern Europe I was asked whether, if there were a peace plan or a ceasefire that involved peacekeeping forces, Canada would be willing to participate. I said yes, in principle.

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): I wonder if the minister—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is the hon. member rising on a supplementary?

Mr. Forrestall: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister be kind enough to indicate who was involved in these discussions when this feeler was put forth, in response to which the minister replied in a positive manner?

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): I have a supplementary question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Can the minister state whether he put this proposal as a Canadian proposal to the United Nations, and whether the United Nations has agreed with the idea of a peacekeeping force returning to the Middle East?

Mr. Sharp: As the hon. member knows, resolution No. 242 of the Security Council provides the framework within which a settlement of this conflict might be reached. Unfortunately, very little progress has been made. In so far as the question of a peacekeeping force is concerned, while it is important that the world should know that, in principle, we would be prepared to participate, I am afraid that it may be some time before we are called upon to fulfil that role.

[Mr. Speaker.]

PRICES AND INCOMES COMMISSION

LISTS OF NAMES USED IN SENDING OUT PAMPHLETS

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): I have a question for the Minister of Finance. Will the minister consult with the Chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission to find out just how the lists were devised by the commission for sending out these pamphlets that have been issued? I have received four pamphlets. I also have in my hand a pamphlet that was sent to a person who has been dead for four years. This is a scandalous waste of hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): I am sure that if the hon. member received four he needed four. However, I will refer the question to my colleague, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

LABOUR RELATIONS

WEST COAST TOWBOAT STRIKE—PRESENT POSITION OF NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): I wish to address a question to the Minister of Labour in connection with the towboat tie-up on the west coast of Canada. I direct the minister's attention to a reply he made, as recorded at page 7544 of *Hansard*. The minister indicated he might be making a statement to the House before the end of last week. Can the minister either give a direct indication of the situation at the moment or indicate when he may be making the statement to which he referred in his answer a week ago today?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): I apologize for not having made the statement, Mr. Speaker. Events have been moving rather quickly on the coast. Any statement I might make in the House could jeopardize the proposed settlement. I can indicate, however, that the representative of the Department of Labour is meeting today with the unions to offer them the package proposal advanced by the employers over the weekend. I have no way of knowing whether that package is acceptable. I hope to know later today.

Mr. Barnett: I intended to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Justice but apparently he has been called out of the chamber. Perhaps the Solicitor General might respond to my question. I have received

requests that the Minister of Justice intervene in the situation because certain union leaders have been incarcerated for contempt of court. I have been asked to request the Minister of Justice to intervene in this matter with a view to facilitating a better mood for completing negotiations. Can the Solicitor General indicate to the House the position the Minister of Justice might take on this question.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to bring this request to the attention of the Minister of Justice. I hesitate to ask the minister to do anything that could be interpreted as interfering with a prosecution that is before the courts.

VIOLENT DISTURBANCES

MONTREAL—CO-OPERATION BY GOVERNMENT IN ENDING BOMB EXPLOSIONS

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): My question is for the Solicitor General. Can the minister make a report to the House on the government's co-operation in putting an end to professional terrorist bombings in Montreal?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I do not know what report can be given to the House on the matter. The three police forces directly concerned are working together to investigate these offences. It has never been the practice to give information about an investigation during the course of the investigation.

MANPOWER

CLOSING OF GOLD MINE, GERALDTON, ONT.—ACTION BY CANADA MANPOWER SERVICE TO ASSIST EMPLOYEES

Mr. B. Keith Penner (Thunder Bay): I have a question for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. It is supplementary to the question I asked last Friday concerning the closing of a gold mine in Geraldton, Ontario. What immediate action will be taken by Canada Manpower to assist the nearly 200 men who will lose their jobs as a result of the closing of this operation?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I have asked Canada Manpower counselors in Thunder Bay to go to Geraldton today to discuss the question with the employer and employees, and to make the services of the department available to those employees who are affected.

Inquiries of the Ministry

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

MIDDLE EAST—REQUEST BY ISRAEL TO UNITED STATES FOR PHANTOM JET PLANES

Mr. S. Perry Ryan (Spadina): I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. At the recent NATO council meeting in Rome did the minister oppose the request of the Israeli government to the United States government for Phantom jets?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): No, Mr. Speaker, I made no comment on the subject.

[*Translation*]

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

QUEBEC—INCLUSION OF MONTMAGNY IN SPECIAL AREAS

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration.

Given the alarming situation now prevailing in the city of Montmagny, where 1,500 people are out of work, would the minister be prepared to recommend to his colleague the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion to include the city of Montmagny in the special area of the district of Quebec, which would enable it to undertake works to provide employment to the greatest possible number of workers.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I think that the hon. member asked this question only a few days ago. If my memory is correct, the hon. member put the question to the minister himself. He is now asking another minister to request his colleagues to study the matter. I do not think that the question as put is in order.

Moreover, the hon. member has already drawn this issue to the attention of the House.

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege.

I admit that I did put that question to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, but since then I have received representations. In view of the seriousness of the situation, I would surely have directed my question today to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, but since the Minister of Manpower and Immigration has some responsibilities in this respect, I put the question to him for that reason.

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*English*]

FINANCE

RECOMMENDATIONS BY AUDITOR GENERAL AND PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): My question is for the Minister of Finance. In light of the statement made in Winnipeg by the President of the Treasury Board that there will be further cuts by the federal government in hospital services, medicare and post-secondary education, will the minister recommend that the government set its own house in order first by following the recommendations of the Auditor General and the Public Accounts Committee to curb extravagance and waste in federal spending?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question as asked is not acceptable procedurally.

REPRESENTATIONS BY BANK FOR INTERNATIONAL SETTLEMENTS CONCERNING RETURN TO FIXED DOLLAR EXCHANGE RATE

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): My question is for the Minister of Finance. Has the government, the Minister of Finance, the Department of Finance or the Bank of Canada received any representations from bankers meeting at the Bank for International Settlements urging Canada to return to a fixed exchange rate? If so, can the minister indicate what the response of the government is or will be?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance is responsible for the exchange rate. I have received no such representation. I will have to inquire to see whether the various people mentioned in the question have received such a representation. I have not, nor has the government.

Mr. Burton: A supplementary question. Can the minister inform the House whether the viewpoint apparently expressed by the Bank for International Settlements at its meeting also represents the viewpoint of Mr. Rasminsky?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I would not think that the question as asked is in order.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

PERU—ASSISTANCE TO EARTHQUAKE VICTIMS

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary Centre): I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of reports over the weekend that Canada has sent some short landing and take-off aircraft to assist in the relief operations in Peru, can the minister inform the House as to the extent of the assistance Canada has now agreed to give to relieve what is probably the biggest, natural disaster in many years?

[Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse).]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I understand that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister made a statement on Friday last. The information I have is identical with the information he gave, so I do not think I can add anything at the present time.

Mr. W. M. Howe (Wellington-Grey): Bearing in mind the tremendous number of people who sustained injuries in this disaster and need to be hospitalized, would the Prime Minister consider making available to Peru some of the 200-bed hospitals which I understand the Department of National Defence is keeping for an emergency?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): We shall consider any request which is reasonable and which we can reasonably meet. I understand that the Department of External Affairs is in communication with our embassy there. The first leg of our assistance has taken effect, in the sense that some of our planes are now arriving in Peru. As to the other matter, I thank the hon. member for the suggestion, and we shall consider it.

ALLEGED REFUSAL OF FRANCE TO GRANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS OVERFLY PRIVILEGES

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): May I take this opportunity to make an explanation which I feel I owe to the hon. member for Fundy-Royal. He has just left the House but perhaps he can read what I say in *Hansard*. It has to do with a question he asked me on Thursday about the reported refusal of France to grant overflight privileges to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. I replied that there had been no such refusal, and my answer was correct; there had been no such refusal. But I went on to add, basing my assertion on information from the Department of National Defence, that no such request had been made. I am now told by the Secretary of State for External Affairs that there was a request made and that the request was granted. So things ended up even more nicely than I then thought.

FINANCE

FREEING OF DOLLAR EXCHANGE RATE—COMPENSATORY ACTION BY COLUMBIA CELLULOSE COMPANY

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday last I asked a question, intended as notice for the Minister of Finance, concerning steps taken by the Columbia Cellulose Company Limited, which, incidentally, is one of the largest pulp exporters in Canada, to establish a Canadian currency equalization surcharge of between 5 per cent and 8 per cent on all its foreign sales of pulp in order to compensate for the effects of freeing the dollar exchange rate. Has the minister received any information about this practice? Does he know whether similar steps have been taken by other Canadian exporters, and what is the response of the government to action of this type by Canadian exporters?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Unfortunately, I was away at the end of last week and the question was brought to my notice only just before the question period began. I must look into the details. If it means that Canadian exporters have not been charging enough for their products, and that they can get more money for them, I do not think we can object. But I must look into the situation in order to understand fully what is involved.

FREEING OF DOLLAR EXCHANGE RATE—OFFSETTING OF EFFECTS ON LUMBER AND SMALL BERRY INDUSTRIES

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland-Colchester North): My question is also related to the consequences of the decision to free the Canadian dollar. Is the Minister of Finance in a position to tell us whether legislation will be proceeded with before the recess designed to offset the serious damage which has already occurred to the lumber industry and to minimize the consequences to the small berry industry which also depends to a substantial extent on export markets?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): When we moved to the floating exchange rate, I undertook to look at some of the difficulties which might be expected to develop as soon as the rate had settled down. I do not see that we could possibly introduce legislation before the parliamentary recess.

Mr. Coates: In view of the strong objections to this step which the lumber industry has taken through its various associations, and the extreme difficulty in which it has been placed, may I ask whether the minister intends to take any action to help them to surmount these problems?

Mr. Benson: Not at the present time. Of course, when our dollar was undervalued exporters had a great advantage, and when it was brought back to a more normal level through the free play of the exchange market exporters enjoy a little less of the advantage which had been theirs. In some cases particular difficulties may arise and we are willing to examine those cases and ascertain what is involved. There are assistance programs administered by the Department of Industry, and they are much more numerous than they were a few years ago. But there is no intention to bring in legislation before the end of the session.

Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Central Nova): Has the minister received representations from industries such as the lumber industry, the pulp and paper industry, and so on, objecting to the move which has been made?

Mr. Benson: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have received a good many representations from exporters with regard to the position of industries which will now be less favourably situated. I have also received congratulations from importers and consumers on the fact that the cost of imports will be lower. It will take some time to determine the over-all effect.

REMOVAL OF SALES TAX ON BUILDING MATERIALS—MEASURES TENDING TO LOWER MORTGAGE INTEREST RATES

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): I should like to ask the Minister of Finance whether he has any intention of announcing the removal of the 11 per cent tax on building materials as well as other measures which will tend to bring about lower interest rates on mortgage loans?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): I think the easing of the monetary situation has already resulted in interest rates coming down somewhat. The treasury bill rate last week was under 6 per cent for the first time in a long while, and there have been indications of other interest rates coming down somewhat. With regard to fiscal measures, if tax changes are to be made they will be announced in the normal manner in the House.

Inquiries of the Ministry

LABOUR RELATIONS

ACADIA FISHING COMPANY AND BOOTH FISHERIES—ASSISTANCE IN SETTLING STRIKE—PROVISION OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): My question is directed to the Minister of Labour. Does the hon. gentleman plan to take any steps to assist in settling the strike of fishermen against Acadia and Booth Fisheries in Nova Scotia?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Does the minister intend to take any immediate steps to put into effect the recommendations of the Woods task force on labour relations that fishermen be given the right to collective bargaining?

Mr. Mackasey: This is always a possibility when these proposed changes are brought before the House.

[*Translation*]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

INQUIRY AS TO WHITE PAPER

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Minister of Labour.

In view of the fact that for several months we have been promised a white paper on the Unemployment Insurance Commission, can the minister assure the House that this white paper will be tabled before the summer adjournment, and tell us if the document will be based on the findings of the Gill Commission?

[*English*]

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Any white paper that I may bring forward on unemployment insurance before the end of the session would, of course, have to take into consideration the recommendations of the Gill report. I am still hoping I shall be able to bring in this paper before the end of the session.

MANPOWER

NEWFOUNDLAND—SPEEDING UP OF PROGRAMS TO RELIEVE UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): My question is addressed to the Prime Minister. At the risk of sounding parochial, may I ask whether the government would attach some urgency to government programs planned for the benefit of Canada's most east-

[Mr. Benson.]

erly province so as to alleviate the unemployment situation there which appears to be getting worse instead of better?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Over the past days and weeks, various ministers have indicated that there is indeed urgency being attached to this matter and, in fact, a considerable amount of assistance has been given.

Mr. Lundrigan: A number of programs have been planned for that province but in the normal course of events it is bound to be some time before they can be implemented. We are now in the middle of summer and the unemployment rate is something like 20 per cent. In the circumstances, would the Prime Minister consult with his colleagues in the effort to speed up these government programs so that they might have some minor impact on the unemployment situation in the near future?

Mr. Trudeau: This suggestion is very much in the mind of the government. Indeed, the proposals which the Minister of Finance made in Winnipeg on Friday involving the expenditure of some of our current financial surplus in various parts of Canada were thought up with a view precisely to making sure that our surplus would be spent in order to assist the particular parts of Canada which need help the most.

Mr. Lundrigan: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the Department of Manpower and Immigration planning to modify its manpower programs in order to try to create some opportunity for people of upper middle age who are basically unemployable and largely untrainable owing to the lack of fundamental skills and education and try to modify—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member's supplementary is very general in nature, and I suggest to him invites a response from the minister which should normally be made to the House by way of a statement on motions.

Mr. Lundrigan: May I finish my question and ask the minister whether he is planning to revive the Newstart program on a general level across Canada, a program which apparently had some relevance to people of upper middle age who are largely untrained and who need some basic skill?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I have to give the same ruling on the further supplementary as I gave on the first. It seems to me that the hon. member's question is much too general to be acceptable. He might follow my suggestion and inquire whether a statement will be made.

Mr. Lundrigan: I can certainly make an inquiry along those lines, but I was wondering whether the minister was going to reintroduce the Newstart program. However, I will ask whether the minister will make a statement on this very urgent matter.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I will consider making a statement on the matter.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—INSTRUCTION OF PRICES AND INCOMES COMMISSION BY GOVERNMENT

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance with respect to earlier questions asked of him. Having in mind that the Prices and Incomes Commission earlier this year accepted from the government the responsibility to instruct the steel industry about steel price increases, how does the minister reconcile his statement now of non-instruction with the earlier action that was requested by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs?

Mr. Speaker: Order. When a member asks a minister to reconcile one statement with another, it is obviously argument and not in order.

PENSIONS

OLD AGE SECURITY—INCREASE BEFORE END OF SESSION

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Finance. In view of statements made by the minister over the weekend, and again in the House this afternoon, expressing the government's sympathy for old age pensioners, may I ask whether the government is now considering an increase in the old age pension before the end of this session?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister then indicate how much all this sympathy is worth?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Hees: Thirty-buck Benson.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

APPOINTMENT OF AMBASSADOR TO RUMANIA

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Is the government taking steps to remove the anomaly to which he referred of Canada being unrepresented by an ambassador in Rumania, which is not only an important country but one which has recently suffered serious disasters?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member has pointed out, we do not have an ambassador resident in Bucharest. The Rumanian government, however, as an indication of the growing relationship between our two countries, has decided to have an Ambassador resident in Ottawa. I told the Foreign Minister while I was there that as soon as my colleague the Minister of Finance gave me a little more money we will consider doing the same thing in Bucharest.

Mr. Brewin: A supplementary question. Is the delay in sending a representative to this important country due, therefore, to the government's austerity policy?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, it is quite clear from statements that I have made that the government considers it necessary, in order to promote the financial stability of the country, that there be a very close check on expenditures. As a result of the program put into effect last year, we did close some missions and we are not reopening them as rapidly as we would like. I am sure that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House will respond affirmatively to our virtue in this respect.

PRIORITY OPENING OF EMBASSIES OR TRADE MISSIONS IN FRANCOPHONE COUNTRIES

Mr. S. Perry Ryan (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Is priority being given by his department to opening embassies or establishing trade missions in Francophone countries over other countries?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): No, Mr. Speaker, but we are looking at our representation there just as we are in other parts of the world. There are a number of missions that we would like to open in due course and hope to be able to do so.

[*Later:*]

ESTABLISHMENT OF TRADE MISSION IN TAIWAN

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, my question is supplementary to the one asked by the hon. member for Spadina and is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the fact that the government of Taiwan has indicated great interest in having Canada establish at least a trade mission in Taiwan, does the minister have any intention of doing so?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): No, Mr. Speaker.

INQUIRIES OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey): Mr. Speaker, I have a question I want to ask the Minister of Finance. Would he consider drawing the federal government's wage and salary increase restraint guidelines to the attention of the commission examining parliamentary incomes?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Prime Minister. Would the Prime Minister please state to the House why he did not attend the Liberal caucus thinkers conference this weekend in Edmonton? Could it be that he had a more pleasant task to perform?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

FINANCE

FREEING OF DOLLAR EXCHANGE RATE—DISCUSSION AT FINANCE MINISTERS CONFERENCE

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Minister of Finance. Could the minister inform the House whether at the meeting of finance ministers over the weekend in Winnipeg there was any discussion of offsetting measures or special problems arising from the change in government policy to a floating exchange rate?

[Mr. Ryan.]

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I did answer that question in my statement. If my hon. friend will read it, I think he will find the answer.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

• (4:10 p.m.)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 58—ALLEGED FAILURE TO PROTECT PUBLIC TREASURY IN REFITTING OF HMCS "BONAVENTURE" AND GENERALLY

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster) moved:

That the government has displayed its mismanagement and abuse of powers and has failed in its responsibility to protect the public treasury in relation to the refitting of H.M.C.S. *Bonaventure* in particular; and generally there has been neglect and default in carrying out programs and recommendations designed to protect the taxpayers of Canada from waste, extravagance and other abuses in the spending of government money and for these failures the government deserves the condemnation of the House.

He said: Mr. Speaker, we have had a long afternoon of questions of privilege, statements and the like, and even though the hour is late I hope that this motion will commend itself to the members of the House. It may receive a mixed reaction from some, but I think all members on the treasury benches will welcome an opportunity to put their side of the case concerning the *Bonaventure* before the House and on the record. Personally, as a member of parliament, I feel that I have a grave responsibility to bring this matter forward for discussion, and I am more than pleased that my colleagues have agreed that it should be the basis for an opposition motion on an allotted day.

I never thought that the time would come, Mr. Speaker, when I would feel sorry for a civil servant. But I must admit I do now, because I feel that many of the civil servants who have been involved in the *Bonaventure* fiasco should have their day in court. I firmly believe that it can only be here, in this forum, which is the highest court in the land.

There are, as I see it, two general responsibilities with regard to the *Bonaventure*, and both are interrelated. I have arbitrarily called them the financial responsibility and the political responsibility. I think the financial responsibility has been dealt with quite well.

This responsibility on behalf of the taxpayers has been handled in the committee report that was released in connection with the *Bonaventure* inquiry. For the record, the report appears in *Votes and Proceedings* No. 122 dated May 13. I should like to take this opportunity to commend the members of the committee for the excellent work they did. I say this without any reservation. New ground was being broken. The members of the committee went into the full story. As one who has studied the report many times in minute detail, I can say that I believe they did a good job of which we should all be proud. They came up with an unanimous report as everybody knows. This is even more to their credit.

The political responsibility, the second responsibility to which I have referred, however, is still very much up in the air. A great deal should be said about this. In referring to the report, I should like specifically to draw attention to items 5 and 6 of the general conclusions and recommendations. Since these will form part of the basis for our motion today, I think I should read them. The first is item 5, which appears on page 775:

> The Committee recommends that the departments concerned determine the reasons why departmental officers involved in the refit performed in the manner they did and also to take appropriate action to ensure that such inefficiency be eliminated in the future. This will require changes to the system under which they work and may require disciplinary action in regard to personnel involved.

Then, item 6 is as follows:

> The Committee fails to understand why the Deputy Ministers of National Defence and Defence Production, realizing that the cost of the refit of the *Bonaventure* was, month by month, getting out of control, did not order an "on-the-job" investigation.

Those are the two pertinent items on which we base our motion. For an authority in respect of this motion I should like to refer to Dawson on "The Government of Canada". This is a reputable political book. It is not one of these political histories written by Pickersgill or LaMarsh. He is an oracle.

An hon. Member: Or Trudeau.

Mr. Bell: Added to the list is another well-known historian who is now in this Parliament. The following words, which appear on page 219, I believe are pertinent in this regard:

> The minister can never afford to forget—

I shall deal with that later.

> —that he will be expected to defend and justify his department's policies before Parliament and the country, and yet at the same time he realizes that those policies must be technically and administratively sound if they are to meet the need which has called them into being. Success in administration, said Walter Bagehot, "depends on a due mixture of special and non-special minds—of minds which attend to the means, and of minds which attend to the end."

I interject here to say that in this case the minister who has primary responsibility also has the background of the two minds. He has the full civil service background. In fact, he is the number one leader of the civil service establishment and, of course, he has made the big jump into active politics. He is a member of the treasury bench. He is the oracle of everything that is right and wrong in this country. I continue the quotation:

> Inasmuch as the minister is politically responsible for everything done in his department, he is given supreme authority, and he therefore has the power to overrule any of his civil servants at any time. They, for their part, give the best advice they can; and if the minister persists in disregarding it —as he has a perfect right to do—they must then acquiesce, and bend all their energies to the problem of making the best of what they are convinced is a mistaken policy. The minister has the privilege of overruling his civil servants even although it involves the making of blunders, and the minister also has the privilege of defending those blunders in Parliament and suffering, if need be, for them.

I think, because it is of further significance, that we should look at the Glassco Commission report which some people may think is more up to date. I refer to Volume 1 at page 32, under the heading "Unlimited Liability" of Ministers. The report reads:

> Concurrently with the development of the "public" service concept, it has become established that direct accountability to Parliament and to the public is imposed only on ministers. Public servants continue to be answerable for their honesty and competence to their ministers, through the ascending scale of their departments, but they bear none of the political consequences of their acts.

I quote further from the same page:

> Since the emergence of this principle, it has been accepted that ministers are accountable for all the administrative acts of their departmental staffs.

There are many quotations which could be added to these. It is also pertinent, in establishing the basis for this debate, to point out that the Financial Administration Act, Part I, Organization, deals extensively with these responsibilities. To give an idea of how the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury) would become involved—and I am sure he knows about this—I should like to quote, for example, section 5(2)(f):

> such of the provisions of any other Act respecting any matter in relation to which the Treasury Board

may act for the Queen's Privy Council for Canada pursuant to subsection (1) as may be specifically—

Then, we have section 6(b) which reads:

for the establishment of general administrative standards of performance and respecting the assessment of the performance of portions of the public service in the light of such standards;

I hasten here to add that it is for this reason that, at the moment, I think the President of the Treasury Board is the minister responsible to Parliament for the situation which now exists. This responsibility is separate from any previous involvement he may have had. I should also like to say for the record that it is well known the President of the Treasury Board was the Minister of Industry from July 25, 1963 until May 8, 1969. I believe this is correct. The Parliamentary Guide seems to indicate that is so. That is the background of the responsibility which I feel is unanswered here.

I should like to place on the record one other matter which I believe has some significance in respect of my interest in the *Bonaventure*. It will also indicate to the House that this matter was not suddenly sprung on the government, but goes away back. If the government is not aware of the way this whole business developed, I would point out to hon. members that everything is recorded in the debates for that period.

We might go back to the first reference I could find which is in *Hansard* for January 24, 1966. At that time I asked a question about the decision in respect of the repair and refit of the *Bonaventure*. Then, on February 3, the member for Burnaby-Coquitlam asked further questions concerning the *Bonaventure*. He was informed by the present minister that the bids had been opened. The contracts were not formally awarded until later, but he established that the bids from the Montreal shipyards were $5.7 million and $5.8 million and that the bid from the Saint John yard, which at that time we thought was away out of line, was $8.5 million. The minister went on to other questions.

• (4:20 p.m.)

The hon. member for Cape Breton South, now the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond (Mr. MacInnis), did not have any doubts at that time about where we were going. He put interjections on the record, even before the contract was let, which indicated there would be a severe escalation in costs. A supplementary question asked on February 3 by the hon. member for Calgary North, now the member for Calgary Centre (Mr. Harkness), has some significance in this respect. He asked the minister:

As a supplementary question, what proportion of the five million odd dollars is on the firm price basis?

The minister answered:

I have not got the figures here but I was told it was the major portion. If the hon. gentleman wishes to know, I will ascertain precisely.

That was when the first reference was made to the $5 million. A question was asked whether this was a major portion, and of course the minister acquiesced.

Let us go on to other references in *Hansard*, so that the background on this can be established. The minister, in reply to another question, referred to good accounting practices. He was taken up on that by the hon. member for Pictou, now the member for Central Nova (Mr. MacEwan). I do not know what the minister meant by "good accounting practices". Then, of course, we had the little interlude when the minister was considering the contracts, and rightly so. He had quite a few weeks in which to go into the tender bids extensively before he officially awarded this contract. We had also the strange interlude when it was discovered that, before the bids had even been requested, the navy had been told the contracts were going to go to Quebec. Here was an odd situation. At least three firms had tendered for this contract, but previous to the call for tenders, the navy had started plans to go to Quebec city. I will not be sidetracked on that. The minister had talked of clairvoyance, but he thought it was after the fact.

There is only one other reference in *Hansard* that I think is important. On April 27 of the same year, the minister announced the formal awarding of the contract. At that time, the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) asked:

Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. Do any of these contracts have any contingency clauses such as those often contained in building contracts, as a result of which padding can take place often to the extent of 10 per cent

He spoke of 10 per cent; I do not know what the amount was finally. He went on:

If so, to what percentage do they exist?

The minister answered:

Mr. Speaker, these contracts do not contain contingency clauses.

So, that is the story. It establishes my interest and I hope also makes it clear to the

House that there was a long history to the whole *Bonaventure* issue, long before the committee report was made. To repeat what I said here today, I want to give everybody an opportunity to take part in this debate. I feel it is extremely important that we air this matter in Parliament and that the minister give us his full story.

I think that the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury) must, on behalf of the government accept full responsibility for the *Bonaventure* matter. He should rise in his place today and tell us the whole story, as he knows it, from the very beginning in 1966. He should start with the original tendering and the award of the contract that he made, as minister of defence production, in 1966. He should deal with the first contract escalation, to which I did not refer but it is all in *Hansard,* from $5 million to $8 million. Perhaps I had better put that on the record because that was a matter in which I became involved.

Before the ship had left Halifax to go into the St. Lawrence, we heard there was going to be an even further escalation of the cost. I asked a question with regard to that and the minister was straightforward at the time. On April 22, 1966, I asked this question:

> Will the minister check into reliable reports emanating from Halifax this morning as the *Bonaventure* left Halifax with Department of Industry officials aboard, that the estimate will probably go over $8 million?

I can only say that at that time the contract had escalated to $8 million. Therefore, there is an extra responsibility on the minister since he knew in the early days of this contract that the cost was escalating and he should have, if he did not, called in his officials. He should tell us of the various conferences he has had with them, whether this matter was referred to him by his civil servants and, if so, what was the action. The minister should deal specifically with items 5 and 6 of the committee report to which I referred. He should report on the inquiry that he said has been under way in the department. On television the other night the minister referred to some sort of an inquiry having been inaugurated, unless my facts are incorrect.

It is incumbent upon the minister to give us the whole story for the following two reasons: first, because of our established tradition that a minister should stand behind his deputy and his other civil servants, as I have outlined in the quotations I brought forward; and second, and just as important, because there must now finally begin an accounting of the government's action regarding the two recommendations which were passed unanimously by the Public Accounts Committee.

I look forward to hearing the minister's reply as I move this motion, seconded by the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall).

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): I, too, would like to hear the minister's statement on the remarks made by the previous speaker. I will try not to cover the same ground covered by him. I find that the motion before the House is an extremely interesting one, particularly as it deals with protecting the public treasury from spending by the government. The motion, as I see it, deals with the important problem of planning, supervision and efficiency in government expenditures. I feel this is a very timely topic, especially in view of the government's present austerity program. I feel it is our job as elected representatives to insist on efficiency in government and to demand that the taxpayers' money be spent without waste and in the best interests of the nation generally. I might add that there will always be disagreement among the various parties as to the priorities for public spending and the emphasis which should be placed on certain government programs. However, there should be no disagreement when it comes to demanding that inefficiency and waste be eliminated wherever it exists. There is no doubt that there is abundant evidence to show that large amounts of public money have been wasted because of inefficiency and lack of co-ordination in a number of government departments.

• (4:30 p.m.)

The Auditor General is the watchdog of government spending. His annual reports are the basis upon which the Public Accounts Committee is able to check into some of the expenditures being made by the various government departments. It was through the Auditor General's report that the Public Accounts Committee investigated the expenditures made on the refit of the aircraft carrier *Bonaventure* and eventually turned up the mess of ineffectiveness and incompetence which existed in the letting of a number of contracts.

This investigation resulted in the 41 page report of the Public Accounts Committee which was presented to this House about a month ago, and which was a biting indictment of the slipshod and haphazard methods used by the Department of Defence Produc-

tion in both estimating and letting out a number of contracts with regard to the refit of the carrier.

As a member of the Public Accounts Committee for the past two years I have become convinced that the Auditor General's department is a real safeguard in keeping an eye on government spending. However, it is apparent his department is in need of a sharp expansion if the whole field of government spending is to be adequately covered. It seems to me that the making of reports on the obviously foolish types of expenditure is only part of the problem. The losses to the nation from imperfect accounting procedures are no doubt substantial, and proper financial control programs are essential in every department; but again, I feel this is only part of the problem. To date, Mr. Speaker, no department has been set up to appraise the benefits the nation receives, or does not receive, from government expenditure programs. Potential losses in this respect could be immense.

In fact, it was the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) who told this House just a year ago how costly the lack of co-ordinated action had been so far as the Canadian taxpayers were concerned. He pointed out that since 1963 we had spent over $1 billion on various programs to help eliminate regional disparity and, because of the lack of co-ordinated action, he estimated we had wasted about half of that amount. Perhaps, as an economics professor at the University of Toronto has suggested, this country should have an Economist General in addition to an Auditor General. I presume his duties would be to report fully upon the effectiveness and the value of the various programs which have been set up to assist various aspects of our economy.

It seems to me that it should be of the utmost importance to appraise adequately the results which are being achieved by our various programs. This knowledge of costs and benefits would be of immense value in reassessing the programs, or directing financial resources to other types of resource development. However, one thing is crystal clear in the field of public expenditures. We must insist upon the right of full disclosure and the right to criticize foolish expenditures. As this task is too great for any ordinary member, it is essential that adequate agencies be set up to do the job, and that they be allowed to carry out their duties free from interference or coercion. This is absolutely essential in our democracy and I am certain the general public will insist that this type of scrutiny continue, and expand, as it is in the interests of Canadians generally.

[Mr. Harding.]

I have made some very general remarks about public expenditures and intend to follow them up with a few examples of departmental expenditures to show how essential it is for governments to keep a constant and careful check on their various departments. However, first of all, I would like to comment on the work of the Public Accounts Committee which delves into the reports submitted by the Auditor General.

In my opinion, the Public Accounts Committee of the House of Commons is doing a good job. All of the members of the committee, regardless of party, are interested in stopping foolish expenditures, and are desirous of seeing improved supervision take place in those departments requiring it. If the government and the departments concerned will accept the recommendations made by the committee, I am certain that most of the slipshod methods of estimating and the letting out of meaningless contracts will be avoided. This will also save vast sums of money for the public treasury and avoid embarrassment for both the government and the departments concerned.

It would appear that, over the years, many of the recommendations made by the Public Accounts Committee have been ignored. A good example appears in the list provided on June 19, 1969, in the committee's fourth report. From this it is evident that a majority of the committee's recommendations have been ignored. I can well understand how a department might have difficulty in accepting all recommendations, because once a certain accounting system is set up it is difficult to make too many changes. However, once an inefficient procedure has been pointed out by the committee, there should be no repetition of that mistake which in most cases was responsible for excessive waste in the spending of public funds.

I should like to refer to the committee report that I have just mentioned. It points out a number of recommendations made by the committee to the government, many of which had not been carried out by the various departments at the time that report was published. The list is headed, "Summary of the Positions of the Recommendations and Observations of Your Committee," and I quote:

The following is a summary of the positions of the recommendations and observations of your Committee contained in Appendix 1 of the 1967 report as of June 5, 1969:

A list of a number of categories and items follows, and shows their disposal by the government. We find that a total of 55 recommendations were set forth by the committee. Ten of these were referred back to the Auditor General, and two were withdrawn by the Public Accounts Committee itself. This left 43 recommendations which had been made to the government, and I think we could consider them as the actual recommendations of the committee. Out of this total no action, to the date of the report, had been taken on 14 of the recommendations. The executive had indicated disagreement with another 14 of the recommendations. Progress had been made on six of them; five of them had been implemented; two of them had been partially implemented; one was soon to be implemented, and in another case the action taken was not satisfactory to the committee. If the Public Accounts Committee is going to do an efficient and effective job, its work must be recognized by the government to a greater degree than is indicated in this report. I want to point out that the members of the Public Accounts Committee come from all parties in this House and every member, without exception, is interested in seeing that Canadians get full value for every dollar spent.

• (4:40 p.m.)

I should like to go back to one of the items mentioned in today's motion, Mr. Speaker, and that is the *Bonaventure*. This is a good example of the weakness and inefficiency of one or more government departments. I was a member of the Public Accounts Committee which examined the expenditure on the *Bonaventure* refit, originally brought to our attention by the Auditor General. I was astounded at how ineffective and inefficient were the terms of a number of contracts. Slipshod and haphazard methods had been used in the drafting of contracts and I believe this eventually resulted in excessive spending of the taxpayers' money. I do not wish to point to any individual in government but I feel that this example should be a lesson to members in this House, and to the government in particular, that the departments concerned should carefully check procedures when letting out contracts. If we are to get better value for the money we spend some tightening up will have to be done. I never thought when first dealing with the refit of the *Bonaventure* as we discussed it in committee, that it would lead to the revealing and shocking departmental procedures used in the spending of the taxpayers' dollar.

If I may, I shall pick out one or two examples to illustrate how slipshod methods used in letting out contracts led to public money being wasted. One of the best examples is the small contract dealing with the briefing room chairs. This matter has been raised in the House before, but in raising it again I want to point out that, while the amount of money involved is small, the disturbing thing is that such a slipshod and haphazard method could have been used in any department of government. I believe this aspect of the matter disturbs every member of the House.

The committee found it very difficult to establish the real cost of moving the briefing room chairs. After a great deal of work, and after hearing testimony which proved to be incorrect, the committee found that the Davie Shipbuilding Company, which had the initial contract, had moved the chairs out in May of 1966 because, it was stated, they required the area for the purpose of conducting electronic tests. Later we found that two separate contracts for the same chairs were let out by the Department of Defence Production. This information angered every member of the committee. It makes one wonder what type of accounting system the department has,—

An hon. Member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Harding: —when two contracts are let out for the same job, each in a different amount. I will not go into the numbers of the contracts. The subcommittee was told that the cost of moving the chairs off the *Bonaventure* was high because there had been a great deal of difficulty in unlatching them from the briefing room floor. It was said that it had been necessary for workmen to crawl between the floor and a false ceiling to enable them to get at the nuts and bolts which attached the chairs to the floor so that they would not slide around in heavy weather. This explanation sounded logical and the committee accepted it, until we went to Nova Scotia to check the *Bonaventure* ourselves. Then, we found that it was not necessary to crawl anywhere to unlatch the chairs, all that had to be done was to tilt them forward and lift them up.

As I said previously, members of the committee were angered to find that someone had attempted to fool them over what the committee thought was an excessive cost for removing these chairs from the ship. One thing led to another, and then we found that there were two contracts; the job had been paid for twice. One of the committee recommendations was that the $4,173 paid under

the last contract be returned to the government. This is a small amount, but it indicates the slipshod method by which contracts are let.

The committee then examined the cabins in detail and found excessive charges for repairs made to them. Sheets were drawn up by the department and given to the Public Accounts Committee showing why certain repairs were made to furniture in the cabins. Different reasons were given by various witnesses, but finally we were told that the sheets did not mean much—

• (4:50 p.m.)

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

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Carry on.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous agreement for the hon. member to continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Harding: Thank you, Your Honour, and I thank hon. members of the House. I will not impose too much upon their generosity. Before concluding, I wish to make one or two points about the furniture repairs. In my opinion, they were excessive. Also, this matter involved some poorly drawn contracts and despite the assurances that have been made, I suggest the public interest was not being watched. On examining the matter further we found that there were verbal agreements that certain repairs had to be done. Certain conditions were set down on sheets, but we were told there was an understanding that repairs over and above those specified on the sheets would need to be carried out in the cabins. If that is an example of the type of estimating that has been going on in this particular department, I say something ought to be done. Members of the House should insist that action be taken to correct this situation.

Before sitting down I wish to make one more point. I know other hon. members wish to take part in this debate. It is not only the matter of the *Bonaventure* that upsets me and other members of the House. Anyone examining the report of the Auditor General, and I have attended numerous meetings of the committee, will find listed department after department and item after item in which there has been gross over-estimating of

[Mr. Harding.]

costs. Goods have been bought before the department has examined them. I am thinking of a case in which a number of buses were bought from a newly established company which was manufacturing them for the first time. The result was terrifically heavy repair costs for the government. How in the world any department could accept delivery of a number of buses that it had not inspected properly is beyond me. That is the type of business administration we deplore. It must be corrected.

I also wanted to speak about the fire which took place on the hydrofoil. The failure to set up proper and adequate fire protection systems on the vessel resulted in the loss to the Canadian taxpayer of many millions of dollars. Consider, also, Expo 67. There, the public purse was not as well protected against many of the expenditures made as it might have been. If certain steps had been taken at the proper time, certain sums of money could have been recaptured for the public purse. The Auditor General's report deals with item after item after item coming under a number of departments.

In concluding, I sincerely urge the government to adopt many of the Glassco Commission recommendations which have not yet been adopted. We ought to go much farther in that direction in order to make certain that the people of this nation obtain as full a return as possible for public money spent. I am convinced that ministers of the government responsible for the over-all programs of government spending will need to insist on a far greater degree of efficiency than the report of the Public Accounts Committee and other information coming forward to members of the House during the present session has shown to exist at this time. May I thank hon. members for their indulgence in allowing me to speak for a few minutes longer.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, the motion under consideration reads in part as follows:

That the government—

—and I would add that none of the governments which followed one another protected the Canadian people. I continue reading the motion:

—the taxpayers of Canada from waste, extravagance and other abuses in the spending of government money and for these failures the government deserves the condemnation of the House.

The motion deals with the refitting of the H.M.C.S. *Bonaventure* which normally would have cost $5 or $6 million but which has cost $17 million to the treasury. This is why the parliamentary committee carried out an investigation on these expenses which are but a pure and simple squandering of public monies.

When this matter was considered by the parliamentary committee, a check was made of the works carried out on the *Bonaventure*, as evidenced by the proceedings of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts No. 20, chaired by the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Hales).

In October 1966, 52 chairs were removed from the deck of the ship and transported to the naval overseeing store for survey. A little further in the report we can see pictures of those 52 chairs. They are arm-chairs which look very much like airplanes seats.

• (5:00 p.m.)

I quote from the Minutes of Proceedings of the committee:

> On completion of repairs or renewals, chairs are to be transported from store to ship and resecured to deck in briefing room.
>
> The price quoted to perform the work of this serial number was 1,040 man-hours at $3.95 an hour with a labour charge of $60. plus a 7½ per cent mark-up on materials used, for a total of $4,173.
>
> In the early stages of our investigation prior to visiting H.M.C.S. *Bonaventure* in Halifax, the Committee was led to believe that the job description contained on this serial number was, in fact, an accurate description of the work to be done.
>
> The justification for this large expenditure of funds was, according to testimony, due to the fact that the chairs were bolted to an inclining floor.

When the *Bonaventure* was visited, the members of the committee—

> —found that this previous testimony was totally inaccurate and grossly misleading. In fact, the chairs were not bolted to the floor, and were neither unduly heavy or awkward. Further evidence on board the ship indicated that there was a short route to the deck.

As I said a while ago, certain photos were published, as well as fairly accurate estimates of the cost of repairs to that famous ship.

For instance, renewal of two drawer pulls on a wood secretary cost $123.10. The cost of renewal of two hinges on the drop-leaf of the wood secretary—a small board which is dropped to make a small secretary—amounted to $186.60. Hinges are expensive these days! Refinishing the drop-leaf of the same secretary cost $530. It therefore cost $839.70 to repair a nice little wood secretary. It must have been some beauty, Mr. Speaker.

And the government complains about inflation! This is a shameless waste of public funds.

$96.50 were spent to renew the mirror of a small medicine cabinet, of which we have a photo and which we see in very ordinary houses. To renew a door-knob cost $61.90. The total cost of repairs amounted to $258.20. Such waste is unbelievable.

The lock of a wardrobe was repaired; material cost $6 and labour, 28 man-hours, $146.80.

A berth drawer was also repaired—a bed with a drawer underneath it, as we have often seen. Here are the details of the repairs: one missing drawer to be replaced, $300.40; two drawers to be refinished, $346.40; one drawer handle to be renewed, $61.90. The total cost amounted to $708.70.

The committee found out all these things while visiting the *Bonaventure*. Repairs cost $17 million and I believe the government is willing to sell it for $250,000. And even at that, a buyer has yet to be found!

The expenditures amounted to $17 million, which means the Canadian people were robbed of at least $8 or $10 million. And I must say it is not only in the Defence Production Department that such things happen, but in other departments as well.

Let us take for instance the Department of National Defence. A few years ago, it was discovered that our servicemen had a supply of fatigue clothes for 1,000 years to come, paid by the Department of National Defence and the Defence Production Department.

Mr. Speaker, at that time the Auditor General of Canada had warned the government against such extravagance, but the government never paid heed to those warnings. Why? Because by negotiating such purchases and awarding repair contracts, the government indulged in patronage in order to help friends not only of this government but also of previous governments, of 1965, 1963 and 1962. Indeed such patronage existed when I first came here, namely from 1946 to 1949.

No wonder people are seen to stick to the government and to act as its propagandists or publicists. Such things went on in the two political parties which succeeded each other in power since Confederation.

In the broadcasting field for instance, the Auditor General did not beat about the bush when it came to making recommendations to the government. The Glassco Commission did exactly the same thing. For instance, in para-

graph 54, some remarks are made about the CBC's revenues and expenditures. Here is an extract from the report:

Salaries and wages paid for work not performed.

In previous reports, we have referred to payments aggregating approximately $450,000 per annum by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to employees for scheduled hours during daily or weekly tours of duty which were in excess of the actual hours of attendance.

And this happened at the CBC, an agency that I like, but I like even better still to acquaint the Canadian citizens with it.

The payments were made in accordance with the provisions of the various union agreements and the Corporation regarded payment of compensation calculated in this manner as proper—

—still, the work was not done—

—having regard to the effect of scheduling requirements for its present studio facilities, the availability of artists, the exigencies of actuality broadcasts and the nature of broadcast program production.

Mr. Speaker, fantastic amounts are spent by the CBC. In fact, this year, this corporation will cost the Canadian taxpayers 191 million dollars. There was a time, during an elections period I know, when CBC employees made hotel reservations in Montreal, in Quebec and in Trois-Rivières totalling $48,000 and these rooms were never once occupied. Reservations were made, bills were paid with the taxpayers' money and the rooms were not even occupied. So much for the employees of the CBC. But surely somebody is responsible for such a state of things. It helps to make us realize all the difference between state agencies and private business. If a private company were to be under such management as the public sector there would not be one company left in business today for they would all be bankrupt.

• (5:10 p.m.)

The government is not bankrupt because it could not care less about expenditures, the people of Canada are paying. When funds run out, it gets more money by raising taxes. And that is the way public monies are spent.

I can hardly believe that no one is responsible for such excessive expenditures, for such abuses. I have here the Auditor General's report. Paragraph 72 is enough to convince anyone that there is still much waste. I quote:

72. Indirect compensation to chartered banks.

It is not an expenditure, but it amounts to the same thing and Canadians do not know anything about it. Most hon. members do not either.

[Mr. Caouette.]

And to go on with the quotation:

It continues to be the practice of the government to maintain large balances on deposit with the chartered banks, receiving interest only on balances in excess of an aggregate interest-free amount of $100 million.

In other words, the government does not earn any interest on $100 million on deposit in a chartered bank. It starts earning a small interest if the deposit exceeds $100 million.

Interest amounted to $20.1 million in 1968-69. The average effective rate was 5.64 per cent.

In proceeding that way, the government is losing large sums of money. If the chartered bank where the government has a savings deposit is entitled to multiply that deposit by 14 under the Bank Act, since any savings account in a chartered bank constitutes a reserve in the Bank of Canada, we can easily imagine the unlimited powers of the banks, while the government, to please bankers, exempts them from paying interests on such a fantastic sum as $100 million!

Let us see what is happening in another area. According to the estimates of June 1964, the National Arts Centre was to cost $18,223,-000. The estimated final cost reached $46,426,-000, exceeding the original estimate by $28,203,000.

The accumulated out lay to March 31, 1969 was $43,779,000 which was provided for by annual appropriations of the Secretary of State.

I would bet anything that the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) was not even aware of it.

Of that amount, $39,631,000 pertains to the construction of the Centre including the underground garage—a building complex which was to cost $18 million—and $3,463,000 to consultants' fees. Those who supervised the work and made sure that plans were followed were paid $3,463,000 as fees.

Mr. Speaker if this is not an outright gift to political friends I can no longer make head or tail of politics.

An additional amount of $1,000,227 was spent since the end of the year. This is in addition to full-scale political patronage through which people are granted amounts of the order of $3,463,000. No wonder some people stick to the system. And if attempts are made to direct their thought to other things, to get them interested in something serious, it is absolutely impossible, because they are totally dependent on the system. It pays them at the expense of the population.

Is it any wonder that young people rebel right in the heart of Montreal and touch off bombs by the half-dozen? The powers that be will wake up the day those bombs explode under their seats, and in the meantime they will have done very little to prevent such incidents. In many cases, they will perhaps have deserved their fate. The people will not be fooled with impunity.

Mr. Speaker, it is a well-known fact that I abhor terrorists; however there is another type of terrorists who dig into the taxpayers' pockets and could not care less about people. If we meet these people, they make fun of us. Whether members or ministers, most of them are on their knees before political organizers who make the others work and keep for themselves the money handed out right and left by the government! A sum of $3,463,000 in fees paid out to consultants! Things are going from bad to worse.

As I said earlier, no wonder our young people are rebelling against society, when it has reached the point of wasting public monies as it has done with the $17 million ear-marked for the refit of the *Bonaventure*! How much did the silent partners of electoral fund make out of it, particularly those of the Liberal party now in power? It was even reported that some Americans had contributed to the Liberal electoral fund. We were told that big companies also contributed to the electoral fund of the Conservatives who, once in power, are at the mercy of their silent partners. What can they do? They put up with it and the Auditor General in turn calls them to order. But one day will come when Canada's young people will call everyone to order and this through violent action unfortunately. Some people will bear the responsibility for this violent action. This is a salutary warning to all representatives of our political parties. You can fool all the people for some time; you can fool part of the people all the time; but it is impossible to fool all the people all the time. The day of reckoning will come.

[*English*]

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

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their generosity. I shall not make ill use of it because some members want to speak on this same subject of extravagant and wasteful expenditures.

Refitting of HMCS "Bonaventure"

Under the heading "Higher costs of procurement in Canada" the following appears in the Auditor General's report:

In August 1962, the Department of Supply and Services contracted on a target-incentive basis with a Canadian manufacturer on behalf of the Department of National Defence for 434 Mark NC 44 Mod. 1 torpedoes, at an estimated cost of $8,747,000, or approximately $20,200 each. The price included the cost of pre-production engineering, tooling and testing.

The contract was awarded without competition—

—This is known as free for all for the government. No tenders are called.

—to the only Canadian supplier, notwithstanding the knowledge that earlier in 1962, this supplier had tendered prices to the United States government for the United States model of this torpedo, the Mark 44 Mod. 1, that were 40 per cent higher than those of the successful United States tenderer. Deliveries were completed in 1965 at an estimated cost of $7,962,000, or $18,300 each, but the contract has not yet been settled.

It must be about to be settled if it has not been yet. Mr. Speaker, in the Auditor General's report, paragraph 113 reads as follows:

Hydrofoil development program—

By September 1969, $48.5 million had been expended, an increase of $3 million during the preceding twelve months—

In its Fourth Report...presented to to the House on June 20, 1969, the Public Accounts Committee expressed concern that the Treasury Board had not been provided with a proper estimate of the probable overall cost of the project at the time initial approval was sought and urged the Treasury Board to investigate cases where it subsequently becomes apparent that proper estimates were not provided. The committee found that a good deal of money was expended on research which was a duplication of efforts in other countries and felt that greater reliance on the experience of other countries could have effected large economies in the program.

The ship, commissioned as H.M.C.S. *Bras d'Or*—"Golden Arms"

—in July 1968, underwent foil-borne trials during the summer of 1969. While we understand it performed satisfactorily, a segment of the main foil developed cracks and must be replaced. In December 1969, the Treasury Board approved further expenditure of $2.2 million mainly for operation and maintenance, including the cost of the replacement of the main foil segment which the department has estimated at $450,000.

We have spent half a million dollars to repair the broken foil and $2.2 million for maintenance only. The Treasury Board knew how to find the money needed for that purpose.

• (5:20 p.m.)

The Treasury Board is not short of funds for favouring financial election backers. How-

ever, when Montreal postal employees request a salary adjustment, a modest expenditure compared to such shameless squandering, they are told they are unreasonable and uncooperative about fighting inflation. They are accused of all the sins of the world.

A plan has even been brought forward for putting straitjackets on union members, asking that they do not demand increases of more than 6 per cent a year. The government is unwilling to pay workers in proportion to work done. That it cannot accept. However, it does not matter if government expenditures reach $100 million. There is no stinting there. But when it comes to helping workers, they stay up whole nights stubbornly telling union leaders they are unreasonable.

And at the same time, the same government, the same Treasury Board are telling banks and finance companies to increase their interest rates.

For instance, last year, banks were boasting about profits from 20 to 30 per cent higher than before.

Did a government member object to that increase? Of course not, but they object to workers asking for salary increases in excess of 6 per cent a year. Therefore, there is one law for the poor and one law for the rich. That is how the government is acting towards Canadian citizens.

I shall now deal with the cancellation of a project, and I quote:

Cancellation of Northumberland Strait Crossing project.

In 1956 the Province of Prince Edward Island asked the federal government to examine a proposal—

I went there last year.

—for the construction of a causeway across Northumberland Strait as an alternative to the existing ferry system. During the next several years studies were made which resulted in the conclusion that a permanent crossing involving a combination of causeway and bridges was feasible.

Everybody knew it was feasible. This proposal would have been helpful to the citizens of Prince Edward Island. In effect, more tourists would have come to visit that province and New Brunswick as well. I keep on quoting:

Early in 1962 approval in principle was given to the Department of Public Works to proceed with the project, with the stipulation that a combined causeway-tunnel crossing to handle only road traffic be investigated.

After further consideration the project was cancelled officially in February 1969.

[Mr. Caouette.]

So this project was looked into for seven years; the time necessary for studies at a university. Therefore it is beyond doubt that the possibility of building a causeway across Northumberland strait was looked into by university people. I quote further:

In the meantime a substantial number of payments had been made for land required for the approaches to the proposed crossing and work had proceeded under a number of contracts for the construction of the approaches for both highway and railway traffic.

Costs incurred in connection with the project to March 31, 1969 may be summarized as follows:

Consultants did not cause the causeway to be built there, but they were experts. They put their knowledge at the service of the nation.

Consultants—consortium	$10,817,000
—others	519,000
Construction of approaches—	
—to that famous causeway—	4,998,000
Acquisition of land	422,000
Miscellaneous	188,000

This must be for the coffee break in the morning and in the afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, $16,944,000 has been spent for the building of a causeway which it has been decided not to build.

Some assistance has been asked of the government for the building of approaches to James Bay, where many new natural resources could be found and developed. But the government is not interested. It is none of its business.

To build a causeway, then not to build it, to undertake a feasibility study, to promise at election time to have it built and then not to build it, all that cost $17 million. The government can afford to do that. The money is paid to people actively engaged in election campaigns.

This concludes my remarks. I would have many more comments to make about government expenditures, but I will let others have their say. However, I repeat that Canadians are becoming increasingly aware of such things. The friends of the party—political favour seekers, government supporters, contributors to campaign funds—are having a field day, but it will not last forever.

Older members may not be in the House in two, five or six years from now, but younger members will still be here. I ask members of all parties to consider seriously the situation because Canadian youths, not only young Quebecers, will lose faith in us. I visited four

western provinces last week and I think we must be on our guard. Let us not take risks as we have done until now. Let us be honest administrators. If we cannot get elected by honest people without the money of those who contribute to campaign funds, we shall be defeated by others who will not necessarily be contributors to election funds and that is why I ask all members of Parliament to seriously consider the situation and tell the government what is happening, as the Auditor General of Canada was not afraid to report the facts.

However, the government does not take notice. It ignores the recommendations of the Auditor General who writes his report, throws light on wrongdoings, abuses and waste. The government does not want to see what is happening.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the government does not do something, others will. It rests with the government, whether it is Liberal, Progressive Conservative, Créditiste or something else, to put its administration in order and to check its expenditures before others do it. We must see to it that each dollar collected from taxpayers is used to provide services to Canadians and make sure that integrity—and especially the administrative integrity—prevails in Canada. Thus the electors will be satisfied with our work.

• (5:30 p.m.)

[*English*]

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, the mover of the motion, the hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster (Mr. Bell), began his remarks with a background of philosophy of ministerial responsibility largely crystallized from Mr. Bagehot. As a consequence of this and because of my previous experience he asked me to give a blow by blow account of the incidents concerning the refit of the *Bonaventure* on the assumption that I had as full knowledge of the facts as perhaps anybody else.

On the government side we take no exception to the doctrine of ministerial responsibility as enunciated by Bagehot. We indeed accept the fact that public servants are responsible for their actions not to the House but to the executive—to the ministers—and are answerable not to the House but to the ministers. As a consequence, it is the ministers who must accept both real and technical responsibility for the actions of the civil servants and/or the departments for which they are administratively responsible.

However, in this matter there is an implication of a concept of continuity of government and government departments. The person who is responsible on a day to day basis for his department is the minister. In the case of the *Bonaventure* we are dealing with the administrative responsibility of two departments, namely the Department of National Defence and the Department of Supply and Services as successor to the Department of Defence Production. I think it would be much more appropriate if the minister having responsibility for these matters and for the people involved were to reply to the invitation issued by the hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster, rather than myself. Later in this debate the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Cadieux) or one of my colleagues on his behalf, and the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Richardson) will be answering for the administrative responsibility they hold in relation to these two departments and their connection with the *Bonaventure* refit.

In so far as the remarks made initially by the hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster are concerned, I have had a look at *Hansard* and particularly the series of questions and answers back in 1966 relating to the *Bonaventure*. I believe that anyone who reads the full text—not all of which was quoted—of these questions and answers will be satisfied in this case, firstly, that the terms and conditions of the contracting and the nature of the contracts in question were fully explained, and that at no point was there either an apparent or real misleading of the House.

When subsequent allegations appear to be different from one's earlier understanding, one is always concerned that there may have been some misleading. But having reviewed the record I am satisfied that no such situation existed in respect of the present circumstances. In so far as the motion itself is concerned, I must thank the hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster for having been extremely gentle with the government. While the words of the motion on the Order Paper are highly condemnatory and are in rather intemperate language, he was sufficiently reasonable not to endeavour to adduce any evidence to support the motion.

However, while I am grateful for his consideration and gentleness, I must also thank him for providing me on a supply or opposition day with an opportunity to place on the record what is probably not very exciting

material but which, rather, is an account of the various measures the government has taken in recent years to improve or increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the public service. The changes the government of Canada has introduced to increase efficiency and effectiveness in the public service fall into three general categories. First, the adoption of a new approach to management; second, changes in organization to achieve this end; third, the introduction of new approaches and procedures in the fields of administrative management, planning and budgeting.

After a quarter of a century of large-scale government in Canada we finally have learned that you cannot achieve efficiency, effectiveness, probity and prudence in the spending of public funds by piling regulation upon regulation. For too long Treasury Boards have sought to achieve these desirable ends by controlling departments and by telling them in ever greater detail how to manage their affairs. The end result of this process, unfortunately, has been not only to achieve probity and prudence in public expenditures but also to erode those qualities of creativity and enthusiasm which are essential to effective management and administration.

We in the present government are trying to change that. We are seeking to provide ministers and their departments with the authority and the machinery with which to better discharge their responsibility to the cabinet and to this House for the effectiveness of their programs and the efficiency of their administration. This means that they will be doing their own evaluation of the effectiveness with which their programs achieve the government's objectives. They themselves will be applying the tests of efficiency with which their programs are administered. To this end the departments of the government of Canada are introducing the internal operational audits which are required to support its operation.

This does not mean that having delegated responsibility to departments, the government can or will simply hope for the best. We, the collectivity of ministers, remain responsible for the effectiveness and efficiency with which departments discharge the responsibilities which have been delegated to them. So we in turn must establish mechanisms for reviewing the performance of departments; for reviewing their evaluation of their programs and their administration.

[Mr. Drury.]

• (5:40 p.m.)

The principal change in organization which has been made to this end has been the designation of a single agency, in place of four or five, to act for the cabinet in reviewing administrative management in the public service. This agency, the Treasury Board, is responsible for ensuring that methods for evaluating the effectiveness of programs and the efficiency of administration are developed and applied throughout the government of Canada. It is responsible for ensuring that the best possible organizational forms and staff development techniques are employed throughout the public service. It is responsible for ensuring that high standards of probity and prudence continue to apply in the expenditure of public funds. And it must do all this without usurping the responsibilities of operating departments.

The second major change in organization was to separate the Treasury Board from the Department of Finance, as recommended by the Glassco Commission under the chairmanship of the late Mr. Glassco. This has had the effect of enabling one minister to concentrate his undivided attention on economic policy, and another to concentrate his attention on the continuing evaluation of programs and administration. In a country the size of Canada, with a government as large in scale and as diverse in activities as ours, this change was essential if both functions were to be performed well. In addition to these changes in organization, and again as a consequence of the change in the philosophy of management in the public service, substantial changes have been made in our approach to planning and budgeting and to administrative management.

Let me say something first about the changes the Treasury Board has introduced and is still introducing in administrative and personnel management. We are seeking, essentially, as I have said, to develop techniques for the evaluation of departmental performance as a substitute for regulating or controlling it. In the field of organization this means encouraging departments to review their organization and participating with them in the evaluation of the proposals which are made. No government has, I think, engaged in more wide-ranging reviews of organization that this one. Indeed, members opposite have sometimes criticized us for concentrating too much on these searches for increased efficiency.

In the field of personnel management we have innovated even more. We have introduced collective bargaining into the public service on a massive scale, giving to public servants in one fell swoop the rights and privileges enjoyed by other workers across Canada. We have revolutionized the classification system. To give one index of the scale of the change and of the simplification, we have reduced the number of position classes from 200 to just under 70. We—here I mean the Treasury Board and the Public Service Commission together—have introduced new programs for the development of personnel, including the training of developing executives, the career assignment program, language training and programs for educational leave; and we currently are engaged in developing a program for the interchange of personnel between governments and between government and industry.

In the field of administrative transactions, as in the field of organization, we are similarly seeking to substitute the evaluation of departmental performance for its regulation. By administrative transactions I mean the inputs into administration—accommodation, contracts for construction and services, travel, the acquisition of materials and supplies, and the system for accounting for all these public expenditures. If we are able to establish norms or standards by which departments ought to be guided in their administrative transactions, and if we are able to develop along the department's techniques for evaluating performance against these norms, we will have found a substitute for the regulations of the past. I might tell hon. members in passing that I am just now in the process of establishing a special administrative policy branch in the Treasury Board secretariat for the purpose of speeding up these developments.

I have spoken so far of the principal elements of administration—organization, staffing and the other administrative inputs. Over and above all this is the evaluation of administrative efficiency generally. Here again the Treasury Board is seeking to develop new approaches and new techniques. In a few pilot projects we are identifying units of output and then measuring the cost of producing these outputs, both over time and as between administrative units. I would not pretend that these have progressed as far as we would like, but I do know that we are advancing with energy and enthusiasm.

Finally, let me say something about the changes we have introduced in our approach to planning and budgeting. In our work in this field we have been guided by the proposition that an expenditure budget is nothing more or less than a bundle of programs and a bundle of administration for executing those programs. If we have the best combination of programs for achieving the government's goals, and the most efficient administration for executing the programs, we will have given the taxpayer the best return for his dollar.

The job of reviewing programs and administration must be done, of course, both by the government and by this House. It can only be done in the light of the objectives of the government. It is for this reason that our first reforms were to introduce a more meaningful classification of expenditures in the estimates and to incorporate into the estimates statements of objectives. Then, to ensure that this chamber would be better able to examine the expenditures budget, the government proposed referring the departmental estimates in every case to a Standing Committee equipped by its nature to examine these estimates in detail.

These were our first steps. Our next ones were designed to improve the reviews within the government of the efficiency and effectiveness of public expenditures. This is not something that is achieved in the short span of weeks during which expenditure budgets are produced. In that interval we are seeking to achieve more limited objectives, to review our programs with a view to ensuring that there are sufficient resources available to accomplish high priority objectives even if this means eliminating some of the low priority programs. We also endeavour to make sure that only those resources which are essential to the implementation of the government's programs are allocated to departments.

We have been prepared to be rigorous in our allocation of resources to ongoing programs, as hon. members discovered last year when we cut both expenditures and the numbers of civil servants. Our rigour was such, indeed, that the opposition complained that we were harsh and heartless. Put rather blandly, hon. members opposite have not always supported our efforts to protect the taxpayers of Canada.

The evaluation of the highest and the lowest priorities and the annual allocation of resources does not, however, complete the

process of evaluating program effectiveness and administrative efficiency in government. What is required, and what has been lacking, is a continuing program of evaluation. This we have started to do in an orderly way. We have begun, as I have said, the evaluation of administrative efficiency generally and we have adopted new approaches to the evaluation of administrative and personnel management.

In addition, we have begun systematically to review in a fundamental way some major areas of policy. Certain of the major policy reviews are now in the public domain, such as the reviews of defence policy, of external policy and of income tax policy. Others, such as income security, are still under internal analysis. But in addition to all these major reviews we are beginning in an embryonic way systematically to examine the effectiveness of individual programs. We are not sure how successful we will be. So far we are sure only that new techniques are required and that old habits of thinking will have to be re-examined. But I am confident that only in this way will governments be forced to review the costliest element of public administration, the programs themselves.

• (5:50 p.m.)

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this will give hon. members an overview of the measures we have adopted for improving effectiveness and efficiency in the government of Canada. I am sure that to most it will have seemed a technical, indeed a less than absorbing review. But if you want to debate efficiency in public administration, you have to be prepared to get right down to the measures which are required to achieve it.

It is, of course, much more spectacular to make general and unsupported charges. One can wax eloquent and use extravagant prose in a case of this kind. But the job of this House, I suggest, is like the job of this government: to examine seriously, carefully and rigorously the operations of departments to ensure that they are performing their duties effectively and efficiently. It is not spectacular work. It rarely makes headlines. But it lies at the heart of protecting the taxpayers, as the hon. member who proposed this motion put it, "from waste, extravagance and other abuses in the spending of government money."

Mr. Bell: Mr. Speaker, would the minister permit a question? I ask the minister if he is going to leave these public servants, the two deputy ministers and the other senior civil servants, undefended and blackened across the country in the eyes of the public.

Mr. Drury: The answer to that, Mr. Speaker, is an emphatic no. As I mentioned at the outset of my remarks, this task will be done by the ministers having administrative responsibility for the departments in which these officials are performing their duties.

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, before the hon. gentleman leaves the chamber for his dinner I must say that never before have I seen a situation where a man—I suppose one might as well be frank—who has one way or another been seriously charged by events, has stood up in the House of Commons to address himself to it and has dismissed it as lightly as we witnessed within the last 15 or 20 minutes. As a matter of fact, I am rather stunned—even appalled—that the minister would treat so lightly the overhaul and repair of the *Bonaventure* and still think that the House and the people of the country are going to accept his walking away from it that easily. In connection with that, and because of the minister's remarks, before I finish my intention in this debate I am going to move an amendment to the motion that is now before the House and I hope we will debate its merits before the day is over.

The history of this matter is pretty clear. It has been dealt with by the mover of the motion, the hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster (Mr. Bell). My entry into the debate is occasioned by a very real concern for the situation that has developed, in which the inference is quite clear from the question just asked of the minister with respect to individuals whom the committee in the performance of its duties saw fit to name. The minister cannot blithely walk away with a lecture to this House on administration. He cannot walk away from his responsibilities in this matter. Indeed, had it been my responsibility, the motion would have been much stronger and I have no hesitation in advising the minister that my contribution to the debate will be strong.

The motion seems to have struck the minister in such a way that he felt a simple lecture to the House on the discharge of responsibility would meet the occasion. Again, so that the remarks I intend to direct to this matter will be clearly understood, I say at the outset that I welcome the non-partisan way in which the committee approached the overhaul of the

Bonaventure. In a sense it is regrettable that committees have to look at matters so long after they occur, so that in the final analysis all they can do is make a little noise about whether moneys were spent properly. If committees were able to examine programs in the course of implementation, they might save the public a great many dollars and cents. The committee's report was presented in a non-partisan way. While I personally regret that the committee saw fit to single out individuals, my great regret is that the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury)—who was the minister responsible at that time—did not take steps that would have prevented or precluded a committee of this House finding it necessary to remove from the minister this function of, I suppose you might use the phrase the reward for good, or discipline for indifferent, action. Mr. Speaker, might I call it six o'clock?

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Speaker, at six o'clock this evening many in this chamber were regretting, and members of the public in the galleries were chuckling at, what I can only describe as the blatant arrogance of the President of the Treasury Board, I am sorry he has not reappeared this evening. Before dealing with an amendment which I wish to propose, if the President of the Treasury Board feels he will escape responsibility for the necessity of this motion by acting in a casual and offhanded manner, I suggest he is wrong.

The context of my intervention in the debate on the motion is based in large part on the acceptance of responsibility by ministers of the Crown. I see the minister has come back to us. Perhaps, after all, the government does take the motion seriously, Mr. Speaker, because I see the Government House Leader (Mr. Macdonald) has not left the chamber although I am sure a game of tennis or something like that would have attracted him more. If we are to take a lesson from the President of the Treasury Board—

An hon. Member: You forgot the Minister of Communications (Mr. Kierans).

Mr. Forrestall: I think this is his night to be in attendance.

Mr. Kierans: It is the attraction of the speaker that entices me.

Mr. Forrestall: I will pass that remark on to the merry monk. To return to my earlier remarks, Mr. Speaker, I regret that the President of the Treasury Board, in his capacity two or three years ago of Minister of Defence Production, permitted the situation to develop which culminated in a committee of this House viewing the matter so seriously as to name names. Whilst I regret this, the responsibility for the situation must strongly attach to the President of the Treasury Board. I regret equally, as indeed must the people of this country, that the government has not yet concluded an investigation into the procedures followed in the repair of the *Bonaventure*.

• (8:10 p.m.)

It is particularly regrettable, as the hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster said, that the minister did not ask for an exhaustive investigation, particularly since there was evidence to show that not only were costs for this contract to go up but there was no way of knowing by how much they would go up. Indeed, when the work began we were told in different ways that the costs would increase, and it must have been evident to the minister that costs were almost out of hand, particularly at the end of the seventh and eighth months of the overhaul program.

Answering the allegations of the motion, the minister this afternoon spoke in a manner that quite frankly I do not find acceptable because he shrugged off his responsibilities on to his colleagues. The President of the Treasury Board smiles. I suggest he is perfectly aware of the serious act of omission he committed, and he will not be able to hide behind the collective responsibilities of his colleagues in cabinet. The tradition that individual ministers were responsible for the acts of their subordinates goes back, if my history is correct, to precedents set in the 1850's and 1860's in Great Britain. At that time, admittedly, a minister could be expected to keep a very close watch on the actions of those who served under him.

This is not the situation today and I do not think that is really what we are talking about. We are not concerned about it today. Circumstances change. Ministers must be as much concerned with events in front of them as with events behind them. We on this side of the House recognize that. But the minister has not changed over the years, as was made

clear in his intervention in the debate this afternoon. This is the ultimate responsibility for the acts of those who served under him. Having acquired knowledge of this matter, the minister failed to act appropriately and failed to institute inquiries into the procedures being followed. I think he is perfectly aware of what I am talking about. The tradition of ministers accepting responsibility for the acts of their subordinates is clear. I could refer Your Honour, for example, to the debates which brought about the establishment, in large measure, of the civil service as we understand it.

I will not allude to what happened in 1909 and the debates that led up to the formation of the modern civil service because I am sure that in his reading the minister has come across them. I am sure he is aware of the traditions and practices of the British House. What is important here is that having been made aware of the situation, the minister failed to do anything about it. Since then the government has failed to correct the situation. The minister in no way this afternoon addressed himself to his omission. He in no way lent the traditional protection to those who served under him. He owes them that protection. In no way did he do anything to protect or reassure senior civil service officials that they would not be casually "docked" if someone bothered to look at their records.

An examination of this particular case reveals some pretty glaring misadventures. I have no sympathy for those who act wrongly while in the service of others. When such people are in positions of high trust, the offence is all the more glaring. As I say, I have no sympathy for such people, although I have sympathy for those who in certain circumstances might be charged with wrongful acts but are completely innocent.

Whether the minister wants to accept responsibility is neither here nor there. The minister has failed to give people who must work in the service day after day an opportunity to defend themselves against the direct or implied charges that have arisen from the report of the Standing Committee. The committee urged the government to take immediate action. It has been suggested that an inquiry is now in process. It may or may not be in process. The minister did not answer that question this afternoon, but left it hanging. Not only did he leave it hanging; he saw fit to treat in a callous and casual way another minister by implying that the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Cadieux) is the minister who knows most about this matter. If that is so, perhaps the former Minister of National Defence ought to share the responsibility for what has happened.

[Mr. Forrestall.]

At any rate, the President of the Treasury Board casually said this afternoon, "I did not have anything to do with this, really. The present minister will have to answer." I do not see either of those ministers or their representatives here this evening. Perhaps they are here and we shall obtain some answers. This motion is not directed against the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Richardson) or the Minister of National Defence.

The President of the Treasury Board cannot avoid his direct responsibilities in this matter, as he tried to do this afternoon. He cannot say that he was not responsible for acting in connection with something that happened a few years ago. He did nothing. Indeed, he chose to leave the matter to a committee of this House which after a fairly thorough investigation found it necessary to be highly critical of procedures followed by public servants who were instrumental in awarding contracts under which tax moneys of the Canadian people were spent. I therefore wish to move an amendment to the motion, seconded by the hon. member for Cumberland-Colchester North (Mr. Coates). I should like to address myself to argument in support of this amendment. First may I read the motion and then discuss it. I move—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Before the hon. member proposes to amend the motion I must bring to the attention of the House that the hon. member is the seconder of the motion and obviously cannot amend his own motion unless he has the unanimous agreement of the House, which apparently is not forthcoming.

Mr. Drury: No, it is not.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member cannot amend his own motion. The hon. member will have to request one of his colleagues to move it, if the amendment is to be moved later this evening in the course of debate.

• (8:20 p.m.)

Mr. Forrestall: I accept that ruling, Mr. Speaker. I say that with deference to Your Honour. I do not know which rule of the House states that I cannot move an amendment to a motion which I have seconded. Undoubtedly there is such a rule. I have no hesitation in accepting Your Honour's ruling.

In the few moments I have left I wish to state that as long as the President of the Treasury Board has responsibility for the expending of public funds, the minister cannot expect other than condemnation by this House. My own condemnation is very strong. As long as the minister fails to act on the situation as it now exists, he cannot expect to be rid of that condemnation. In the public realm six senior civil servants have been charged. They have no recourse to defence and no recourse to a forum to which they can present their side of the situation.

I think it is regrettable that the President of the Treasury Board allowed this situation to develop. It is a matter of even deeper regret that he allowed it to continue once it became known. I think it is deplorable and unforgivable that the minister has not seen fit to take a public position either of discipline or of defence. The fact that time has passed and the minister has now assumed other responsibilities does not mitigate his responsibility. Indeed, the office which the minister now holds as President of the Treasury Board ties him closer to his initial failure to act in this regard.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of my colleague the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Cadieux) who could not be in the House today for this debate because he is attending a meeting of the NATO nuclear planning group of which Canada again this year became a member on rotation. This group normally meets twice a year. The current meeting is being held in Venice today and tomorrow. My colleague will then proceed to Brussels to the spring meeting of the Defence Planning Committee of NATO on June 11. In his absence today on this important item of public business he has asked me to speak with regard to his responsibilities as Minister of National Defence. I welcome the opportunity to speak this evening and to set forth on his behalf his response, which I make clear I am pleased to support.

There are two points to be made before dealing with the details of the committee—report two assertions of the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall) which should be contested. I got the impression from the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East and the hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster (Mr. Bell) that there is an element of personal vendetta in their presenting this motion. The hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East suggested that in some way the President of the Treasury Board could have gone into other departments to discipline employees who are not his direct responsibility. The rules of public administration are clear; they have been clear for a long time. Ministerial responsibility attaches to the specific office, the person occupying it from time to time, and not to any individual. It is the minister currently holding the office in question who answers to the House for the acts and omissions of his public officials. The matter in issue refers to acts and omissions which have occurred in the past as well as the present.

It is improper for the hon. member to say that the President of the Treasury Board is evading his duly in failing to discipline the employees of the Department of National Defence, for which department I am responding this evening, or those of the Department of Supply and Services for which my colleague will respond.

Mr. Bell: If that is the theory, you change departments if you get into trouble!

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Perhaps the hon. member was in trouble with his own party by putting this motion which appears in his name. Perhaps the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Hales) will agree that the position of the hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster should be changed.

Mr. Bell: We do not call for resignations in our party.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): It would be improper for the President of the Treasury Board to deal with this part of the motion. It was absurd for the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East to suggest that the President of the Treasury Board should go into other departments for which he does not have responsibility and engage in the disciplining of employees.

Secondly, the hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster, the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East and other members commended the committee on its work in this regard. They then condemned the censuring of a number of public servants including several serving officers of the Maritime arm of the Canadian armed forces. I suggest they cannot have it both ways. If they did not wish specific individuals to be named, they could have prevented it. This committee, unlike other Standing Committees of the House, does not have a government majority.

Mr. Bell: There is a man who has it both ways.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The chairman of that committee is not a government member.

Mr. Hees: The Liberal party has a majority.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The government does not have a majority. The number of opposition members and the number of government members is equal.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The chairman of that committee is a member of the opposition. If the member for Dartmouth-Halifax East is going to censure someone in this regard, he should censure the presiding officer of that committee. I do not intend to do so. I say on behalf of my colleagues that we regret this procedure of making specific attacks on individual public servants. The President of the Treasury Board set out the theory in this regard, to which we adhere. Public servants do not respond to Parliament; they respond to the minister responsible. That is the position on behalf of the government in this regard. I hope other committees of the House will not indulge in the same practice which was condoned by the hon. member for Wellington in allowing an attack on individual public servants.

The Standing Committee on Public Accounts is a very important and essential committee of this House. The third report of that committee, which has been presented to the House, refers extensively to the *Bonaventure* refit. The report to which I have referred deals with the midlife improvement and refit of the *Bonaventure*. Construction of the *Bonaventure* commenced in the United Kingdom in 1942 during World War II. The ship was not completed in time to see service in World War II and work was suspended shortly thereafter. The hull was acquired for the Royal Canadian Navy in July, 1952. The ship was completed in a United Kingdom shipyard and commissioned by the Royal Canadian Navy in 1957. Prior to the refit the ship had been in service continuously except for periods of minor refit and repair.

The refit, which began in 1966, was its first major refit and the project included improvements and replacements of certain systems to maintain its reliability and operational capability. At that time it was expected that the ship would remain in service until 1975, if not longer. However, it was decided last year to retire the ship from service in 1970. This decision, with a number of other changes, resulted from the recent defence review and the need to restrict defence expenditures to the 1969 budget level for the following three years.

It was a difficult decision to make, but it was a forces-wide reduction. After a searching re-examination of Maritime Command's operational commitments, it became a choice between taking the *Bonaventure* out of commission or reducing the fleet by a number of destroyer escorts. It was decided that it was preferable to retain the destroyers. By taking the *Bonaventure* out of commission the department was able to free $10 million to $12 million annually for these other needs.

• (8:30 p.m.)

The proceedings of the committee leading to this report and the report itself have received a great deal of public attention. The report refers by name or position to certain officers of both departments and implies that they were deficient in the performance of their duties to the degree that disciplinary action may be required. The principles are clear. Disciplinary procedures have been established in accordance with the law of the Parliament of Canada for both the public service and the armed forces.

Mr. Woolliams: What about the minister?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): These are designed to ensure the protection of the individual from injustice as well as to protect the interests of the public. Parliament has been diligent in its protection of these rights, even though an hon. member opposite may be facetious about them. The Minister of National Defence is responsible in his department to ensure that discipline is administered in accordance with the procedures established by the law of this Parliament. In view of the allegations contained in this report, which reflect on certain officers of his department, he considered it essential to deal with these matters today, and I do so on his behalf.

The report states, on page 775, paragraph 6, under "General Conclusions and Recommendations":

> The committee fails to understand why the Deputy Ministers of National Defence and Defence Production, realizing that the cost of the refit of the *Bonaventure* was, month by month, getting out of control, did not order an "on the job" investigation.

The Minister of National Defence and I have been unable to find any evidence before

the committee which would support such a statement. Regular production meetings were held at the shipyard. The two deputy ministers arranged to have a monitoring committee composed of officials of the Department of National Defence, the Department of Defence Production and Treasury Board review costs on a continuing basis. A review was made in the shipyard by officials from both departments and Treasury Board staff before the principal increase in the estimates for the project, amounting to $3,770,000, was approved on December 1, 1966, by Treasury Board. A further increase of $800,000 was subsequently reported to Treasury Board in June, 1967, bringing the original $8,000,000 estimate to $12,570,000. I think it will be clear that every effort was made to keep the costs under control.

At page 788 of the report, in the section on item X-427, the committee states:

> It is inconceivable to the committee that representatives of the Department of National Defence and Defence Production would present as facts such false testimony regarding details surrounding the movement of briefing-room chairs.

I wish to deal with this aspect in so far as it relates to National Defence employees. Captain T. W. Maxwell, Maritime Systems Engineering Section of the Department of National Defence, who was not involved in the *Bonaventure* refit beyond the preparation of certain specifications relating to conversion of systems, endeavoured to obtain information for the sub-committee from various sources in the department. The information he gave the subcommittee on the briefing-room chairs was given in good faith and during the course of subcommittee hearings conducted informally and of which no minutes were kept.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I am glad to see we are winning the support of hon. members opposite.

Mr. Forrestall: You are winning nothing. We shamed you into it.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): There are the hon. members who commended the committee for attacking this serving officer.

Mr. Forrestall: Who attacked a serving officer?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Captain Maxwell sincerely regretted that he had given the committee incorrect information, and when he became aware of his error he reported it to the committee.

Mr. Woolliams: You are confessing your own weakness.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Is the hon. member referring to this serving officer as having confessed? I think that is shameful. Reference is made to this on page 532 of the proceedings of the main committee. Further, on page 794, under the item X-1237, the committee reports that evidence was given by Captain Maxwell and Mr. R. D. Wallace that this contract was largely required because of the need to secure lockers in position on board ship. The report goes on to say:

> The committee, when visiting the *Bonaventure*, discovered that this information was inaccurate and, in fact, many of the lockers were not secured to their frames and those that were had not been secured in the manner described.

According to the evidence on page 603 of the proceedings, Mr. Wallace did not provide the information referred to in the report. The evidence on pages 603 and 604 given by Captain Maxwell was that part of the reason for X-1237 was to bolt lockers aboard ship. Captain Maxwell stated specifically, and I quote from the proceedings: "I do not think that I ever implied that the locker work was a large proportion of X-1237." The necessity to fasten lockers aboard a sea-going warship should be self-evident notwithstanding the fact that some were temporarily unsecured when the committee visited the ship some two years later in Halifax following its return from a lengthy operational trip.

The minister advises me that he has looked into this very carefully and he is convinced that Captain Maxwell did his best to assist the subcommittee in its investigations. Captain Maxwell did not have personal knowledge of all the detailed items in which the subcommittee was interested. He obtained information as quickly as possible from various sources in the department, and in these circumstances there is always some possibility of error in dealing with detailed questions some two or three years after the work was done.

The report on page 792 made some criticism of Captain Lynch concerning the detailed records on furniture repairs. Captain Lynch was responsible for overseeing the whole refit and in the matter of furniture repair he concerned himself with the over-all operation rather than the details. The committee reports that Captain Lynch cancelled

item X-337 which would have required an expenditure of $550,499 for the repair of furniture. This was replaced by items X-782 and X-784, totalling $206,861. There were comprehensive specifications covering the refinishing of furniture. The work orders were supplemented with diagrammatic and oral instructions. The evidence before the committee indicates that these were adequate for those concerned with the work. It would appear that the committee's criticism of Captain Lynch relates to the fact that the work orders for furniture repairs were not amended in writing to include the supplemental instructions so that they could be readily audited by the committee. I can understand the committee's concern in this matter. This raises the general question of records adequate to the job and those satisfactory for a later, detailed investigation.

We appreciate the need when dealing with public moneys to keep records in sufficient detail to satisfy a subsequent review of the expenditures involved. In this particular instance it is agreed the detailed record available to the committee was difficult to follow. Every effort will be made to provide better records to the fullest extent possible. My colleague, the Minister of National Defence, was deeply disturbed that the report reflected unfavourably on some of his departmental officials who appeared as witnesses before the committee. He carefully reviewed the evidence and the performance of the officials concerned. He has satisfied himself that there are no grounds for disciplinary action against the personnel involved, and asked me to say this today.

I wish to turn, now, to some other aspects of this report. I would like to comment on the estimated cost of this refit. The committee, in its report, recognized that the *Bonaventure* refit was the first of its kind in Canada and was of such unprecedented magnitude that it would pose some difficulties to the Defence Department. It was also one of the early contracts using a new system of awarding such contracts by competitive tender. The committee, however, believes that a large number of obvious items could have been included before the tendering process and that greater efforts should have been made to determine and define the amount of work to be undertaken before seeking public tenders.

I agree that the effectiveness of competitive bidding is enhanced when as much work as possible is defined before seeking tenders. The two departments, before receiving the report, had gone into this question and had worked out revised procedures which will improve performance in this respect. None the less, there is no practicable way prior to opening the ship, particularly a ship of this size, of determining in full the precise nature and scope of the work to be done. So an allowance has to be made for "work arising" or "unknown work" in the tendering process. The allowance for this in the tender call was 200,000 hours of labour and 10,000 hours of drawing office time. The departmental estimators used their best judgment, but in the absence of previous experience or historical data to assist them their estimate was concededly too low.

• (8:40 p.m.)

As for the new work introduced after the tender call, it was decided in the course of the refit to do additional painting, based on surveys as the work proceeded—certain work which would improve living conditions and some improvements to safety and operating features. We became convinced of the advisability of doing this work only as the refit proceeded. These deliberate decisions were based on defence priorities at the time, as any additional costs of the refit had to be met by transfers from other items within the total defence budget and were not in addition to it.

Estimates on repair and refit contracts on destroyers and smaller ships, with which there has been long experience, have been good. On some 45 repair and refit contracts in the last two years, contract prices were well within the estimates.

The original *Bonaventure* refit estimate of $8 million was based, firstly, on the procurement of government-supplied material, secondly on known shipyard work, and thirdly on provision for refit work arising. The completed program costs consist of $10,290,-090.74, the contract price as shown on page 778 of the report, and the items "direct cost of government-supplied materials by naval stores, $2,068,000.00" and "freight and sales tax, $150,000" included in the table of figures on page 779, giving a total of $12,508,090,74.

If indirect costs are to be added, as they were added by the committee in arriving at the total amount, such as the $1,074,000 estimate for crew salaries, as they are on page 779, they should also surely be added to the original $8 million estimate. The converse of that would have been the suggestion that serving crews should have been discharged for the interval. Moreover, a tabulation of this kind, to be consistent, should deduct the

estimated ship operating costs for the 16-month refit period when she was not operating, which would more than offset the indirect costs attributed in the table.

I appreciate the need for committee examination of public expenditures. I share the concern of the committee over procedures. We keep these under continuous review with the object of incorporating improvements which experience reveals to be desirable. I think it is fair to say that the energy demonstrated by the committee in this particular case will undoubtedly result in closer scrutiny of refit operations in the future, indeed of all government procurement operations.

In closing, may I repeat my statement that I hope we will not again see the naming of specific members of the public service or members of the armed forces as was done in this particular case. After all, the minister responsible, on whose behalf I am speaking tonight, takes full responsibility for those officers and I give my support for the efforts that they made, using their best judgment in the circumstances, in making this refit. As I say, I hope such naming will not occur again in the committee's work.

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary Centre): Mr. Speaker, I came into the chamber after the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) had commenced to read this well prepared speech made up for him by someone, I think I probably know who. Thus, I am not in a position to comment upon it from its beginning. In any event, I have not risen tonight to deal with the bits and pieces of the *Bonaventure* affair or of any of the other numerous instances brought to the attention of the House of Commons by the Auditor General of extravagance, of wasteful expenditure, of bad administration and so on during the past several years. As a matter of fact, I think what is involved here is a much more important question of principle, namely the principle of ministerial responsibility for what goes on in any department of the government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Harkness: I will come back to this point in a moment, but it is the main reason I have risen to my feet tonight and the chief subject about which I am going to speak.

I think there has been a deliberate effort on the part of the government to shift their responsibility on to members of the civil service at various levels. This is something I resent quite strongly, having myself been a minister of three departments. When I was minister of a department I was prepared in every case to take the responsibility for anything that any of my officials did. Apparently the present government is not prepared to take that responsibility. In my view this is the real principle at issue as far as this motion is concerned.

Before I deal with this matter I should like to say that in my view the escalation in cost of the *Bonaventure* refit is very much less than the escalation in cost of a number of other projects initiated by the present government. As an ex-minister of defence, I resent to a considerable extent the fact that the general public thinks that perhaps the worst example of bad administration, of expenditure of public funds on useless purposes, has been the case of the *Bonaventure*. As a matter of fact, in the Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs Committee last year I personally insisted on going into the affairs of Expo, which is a far worse example of what I am talking about than the *Bonaventure*. In this particular case the total commitment of the federal government to begin with was $40 million. In the Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs we were never able to find out what the final cost of Expo was, but it ended up that the federal government had to pay somewhere around $300 million. This is an escalation that is far higher than that in the case of the *Bonaventure*, one which the Canadian people should keep in mind.

Then there is the case of the Arts Centre. I recall quite well when this project was first presented to the House of Commons that it was supposed to cost in the neighbourhood of $9 million. Then when all the estimates, and so on, came in the government said it was going to cost $18 million. It ended up costing $45 to $50 million, an escalation of five times or more. One of the examples that hurts me most is that of the hydrofoil. When I was Minister of National Defence I was very loath indeed to authorize a start on the experimentation and construction of the hydrofoil, and did so only after I had been assured that the cost would not exceed, under any circumstances, $11 million to $12 million. That was to be the absolute maximum. The cost has now risen to some $50 million odd. The only conclusion I can draw is that the present government has been extremely lax in seeing that the people's money is spent in a reasonable way. The people responsible for this are not the deputy ministers and the various other people down the line. The people responsible are those who sit on the treasury

benches at the present time and the people who have sat on those treasury benches by and large ever since 1963.

• (8:50 p.m.)

At this point I should like to pay a tribute to the members of the Public Accounts Committee. I have not been a member of that committee for the last 2½ years, but I was a member before that and for most of the period between 1945 and 1957. The Public Accounts Committee, above all others, is the committee which performs a great service for this Parliament and the people of Canada in examining the accounts of the government. We might say it acts as a brake on excessive expenditures by the administration and things along that line. I believe the Public Accounts Committee has rendered a great service to the people of Canada in presenting its report in this regard. I do not want anyone to think that my ideas are any different in that respect. However, I think the Public Accounts Committee in recommendation No. 6, which appears at the bottom of page 775 of *Votes and Proceedings* for May 13, pointed the finger in the wrong direction. Recommendation No. 6 states:

> The committee fails to understand why the Deputy Ministers of National Defence and Defence Production, realizing that the cost of the refit of the *Bonaventure* was, month by month, getting out of control, did not order an "on-the-job" investigation.

The people who should have ordered that investigation were the then Minister of Defence Production, now President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury) and the hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Hellyer) who at that time was Minister of National Defence. They should have ordered the investigation. As a matter of fact, on the basis of my experience of about six years as a cabinet minister I know that none of my deputy ministers at any time could have ordered such an investigation unless I told him to do so.

This is the great difficulty so far as this question is concerned. I know it probably is beyond the bounds of possibility to accept that in this present Parliament the government members on the Public Accounts Committee would agree to a unanimous report which condemned their own ministers. I recognize that this probably is the situation. Nevertheless, this is what the Public Accounts Committee should have done. The Public Accounts Committee at that time should have condemned the then Minister of National Defence, the then Minister of Defence Production and Industry, and so on, because they were the people responsible for this situation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Harkness: If any on-the-spot investigation was to be made, it would have had to be ordered by the ministers. No deputy minister could on his own order an investigation of that kind. It is nonsense to think along such lines. The fact that these investigations did not take place and the costs escalated to the extent they did is the direct responsibility of the minister, now President of the Treasury Board, who at that time was in charge of defence production and industry, and the hon. member for Trinity who at that time was Minister of National Defence.

That is where the responsibility lies, and not on the deputy ministers. I take great exception to an attempt being made to place on deputy ministers and other lesser officials in the Departments of National Defence and Defence Production the blame for the mess in respect of the *Bonaventure*. The people responsible for this situation are the ministers. They should stand up and accept that responsibility. I heard a good deal of the speech the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) read in respect of this matter. I think I have a fairly good idea who prepared it for him, and so on. Perhaps he was speaking for the Minister of National Defence of that time. As a matter of fact, the present Minister of National Defence (Mr. Cadieux) shares some responsibility because while he was not in charge of the department he was the associate minister for a good part of that period. The President of the Privy Council should have said that the ministers of this government are responsible for the mess and that they are sorry for it. Instead of that, ever since the Auditor General's report came out people have been trying to place the responsibility on the deputy ministers and other officials of these two departments.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Hees: Resign!

Mr. Harkness: I take a great deal of exception to that. As was pointed out by the hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster (Mr. Bell) when this debate was instituted, there is no question about ministerial responsibility in our system. He read some excerpts from Mr. MacGregor Dawson's book. I have some quotations here but I shall not take the time of

the House to read them. The hon. member also referred to some excerpts from the Glassco Commission report. I shall take time to read only one excerpt from the Glassco Commission report in order to demonstrate the fact that the principle of ministerial responsibility is completely entrenched in our parliamentary system. If we do not continue with a system of parliamentary responsibility, and if ministers try to slough off responsibility to deputy ministers or officials, our system will fall to the ground and we will be left with practically nothing. This is my great objection to the position of the government to this date. I have really heard nothing in this debate in respect of ministers saying, "I will take the responsibility".

Mr. MacEwan: They haven't got the guts.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): How can the hon. member say he has heard nothing in this debate, when he accepts that he has been absent for most of it?

Mr. Harkness: I did not hear what the minister said.

Mr. Hees: He had an attack of wind.

Mr. Harkness: I shall return to the Glassco Commission report in respect of the conduct of government in this country, under the heading "Political Accountability of the Executive Branch". I shall quote from page 32.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): What volume?

Mr. Harkness: Volume 1. You do not need to think that I do not know what I am talking about.

Mr. Hees: He is beginning to realize that you know very well what you are talking about.

Mr. Harkness: The Glassco Commission report states:

> Concurrently with the development of the "public" service concept, it has become established that direct accountability to Parliament and to the public is imposed only on ministers.

I repeat, "only on ministers".

> Public servants continue to be answerable for their honesty and competence to their ministers, through the ascending scale of their departments, but they bear none of the political consequences of their acts.

They also do not bear any of the financial consequences of their acts. In other words, under our system the ministers are responsible for all the mistakes made by members of their departments. If they are honest about it, they must come into the House of Commons and accept that responsibility. As a matter of fact, if the situation is bad enough they should resign.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): What did you do in 1963?

Mr. Crouse: At least he had integrity.

• (9:00 p.m.)

Mr. Harkness: I followed my furrow in 1963, and I only wish that a lot of members of the present government had done the same thing subsequently. But they have not.

Mr. Hees: Thanks for the straight line.

Mr. Crouse: There is no integrity on that side of the House.

Mr. Harkness: Undoubtedly the general situation is this, that an attempt has been made, so far as the government is concerned in this case, to shuffle off their responsibility to deputy ministers and to other lesser civil servants, serving officers and people along that line. I do not think that this is going to wash with the Canadian public, nor do I think it has washed with this Parliament. The government has a subservient majority. I have no doubt that if this matter came to a vote—as it happens it is not going to come to a vote because today does not happen to be a voting day—the government side would carry the vote. There is no question about that because, as I say, they have a subservient majority. But if the people constituting the members of this assembly were asked, on a sort of secret ballot, to indicate what they thought in connection with this matter, I have not the slightest doubt what the verdict would be. I do not expect the Liberal members supporting the present government to get up—as they would if they were independent in their views, but they are not—and condemn the government. As I said earlier, it would be too much to expect that to be the case.

Mr. Woolliams: They only do that in caucus.

Mr. McKinley: Once a month, for three minutes.

Mr. Harkness: Nevertheless, the basic issue in this whole matter is ministerial responsibility. I am very much afraid that if the

present government continues to evade what should be their responsibility in connection with every executive act of the government, our present system of government will disappear. I do not know what will supplant it, but I am sure it will be much poorer.

The reason I am so concerned about this matter is that, as I said, the basic principle of ministerial responsibility is being evaded in this case. I do not think it should be evaded. I think that of the ministers who are responsible for these departments the only one who is still on the treasury benches is the President of the Treasury Board. The hon. member for Trinity has left the government. There is no question in my mind whatever that the present minister, who is an old friend of mine—we served together in the war, and so forth and so on—

Mr. Drury: Especially "and so on."

Mr. Harkness: —and had a very pleasant time, but he is still in my view, in spite of all, evading his responsibility.

Mr. MacEwan: Resign!

Mr. Harkness: When I was interrupted by the President of the Privy Council I was going to say that the greatest example of this in recent times was the Crichel Down case in Great Britain, in 1954. I will explain later how I happen to know something about it. In any event, here was a case where a piece of land had been taken by the RAF for war purposes and when the RAF had no more use for it, the department of agriculture, a great bureaucratic organization, particularly in the U.K. at that time, thought they could run it better than the former owner. He kept on trying to get back control of the land, without success during the time the Labour government was in office.

Then the Labour government was defeated and the Conservatives came in. He went on for another two or three years trying to get it back. Eventually he raised so much hell that the matter became a big question in Parliament. Sir Thomas Dugdale, who was the minister of agriculture, although he really knew nothing about what had been going on because he had been given bad advice by his officials—this came out in the public inquiry which was held—was not really personally responsible. But in that Parliament the idea of ministerial responsibility was so firmly ingrained that Sir Thomas Dugdale insisted on resigning, and he did. As a matter of fact, this is what should happen in this Parliament.

[Mr. Harkness.]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Continue.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Does the House give unanimous consent to allowing the hon. member to continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Harkness: I thank hon. members for their indulgence. I will not keep them very much longer. As I was saying, the Crichel Down case is the outstanding example in recent times of a minister who really did not know what his officials were doing and who nevertheless took the responsibility and resigned as a result of it. As I started to say earlier, the reason I know something about the case is that the minister's successor came over to visit me. He was minister of agriculture when I held the same office here in 1957. I got a whole rundown on the case.

If we are going to continue parliamentary government, of which the basic ingredient is the responsibility of the executive to the Members of Parliament, then ministers will have to accept responsibility for what their officials do, whether or not they know anything about it. In fact, it does not make a bit of difference whether or not the officials have done something without the minister's knowledge, the minister still has to take responsibility for it. If he is not pleased, it is his job to fire the official who has not done a good job, or transfer him somewhere else. But so far as Parliament is concerned and so far as the people of Canada are concerned, the minister must take the responsibility. If he does not do so, our system is going to disappear. As I said, that is why I feel so strongly about this matter.

I will conclude by saying that I think the only good effect that can come from this debate and from the Standing Committee's public investigation of the matter would be for an effective measure to be taken. I put it to the government that they must take effective action to prevent the waste of public money, which has been apparent in this case and which has been apparent in a number of the other cases I have mentioned. If this is not done, the whole idea of trying to give more life to members of the House of Commons and to the House of Commons as a whole will come to nothing.

The only way in which the members of the House of Commons can exert any real influ-

ence on administrative actions of any kind by the government is through committees. The Public Accounts Committee is a good example of this. If attention is not paid to the reports of committees, if they are just filed and nothing happens in regard to them, there will be less and less interest among members in this House and less and less interest of the public in the operations of this Parliament; and our responsible, parliamentary system of government will go down the hill.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (9:10 p.m.)

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, in response to the motion which is before the House, and in response to several of the remarks that were just made by the hon. member for Calgary Centre (Mr. Harkness), I welcome this opportunity to bring to the attention of the House some of the cost-saving practices and some of the improved, and I might say improving procedures that are now being implemented in my department. I would like not only the House but also the Canadian public to know that the procedures we have instituted are designed to protect the public treasury. What is of even more importance, Mr. Speaker, is that some of the results we have achieved have in fact protected that treasury and have saved the taxpayer's dollar.

Also, as the refit of the *Bonaventure* was referred to specifically in the motion before us, I would like to speak about a number of matters raised in the third report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts which is, of course, their report on that refit. I think at the outset it would be useful for all of us to put the *Bonaventure* refit into what might be called historic perspective.

Mr. Dinsdale: Hysteric perspective.

Mr. Richardson: The methods and the procedures which the Canadian government has used to handle major ship repairs have been evolving and changing, and I believe improving, over many years. In the post-war years before the *Bonaventure* refit there was no competitive bidding; in other words, there were no firm contracts. Prior to the *Bonaventure* refit it was the practice of the Canadian government to negotiate the price and to rely in those days only upon cost-plus arrangements. Because of these unbusinesslike procedures that were in use prior to the *Bonaventure* refit it was decided to introduce competitive bidding and the writing of firm contracts between the government and the successful bidder.

The *Bonaventure* was the first major refit in which there was competitive bidding and a firm contract, and because of this—because it was the first—I would say that it is understandable that government personnel may have lacked experience regarding estimating the total amount of work on a project of that size. However, the change to competitive bidding and to a firm contract was a step in the right direction and, as I will point out, the government's contracting procedures have continued to improve right up to the present day.

I have indicated in these remarks, Mr. Speaker, that I am responsible for a department that is vitally concerned with the efficiency of government, and I welcome the interest shown by members of the opposition and by the Standing Committee in improved procedures and cost-saving practices. I am pleased to be able to say that some of the recommendations made by the Standing Committee for improving the government's contracting procedures are already in effect in my department and this, I believe, is the answer to what the hon. member for Calgary Centre was speaking about a moment ago. For example the first general conclusion and recommendation made by the Standing Committee is:

> That greater efforts should have been taken to determine and define the amount of work to be undertaken in the refit, prior to the seeking of public tenders.

Quite apart from the hearing on the refit of the *Bonaventure,* I established last fall, now some time ago, an interdepartmental study group to press on with our program of procedure improvements so as to prevent, or at least to minimize cost overruns on ship conversions, repairs or refits, and to ensure that all work that could be indentified was put in the specifications for the original tender call. This task force studied cases where cost overruns had occurred. They established the causes for such overruns and then developed a working procedure to reduce or eliminate these overrun difficulties.

The final report of this task force was given to me last March. It is several pages in length and covers in detail the procedures to be followed to achieve time, cost and performance objectives in the carrying out of refits, repairs and emergency docking of naval vessels. The Department of National Defence and

my department reached agreement on implementation of the proposals contained in the report and these proposals are now in effect in my department. I believe that members of the opposition and the Standing Committee on Public Accounts would be interested in this report. In fact, if they would read it I think that they would be encouraged by it because it is, I believe, a clear indication that within the Department of Supply and Services we have in some respects been thinking along the same lines as the Standing Committee. We have been trying to improve our contracting procedures in a manner fully consistent with some of the recommendations of that committee.

At the time of the *Bonaventure* refit when we were introducing competitive firm price contracting for ship construction and repair, it was found that in many ways my department, the user departments and the contractors were not fully experienced in working within the rigid conditions laid down in the contracts. Since that time we and the other concerned parties have gained considerable experience and have developed techniques that enable us now to have these contracts completed successfully, on time and within budget.

As evidence of that statement, Mr. Speaker, in the last three years, of 33 ships purchased for civil departments all but one were delivered on schedule or ahead of time. The actual shipyard costs amounted to $14,079,000 against a budgeted cost of $14,505,000. As another illustration of how we are continually improving our estimating and programming practices, the Department of National Defence and the Department of Supply and Services handled 25 naval ship refit and repair contracts during the fiscal year 1968-69. The total budgeted figure for all 25 contracts was $4,668,000. The total final contract price was $3,755,000. This means that owing to detailed cost estimating and tight negotiation the contract prices were some 20 per cent below our budgeted figures. In 1969-70 the total budgeted figure for 20 refit and repair contracts was $3,495,000, with a total final contract price of $2,959,000. The contract prices for that year were some 15 per cent below our budgeted figures.

The examples I have just given are mainly in the area of ship construction and repair but are illustrative of the results of our system improvement program. There are many other examples that could be given where changes and improvements are providing better estimates and substantial savings in the cost of the goods and services which the government buys. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that my remarks up to this point have established that the system improvements in the area of government procurement are in a continual process of improvement.

[Mr. Richardson.]

• (9:20 p.m.)

Turning now specifically to the *Bonaventure,* the contract—as do all refit and repair contracts—provided for a fixed price for the known work and a firm chargeout rate for labour and overhead. The committee expressed concern that the chargeout rate for labour and overhead was renegotiated. However, Davie Shipbuilding Limited was not obligated to deliver more than 200,000 hours of "work arising" at the original rate of $3.95 an hour. In view of the committee's concern I have consulted the Department of Justice, who have fully confirmed the legality of the department's action in this matter. Perhaps I should add that the new rate was not unreasonable. It was, as shown in the committee's report, only a few cents higher than the rate bid by the two competing yards for the first 200,000 hours of "work arising". The average chargeout rate by Davie was thus well below the rates originally bid by the competing yards.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that in its extensive report the committee did not mention what seems to me to be an important fact. At no place did the committee indicate that an over-all audit of the total contract with Davie Shipbuilding Limited was carried out by the audit service branch and that it was determined by that audit that the over-all profit before taxes was below 10 per cent of the cost.

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

Mr. Richardson: Gladly.

Mr. Woolliams: I take it from his argument that the minister is trying to evade ministerial responsibility. But apart even from the overexpenditure can you, as a minister of the Crown with a lot of say, particularly in western Canada, say that the government was right in stating, "Spend all this money, and when we get through we will either sell it or scrap it"?

Mr. Richardson: Mr. Speaker, we are talking of two separate matters.

Mr. Woolliams: Well, answer that question.

Mr. Richardson: At the point in time when the refit was undertaken there was a plan to keep the *Bonaventure* in service for a much longer period of time. Then we had a full defence review in which expenditures were held back, and one of those was the *Bonaventure*. It is a very logical and progressive conclusion. That is the answer to the question.

Mr. Dinsdale: There is not much logic there.

Mr. Richardson: I wanted to say, Mr. Speaker, that the total profit as determined under audit was under 10 per cent. In other words, the over-all profit was not unreasonable for a fixed price contract. My colleague, the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald), has spoken of officials in the Department of National Defence, and part of what he has said also applies to officials in the former department of defence production. In particular he has dealt with the committee's general conclusion No. 6, in which the committee indicated that it failed to understand why the Deputy Minister of National Defence and the Deputy Minister of Defence Production did not order an on the job investigation. My colleague has pointed out that the two deputy ministers discharged their responsibility in this respect by having the project monitored closely by an interdepartmental committee and by having a special on the spot review of the project undertaken at the time of the request for additional funds in the fall of 1966. Surely this is the answer to the charge made just a few minutes ago by the hon. member for Calgary Centre.

Two other officials of the former department of defence production who are mentioned specifically in the report are Mr. R. D. Wallace and Mr. L. E. St. Laurent. Mr. St. Laurent's estimating has been criticized, but in appearances before the standing committee he has pointed out that his final estimating work was in the category of summaries and not in the itemized figures. Mr. Wallace was the division chief responsible for the contract with Davie Shipbuilding, and the committee report indicates that he misled the committee in respect to the manner in which lockers and briefing-room chairs were secured on the ship. My information is that Mr. Wallace was one of a group of officials who met with a subcommittee of the Public Accounts Committee and was present when certain explanations were advanced by officials for the cost of removing these furniture items. Mr. Wallace was not, however, the person who gave the explanation to which the committee later objected, and subsequent testimony of other government officials before the committee clearly exonerates Mr. Wallace in this respect.

With these comments, Mr. Speaker, I wish to assure the House that I intend to continue to give most serious consideration to the matters raised by the Standing Committee and to any of the constructive observations made on both sides of the House in the debate today. As I have pointed out, some of the committee recommendations have already been implemented.

I would welcome a further opportunity either in the House or before a committee of the House to give additional information. In particular, I would be glad to provide more information on the improved procedures and cost-saving practices which have been put into effect and which are continuously being put into effect by the Department of Supply and Services.

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland-Colchester North): Mr. Speaker, we have really been honoured in this debate as a party because we have seen three cabinet ministers participate. That is almost unique in this Parliament. But there is a reason why these three cabinet ministers have participated—it is because they are in trouble and they know it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Coates: Mr. Speaker, Hoot Gibson is over there and he is hooting, hooting, hooting. Owls go out and sit in trees. If hon. members opposite want to participate in the debate they should stand up; and if they do not, they should shut up.

Mr. Speaker, a former president of the United States, Mr. Harry Truman, had a sign on his desk and that sign is what the opposition is talking about: it said, "The buck stops here". That is what we say: the buck stops with the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury) and nowhere else. The President of the Treasury Board was desperately concerned about the civil servants named by the Public Accounts Committee. Apparently the committee did a terrible thing to these people. But, Mr. Speaker, the reason they were named by the Public Accounts Committee was because those gentlemen did not do their job. There is no other reason. Had there not been incompetence in government, $17 million would not have been spent on the *Bonaventure* and no public servant in Canada would have been named in any Public Accounts

Committee or in any Auditor General's report. Their names are there because the President of the Treasury Board did not do his job.

• (9:30 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Coates: And because he did not do his job, he should no longer be President of the Treasury Board. The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) says we are carrying on a vendetta. Yes, we are carrying on a vendetta, but not against the public service of Canada: it is against the incompetent cabinet ministers sitting on the treasury benches of this House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Coates: Our vendetta is aimed at the squandering of $17 million of the taxpayers' money on the *Bonaventure*. We are carrying on a vendetta against a government unwilling to face its responsibilities. They are playing musical chairs by suggesting today that since the President of the Treasury Board is no longer the Minister of Defence Production, he should not be blamed for what happened, or that since the Minister of National Defence was at that time the associate minister of national defence, he ought not to be blamed. I say these men are responsible, and if they had accepted their responsibilities they would have submitted their resignations to the Prime Minister.

I listened to the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Richardson). He is a man who should be keenly interested in protecting the taxpayers' dollar, as should the President of the Treasury Board. As a matter of fact, his department more than any other can assure the taxpayer that tax money will be spent properly. I suggest that when a man like that comes into the chamber and categorizes $17 million misspent on the *Bonaventure* as "historic perspective," he ridicules his position has gives little or no guarantee to the public of Canada that that mistake will not be repeated again and again. That is what worries me.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Coates: It is not historic perspective that we want, Mr. Speaker: it is action.

Mr. Dinsdale: History repeats itself.

Mr. Coates: We want guarantees for the taxpayers of this nation that we shall not see one *Bonaventure* misadventure after another. There is no guarantee in the type of statement made by the Minister of Supply and Services. We heard the tripe and gobbledegook spoken by the President of the Privy Council, but we did not hear anything about such a guarantee.

Mr. Gibson: The hon. member is wandering.

Mr. Coates: There goes the hoot again. It goes hoot, hoot, hoot. You can anticipate his hooting. Every once in a while you hear a hoot like an owl's. They say the owl is old and wise. Perhaps the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. Gibson) is a wise old owl, because he hoots all the time. We are not interested in owls; we are interested in the taxpayer and the way tax dollars are spent.

Mr. Dinsdale: The government does not give a hoot about taxes.

Mr. Coates: We hope the government will give more of a hoot, in the days ahead, for the Canadian tax dollar than it has in the past. A new program was proposed to the provincial premiers in Winnipeg over the weekend. I am wondering whether we can obtain some kind of guarantee that the government will peg wasteful government expenditure at 6 per cent for the next year. If we obtained that kind of guarantee from the government we would need less and less in the way of guarantees from labour in this country.

Mr. Gibson: What chapter is that?

An hon. Member: Hoot, hoot!

Mr. Coates: If the hon. member could read, I would give him the chapter and verse. But all he can do is hoot, hoot, hoot.

An hon. Member: Like an empty vessel.

Mr. Dinsdale: An empty vessel makes the most sound.

Mr. Coates: We face a national strike in the postal service and the government refuses to budge from its fixed position. It is said that the government's proposal to the postmen would cost an extra $41.5 million over 30 months, and that the union proposal would cost $51 million over 24 months. How long would it take the government to meet the union proposals, in terms of the money it has wasted? For starters we can look at the misadventure of the *Bonaventure*. Altogether $17

million has been paid out on a ship that is now up for sale and is likely to wind up her days as a floating crap game.

Mr. Gibson: What page is that?

Mr. Coates: Is it not time that the minister or ministers responsible were keelhauled or scuttled? Let us take a look at another government spending fiasco. An estimated $18 million National Arts Centre winds up costing $46 million. Here we have a $46 million chunk of culture, with prices out of reach of the working man in Ottawa and performances out of reach, through sheer distance, for millions of Canadians from coast to coast. Let us take a look at the $16 million spent on the beginnings of the P.E.I. Causeway.

An hon. Member: That was a shocking waste.

Mr. Coates: Anybody who visits Prince Edward Island should look at the area where they built railway tracks to Northumberland Strait. Indeed, we have been told that although we wasted $17 million on the *Bonaventure,* we can reclaim $500,000 if we sell the ship as scrap. I wonder how much these rails, which cost us between $16 million and $17 million, on the edge of the Northumberland Strait would fetch if they were torn up. I walked down that railway line. I thought I might as well. As a taxpayer I thought I might as well walk along those tracks to see how $16 million of my money had been spent. Well, I did not get my share of enjoyment out of that $16 million. Unfortunately, the people of British Columbia do not even have a chance to see the rails.

Mr. Dinsdale: Neither do the people of the Prairies.

Mr. Coates: That is all you can see; there are two rails leading to Northumberland Strait. The government did not sink New Brunswick and it has not succeeded in sinking Prince Edward Island.

An hon. Member: Perhaps the present Premier will sink it.

Mr. Coates: Yes, perhaps the present Premier will sink it. He is driving the province very hard. But he has had a tremendous amount of assistance from our friends across the way.

Mr. Dinsdale: Birds of a feather.

Mr. Coates: Who are all hooting together.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Coates: Those are only a couple of reported items. I wonder how many cents an hour they would represent to a postal worker who feels he is being short-changed by this government. Next year's report by the Auditor General will probably have a special chapter on the Montreal mail trucking farce in which the Post Office set out to save money but has had to pay out more then $2 million in buying trucks, settling broken contracts, paying for extra security and so on.

So I ask again: Is the government going to peg its expenditure wastes at 6 per cent, or might it be that the minister responsible for the *Bonaventure* in the area of defence production or for government spending in general will, after we have looked at the grim, total picture, be given their marching orders? It would be mighty good news for Canada if that were done, but I doubt if it will be.

I should like to refer to a CBC program entitled "Encounter" on which the President of the Treasury Board appeared on April 11. He was interviewed by Ron Collister, Charles Lynch and Pierre O'Neil. What I like about this program is that the minister talked of a tight ship. The way the expenditures on the *Bonaventure* went, I think the only fellow who was tight was the President of the Treasury Board.

• (9:40 p.m.)

Mr. Dinsdale: He was spending money like a drunken sailor.

Mr. Coates: There could be no doubt about that. When talking about this tight ship, the minister said:

> The government is turning rather more attention to what I would call effectiveness as distinct from efficiency—

I do not argue with that.

> —that is making sure that what we are doing is producing the result that is really needed—

I do not argue with that. Apparently the main result the government wants is unemployment. They are doing it with an effectiveness that beyond a doubt is better than has been done by any government in Canadian history.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Coates: At the present time 550,000 Canadians are unemployed. If unemployment is the main goal of the government, they are both effective and efficient. This seems to be

their main goal. In this interview the President of the Treasury Board referred to the Auditor General. Although the minister thinks the Auditor General is a great fellow, he thinks he would be a lot better if he wrote with invisible ink in an invisible pen. That is really what the minister wants. The minister thinks if the Auditor General used invisible ink in his invisible pen he would have the kind of report that is required. In this interview he said to Mr. Lynch:

> I wonder myself whether the Auditor General should cast himself in this role, or whether we should look for really another kind of person to be Auditor General—

I know the kind of person the President of the Treasury Board would like as Auditor General. There used to be a radio program called "The Shadow Knows". That is the fellow he wants to be Auditor General.

An hon. Member: The Green Hornet.

Mr. Coates: No, not the Green Hornet. He wants "The Shadow" and he wants him with an invisible pen with invisible ink so that no one in this country can find out about the misadventure of the *Bonaventure*. I wish to refer to an editorial which appeared in the Cape Breton *Post*. This refers to another stage in the career of the President of the Treasury Board. I quote:

> One example is the suggestion by Hon. C. M. Drury, Minister of Industry, in a Montreal speech that the government should print its own newspaper and insert its own programs into the CBC. This sounds incredible, coming from a man of Mr. Drury's presumed intelligence.

That, Mr. Speaker, would be the fantasy of all fantasies. I would love to see the programs that the President of the Treasury Board would prepare for the CBC. Alec Guinness starred in a tremendous movie entitled "Tight Little Island". I think the minister would keep repeating that movie on the CBC so no one would ever find out about the *Bonaventure*. The movie was about a ship that sank with a cargo of scotch. The men of the island went out in rowboats to get the scotch from the ship. They had quite a party.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Never on a Sunday!

Mr. Coates: I do not know whether there was any scotch aboard the *Bonaventure*, but a lot of people had a mighty big party at the expense of the taxpayers.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[Mr. Coates.]

Mr. Coates: I would like to say more, Mr. Speaker, but one of the members of the NDP has been trying to get the floor. I will let him take over.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the offer of the hon. member. I appreciate it more because it was not offered by the previous speaker.

This is really a sad state of affairs. After meeting for a number of months the committee prepared a very detailed report on a very large expenditure. It is sad that opposition members have to raise this subject on their day rather than having the committee report presented in the ordinary way. The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) defended this action. He would have had this same opportunity had he allowed the committee report to be presented in the normal fashion. All opposition members are concerned about our inability to supervise the estimates and expenditures of this House. Some hon. members will remember the days of the old type of estimates when we could understand exactly what was happening. I must admit this was not true when I came to this House; it was more complicated then. The new system of estimates is even more confusing. One of our responsibilities in an economic sense is to scrutinize all expenditures. After a great deal of time and effort the committee unanimously presented a report. The government covered up that report.

I was not impressed by the speech of the President of the Privy Council because I am aware that he was reading someone else's document. He was not giving his own point of view or that of the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Cadieux). I was shocked at the speech of the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury). This man has had it both ways. He was a senior civil servant. I am sure he remembers the Currie report. It may be true that somebody took the blame for him at that time. I do not know whether he had the responsibility or whether it was the responsibility of someone under him. I am sure he was able to transmit to those responsible the difficulty that developed at that time. I am sure he did something about it.

Although this is a democratic process, I do not entirely agree that the minister has to take the responsibility. This only works when the minister is willing to do something to those responsible for the neglect that occurs. It is all right for the minister to stand in this House and say, "I take full responsibility". There was an expenditure of $17 million on

the refit of the *Bonaventure*. It did not need to be refitted; it would not have sunk with an additional three years' service. What does it mean to the Canadian people when the minister makes such a statement? Does it assure them that the same situation will not occur in the future?

The President of the Treasury Board did not say anything. It was interesting to watch his officials in the gallery. They were amused. I am not sure what they were amused about. They may have been very pleased with the speech they had written for the minister, they may have thought he was doing very well, or perhaps they were laughing at Parliament or its members. Then again, though I do not suggest this very seriously, they may have been laughing at the minister himself.

• (9:50 p.m.)

The minister has a responsibility for considering the average Joe who is getting damn poor results from the expenditures we are making under the tender system. The work on the West Block was another wonderful example of underruns and overruns. Every time the contractor got an underrun he put the money in his pocket, and whenever he got an overrun the government paid. We all remember the Arts Centre. The estimated cost was $9 million. In the end it exceeded $47 million. Expo was supposed to have cost $40 million. In fact, it turned out to be $300 million. Would anybody like to guess how much it will cost us to hold the 1976 Olympics that are not supposed to cost us anything. My guess is that $50 million will be very cheap.

The Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Richardson), who is new in his department, did tell us he was giving some consideration to this problem, and I am sincerely grateful for that. People are making estimates in connection with government contracts without having the faintest notion of what they are doing. They are not competent. Every major estimate has proved to be so far out that it might as well not have been made. The minister sought to tell us we were not doing badly on the basis of 10 per cent plus cost. That may be the opinion of some people but it does not seem to me we should be counting on overruns at 10 per cent plus cost. It reminds me of the days when the country had to depend on operations of that kind. Surely that is not the case today.

This country is not getting full dollar value for the work we are contracting out. The Postmaster General (Mr. Kierans) has found this out. His tender system was so bad that the man who already owned the trucks and operated under a contract refused to tender on it again. It seems to me that if anyone was in an advantageous position to tender, this operator should have been. He did not wish to be involved in the tender system. In my opinion the tender system is not honest, it is not competently managed and the government should come up with a new one.

The cost of refitting the *Bonaventure* was estimated at $8 million. Then somebody came along and made an offer of $4.5 million. There were other tenders of $5 million and $7.5 million. Mr. Speaker, in these circumstances the only bid worth considering was the $7.5 million bid; otherwise one has to assume that those preparing the estimate were stupid or that the man who volunteered to do it for $4.5 million was stupid. Nobody in his senses would grant a tender for an amount which is just half of the estimate. Today, the real facts are available. The estimate was $8 million but the cost turned out to be $17 million. Where does this leave a government which accepted a $4.5 million bid?

I have seen this happen both ways. There is another facet to this question which has not been discussed. I can remember the end of the Arrow program and the decision by the Department of National Defence that it could no longer pursue this national endeavour. I know many people who were very proud of the fact that Canada had one aircraft carrier. I am also aware that there are many pilots in the air force today flying the CF-105 who realize that this plane, with a 200-mile radius, cannot go anywhere unless it has an aircraft carrier to support it. It has no value unless it is flying around in Canada close to a gas station.

Many people still do not like to see the end of "The Bonnie" The Canadian public are fairly generous and they have shown this quality on many occasions, even when they have not been asked. I am sure that if we asked them to agree to give the *Bonaventure* as a gesture, to Australia—which might be able to use it, since Australia already has a ship of the same type—they would willingly give consent. It would be a gift worth making to a sister dominion. I strongly urge the government to consider this proposal rather than letting the ship go to some art dealer in Toronto who would take it through the Seaway. The government would probably have to spend another $50 million to widen the Seaway for that purpose.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Don't put ideas into their heads.

Mr. Peters: The committee worked very hard. Every member gave of his time and effort to the fullest extent. The report is a good report. For his part, the Auditor General was most diligent in helping to assess the accounts with the staff he had available. The government appears, sometimes, to be very stupid. Let them not be encouraged by the fact that they have a majority which will clap for them no matter what they do. Let them take the advice of the Minister of Supply and Services tonight and redesign the whole tender system so that we do not continually get into trouble of this kind.

There must be a way of arriving at a better tender system to ensure that this kind of thing will not happen again. From this point of view the lesson of the *Bonaventure* is one well worth learning. If we are capable of designing new methods of estimating expenditures in advance and of controlling expenditures so that they remain within the estimate, if we are willing to eliminate the practice of allowing business people to decide for us how much we should pay for whatever we are buying, we shall be able in the end to say "Thank you" to the Public Accounts Committee and to the Auditor General. Moreover, many people will appreciate the efforts of a government which, having made a bad mistake shows us it is willing to change the whole of its procedures to ensure that the same mistake is not repeated again as it has been repeated hundreds of times in the past.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

At ten o'clock the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

APPENDIX

COMMUNIQUÉ AND DECLARATION FOLLOWING ROME MEETING OF NATO FOREIGN MINISTERS

FINAL COMMUNIQUÉ

The North Atlantic Council, meeting in ministerial session in Rome on 26th-27th May, 1970, reaffirmed that the alliance remains indispensable to the security of its members and makes possible their common search for progress towards a more stable relationship between east and west in which outstanding issues dividing Europe can be resolved.

2. Ministers again stated their determination to resolve these problems through a process of negotiation. They recognized that for their part, this search for peace must rest upon a spirit of genuine partnership, the maintenance of the defensive strength of the alliance, and the practice of full and timely consultation.

3. Ministers agreed that it will not be enough to talk of European security in the abstract. The causes of insecurity in Europe are specific, they are deeply rooted in conflicting perceptions of state interests, and their elimination will require patient endeavour. However, the allies, for their part, remain willing to negotiate, in any suitable forum, those concrete issues whose resolution would enhance the security of Europe. The success of efforts to pursue genuine relaxation of tension will be a test of the willingness of all interested countries to deal meaningfully with real issues of security.

4. Ministers affirmed that to endure, peace must rest upon universal respect of the sovereign equality, political independence and territorial integrity of each European state, regardless of its political or social system, and for the right of its peoples to shape their own destinies, free of the threat of external intervention, coercion or constraint.

5. Ministers, recalling their earlier statements on the subject, examined and approved a report on the situation in the Mediterranean, prepared by the Council in Permanent Session which they had requested in their meeting of December 1969. Having regard to the conclusions presented in this report, they found reason to reiterate their concern with regard to the situation in the area. They stressed again the importance of full and frequent consultation among the allies on this question and the necessity for continued vigilance. They instructed the Council in Permanent Session to continue their close review of the developing situation in the Mediterranean and to report fully thereon to ministers.

6. At their April 1969 meeting in Washington, ministers agreed to explore with the Soviet Union and the other countries of eastern Europe which concrete issues best lend themselves to fruitful negotiations in order to reduce tension and promote co-operation in Europe and to take constructive actions to this end. The council thereafter conducted a detailed study of those issues, and at their meeting in December 1969, ministers declared that allied governments would continue and intensify their contacts, discussions or negotiations through all appropriate channels, bilateral or multilateral, and that they remained receptive to signs of willingness on the part of the Soviet Union and other eastern European countries to engage in such discussions. Progress, they said, in these discussions and negotiations would help to ensure the success of any eventual conference, in which, of course, the North American members of the alliance would participate, to discuss and negotiate substantial problems of co-operation and security in Europe.

7. Ministers expressed satisfaction over the launching or continuation of the whole range of talks and negotiations, initiated by members of the alliance, which they have been actively promoting during the six months since December 1969. At the same time, numerous other east-west contacts have been pursued. The allies have consulted and will continue to consult closely on all these initiatives and contacts.

8. With the support and understanding of its allies, the Federal Republic of Germany has initiated talks with the Soviet Union, Poland and the GDR in order to improve the situation in central Europe. The allies consider this to be encouraging. They express the hope that these talks will yield results and will not be compromised by the presentation of unacceptable demands. The efforts being made to solve outstanding problems and to achieve a *modus vivendi* in Germany which

would take account of the special features of the German situation, represent an important contribution to security and co-operation in Europe. The ministers express the hope that all governments desiring to contribute to a policy of relaxation of tension in Europe will, to the extent possible, facilitate a negotiated settlement of the relationship between the two parts of Germany and the development of communications between the populations.

9. The ministers noted with satisfaction that the four powers, in the framework of their rights and responsibilities for Berlin and Germany as a whole, began discussions on 26th March about improving the situation with regard to Berlin and free access to the city. They express the hope that the difficulties which exist at this especially sensitive area of the east-west relationship could be overcome by practical measures and that Berlin would be enabled to make its full contribution to economic and cultural exchanges.

10. The conversations between the United States and the Soviet Union aiming at the limitation of strategic armaments, which began last November at Helsinki, have been continued at Vienna in April. Ministers welcome these talks, the outcome of which is so important for the security of Europe and the future of humanity.

11. On the occasion of the coming into force of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, ministers reemphasized the importance they attach to limiting the spread of nuclear weapons as well as to measures for genuine nuclear disarmament. They noted with interest the efforts now under way to exclude mass destruction weapons from the sea-bed and to deal with the problem of control of biological and chemical weapons. They expressed the hope that further progress on disarmament measures, with appropriate safeguards can reduce the arms burdens borne by all.

12. The members of the North Atlantic Alliance have, over a number of years, proclaimed their interest in arms control and disarmament measures which facilitate a gradual elimination of the military confrontation in Europe. Ministers recalled the declarations issued at Reykjavik in 1968, and at Brussels in 1969. They noted that up to now these declarations had led to no meaningful reply.

13. The allies have nevertheless carried out intensive studies on mutual force reductions in accordance with the directions given by ministers in December 1969. Ministers examined the detailed report presented to them by the North Atlantic Council in Permanent Session. This has been of great value in clarifying the complex issues involved. Ministers gave instructions for further relevant studies which would guide policies and explorations in this field.

14. Ministers, having examined all these developments, both positive and negative, and having taken note of the report on the procedures for negotiation which they had commissioned from the Permanent Council, stated that they were ready to multiply exploratory conversations with all interested parties on all questions affecting peace.

15. In so far as progress is recorded as a result of these talks and in the ongoing talks —in particular on Germany and Berlin—the allied governments state that they would be ready to enter into multilateral contacts with all interested governments. One of the main purposes of such contacts would be to explore when it will be possible to convene a conference, or a series of conferences on European security and co-operation. The establishment of a permanent body could be envisaged as one means, among others, of embarking upon multilateral negotiations in due course.

16. Among the subjects to be explored, affecting security and co-operation in Europe, are included in particular:

(a) the principles which should govern relations between states, including the renunciation of force;

(b) the development of international relations with a view to contributing to the freer movement of people, ideas and information and to developing co-operation in the cultural, economic, technical and scientific fields as well as in the field of human environment.

17. In addition, ministers representing countries participating in NATO's integrated defence programme attach particular importance to further exploration with other interested parties of the possibility of mutual and balanced force reductions and have therefore issued a declaration on this subject.

18. As a first step, Ministers requested the Foreign Minister of Italy to transmit this communiqué on their behalf through diplomatic channels to all other interested parties including neutral and non-aligned governments. They further agreed that member governments would seek reactions of other governments to the initiation of the

comprehensive programme of exploration and negotiation which they envisage.

19. Ministers reviewed the first report from NATO's Committee on the Challenges of Modern Society and welcomed the progress made in the six months since the committee was established as a demonstration of the value of allied co-operation on the urgent problems of human environment. Intensive studies now in progress will contribute to national and international action on a broad range of environmental issues, including such pressing concerns as air and water pollution.

20. Minister reaffirmed the view that the benefit of the alliance's work in mankind's environment particularly could become a basis for broader co-operation between east and west in this field of ever-increasing importance. They considered that this could be ensured either through existing international organizations providing a useful framework for enhanced co-operation or by any other appropriate method.

21. The next ministerial session of the North Atlantic Council will be held in Brussels in December, 1970.

DECLARATION ON MUTUAL AND BALANCED FORCE REDUCTIONS

1. Meeting at Rome on 26th and 27th May, 1970, the ministers representing countries participating in NATO's integrated defence programme recall and reaffirm the commitment of their nations to pursue effective policies directed towards a greater relaxation of tensions in their continuing search for a just and durable peace. They recall, in particular, the invitation they have previously addressed to the Soviet Union and other countries of eastern Europe to join them in discussing the possibility of mutual and balanced force reductions.

2. The objective of the work on which their representatives have been engaged has been to prepare a realistic basis for active exploration between the interested parties at an early date and thereby to establish whether it could serve as a starting point for fruitful negotiation. Such exploratory talks would assist those concerned in developing in detail criteria and objectives for substantive negotiations to follow at the appropriate stage in a forum to be determined. They would also provide tangible evidence of the readiness to build confidence between east and west.

3. Ministers invite interested states to hold exploratory talks on mutual and balanced force reductions in Europe, with special reference to the central region. They agree that in such talks the allies would put forward the following considerations:

(a) mutual force reductions should be compatible with the vital security interests of the alliance and should not operate to the military disadvantage of either side having regard for the differences arising from geographical and other considerations;

(b) reductions should be on a basis of reciprocity, and phased and balanced as to their scope and timing;

(c) reductions should include stationed and indigenous forces and their weapons systems in the area concerned;

(d) there must be adequate verification and controls to ensure the observance of agreements on mutual and balanced force reductions.

4. As a first step ministers requested the Foreign Minister of Italy to transmit this declaration on their behalf through diplomatic channels to all other interested parties, including neutral and non-aligned governments. They further agreed that in the course of their normal bilateral and other contacts member governments would seek to obtain the responses and reactions of other governments. Members of the alliance will consult further regarding the outcome of their soundings with a view to enabling the alliance to determine what further individual or joint exploration might be useful.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

The House met at 2 p.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. HALES—REMARKS BY PRESIDENT OF PRIVY COUNCIL CONCERNING CHAIRMAN OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to rise on a question of privilege. It concerns the improper and incorrect remarks made by the hon. member for Rosedale (Mr. Macdonald), the President of the Privy Council, concerning myself as Chairman of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts and the members of that committee. These remarks were made in my absence and I therefore raise the matter at the earliest opportunity available to me. I might say, Your Honour, that I was attending to a very pleasant duty, that of our son's graduation.

The question is whether these remarks constitute a breach of privilege and contempt of the House by the hon. member for Rosedale. As you know, Mr. Speaker, it is my honour to be Chairman of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts and the third report of that committee is presently on the order paper awaiting concurrence. The House may either concur in the report or reject it.

The hon. member for Rosedale spoke of that report during the debate on the opposition motion yesterday and of myself as chairman of that committee. In part he said, as recorded on page 7864 of *Hansard* for June 8, 1970:

> The chairman of that committee is a member of the opposition. If the member for Dartmouth-Halifax East is going to censure someone in this regard, he should censure the presiding officer of that committee. I do not intend to do so.

If the minister had stopped there and had said no more I would not have risen on a question of privilege. But he went on to say, and this is what gives rise to the question of privilege:

> I hope other committees of the House will not indulge in the same practice which was condoned by the hon. member for Wellington in allowing an attack on individual public servants.

Your Honour, I did not condone that any more than any other member of that committee.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hales: It was a unanimous report presented to the House, and the minister has no right to point his finger at me and say that I condoned that practice.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hales: I believe this is a reflection on the committee and on myself as chairman of that committee. As such it is a breach of the privileges of the House and, specifically, a breach of Standing Order 35.

• (2:10 p.m.)

The precedents are clear and therefore I do not propose to do more than refer Your Honour to pages 123, 124 and 125 of Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice, seventeenth edition. Among the precedents found to constitute contempt and breaches of privilege are reflections on the character of the Speaker and accusations of partiality in the discharge of his duty, reflections upon the conduct of the chairman of committees, reflections upon the impartiality of the chairman of ways and means, reflection upon the conduct of the chairman of a standing committee. I do not propose to take the time to read all of Standing Order 35 but simply to quote this very important part:

> No member shall speak disrespectfully of...nor use offensive words against either House, or against any member thereof. No member may reflect upon any vote of the House, except for the purpose of moving that such vote be rescinded.

The hon. member for Rosedale, by his words reflected upon the vote of every member of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Upon Your Honour ruling that there is a prima facie breach of privilege I shall move, seconded by the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid):

> That the matter be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Wellington for having given me

notice of his intention to raise this question of privilege. As I pointed out to him, I said quite specifically, last night that I did not intend to reflect upon him in his capacity as chairman of the committee. I am pleased to repeat that in the House. I regret if this matter has caused him any embarrassment. Therefore I make it quite clear that I agree that one should not comment on the conduct of the chairman of a committee. I hope the House will remember that for future circumstances.

I might say, however, that it is entirely within the right of the House and any member of the House to criticize the collective decision of the committee and, whatever the hon. member may say about the decision of the committee generally, I do not think that is a question of privilege. I certainly apologize to him for any reflection upon him personally.

Mr. Baldwin: We will make something of you yet, Don.

Mr. Speaker: Having heard the hon. member for Wellington who raised the matter as a question of privilege and the comments made by the President of the Privy Council, I would think that there might not be too much purpose served by sending this matter to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections. The hon. member has raised a very good point and the references he has made are quite in order. As the President of the Privy Council has himself pointed out, it is not competent on a member to cast reflections upon the chairman of a standing committee of the House in the performance of his duties. The minister has indicated that that was not his intention, and by his words I think he has satisfied the hon. member for Wellington. I do think that in the circumstances we would not be assisting the House very much in the pursuit of its work if we referred this matter to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. Hales: Sir, I accept the apology of the President of the Privy Council.

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

POST OFFICE

CONTINUING DISRUPTION OF SERVICE

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 26 I ask leave to move a motion for the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter involving the administrative responsibility of the government and one which requires urgent consideration. The matter is the continuing disruption of the postal service, a situation which is seriously affecting the national economy and the Canadian people.

Mr. MacEwan: And admitted by the Postmaster General.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Hillsborough has filed with the Chair the notice required under Standing Order 26. The subject proposed for discussion by the hon. member is "the continuing disruption of the postal service". Obviously, in the hon. member's own words the problem posed by him for an emergency debate has been in existence for some time and is a continuing one.

It is hardly necessary to remind hon. members that the postal situation has been the subject of interventions in the House over a prolonged period of time. On February 18 last a motion in the name of the hon. member for Sainte-Marie was allowed for the purpose of discussing the postal dispute in Montreal. This debate ranged far and wide and provided an opportunity for the discussion of difficulties in postal services quite beyond the limits of the dispute in Montreal. Since then the hon. member for Hillsborough has initiated a number of adjournment debates on the subject of the postal services. In that sense it would be hard to rule that we have before us a problem that is of the nature of a new and sudden emergency.

Hon. members will realize that this kind of decision is somewhat difficult to make. We have here a situation which has been continuing for a time. I think I must bring to the attention of hon. members that under the provisions of Standing Order 26 there can be only one debate on the subject. I am not, of course, suggesting that the debate we had in February was on this subject. I agree that it was not. But we must take into account the circumstances as they exist today when the motion is proposed.

My understanding of the situation is that there is to be a resumption of negotiations, and it seems to me that this might not be the ideal day to have the debate which perhaps we will have some day on this difficulty if it continues. As I say, there can be only one debate under Standing Order 26 and if we have one today, as hon. members realize, it would be the last one that we would have on this subject. It is incumbent on the Chair to

choose the most appropriate day for such a debate. The time and day on which we have such a debate must be the most conducive to the submission of constructive suggestions on the part of hon. members in respect of the matter on which the debate would be held.

In the circumstances as they exist today, taking into account all the conditions and taking into account the requirements of the Standing Order and precedents, I would not think that this would be the ideal time to put to the House the motion proposed by the hon. member for Hillsborough.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—IMPOSITION OF WAGE AND/OR PRICE CONTROLS—APPLICATION OF SIX PER CENT WAGE INCREASE GUIDELINE TO POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister whether the government is actively considering the imposition of wage and/or price controls at the present time? I direct this question to the Prime Minister because the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce is reported to have said in Montreal yesterday that this matter is actually being studied and that an announcement is to be expected within a few days.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, my office has been in communication with the minister, who I see is in the House now, but this is not government policy, nor did the minister announce it in the terms which are quoted by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Stanfield: May I ask the Minister of Finance, who I suppose is the expert on the existing guideline policy of the government, whether the guideline policy of the federal government limiting wage increases to 6 per cent applies to the wages and salaries of the Post Office employees which are now under negotiation?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the government, having accepted these guidelines, will have to take cognizance of them in its settlements with its own employees.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, am I to understand that there is no guideline policy in effect?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the opposite of what I said. I said that the government, having accepted these guidelines, will have to take cognizance of them in dealing with its own employees.

An hon. Member: And what does that mean?

Mr. Stanfield: May I ask the President of the Treasury Board whether this does not mean that in fact there is no collective bargaining, nor room for collective bargaining? Also, does the government intend to proceed directly and impose a limit, in accordance with these guidelines, upon the Post Office employees who are negotiating? In other words, does the government intend to end the pretence that there is actually collective bargaining going on?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, it is not a pretence that there is collective bargaining. There is bargaining going on at this very moment, or there will be very shortly, in respect of a number of issues as well as the one of the so-called pay package. I think the government recognizes and I am sure the Council of Postal Unions will recognize that there is greater freedom to bargain in certain areas than in others. In the matter of the pay package there is very little freedom.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I ask the Prime Minister to clarify the statement he made a moment ago in view of the fact that the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, according to this morning's Montreal *Gazette*, made two statements. First, he said that an announcement will be forthcoming in a few days. Second, when asked whether the government was preparing price and wage controls the minister said:

> I believe this is what they are working on in Ottawa at the moment.

The Prime Minister said that the minister was not correctly quoted. Are both statements incorrect? I ask the Prime Minister specifically whether the government is working on mandatory wage and price controls, and will an announcement be made in the course of a few days, as suggested by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce?

Mr. Trudeau: I believe I indicated to the Leader of the Opposition that it was not government policy and that we were not working on mandatory wage and price controls. I indicated that communications which my office had with the minister disclosed that he

was not properly quoted in the context of what he said. The minister may want to explain to the House that he did not say it in those terms.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I am ready to allow the minister to accept the invitation of the Prime Minister. Will the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce tell the House what he did say? In view of the confusing statements made by ministers in recent days, could we have this statement clarified?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I hesitate to allow the minister to make a statement on a statement that was made outside the House, except on a point of order or alleged question of privilege. It has been a long-standing practice in the House that questions can only be directed to the Prime Minister on whether a statement made outside the House represents government policy. I suggest this rule should be enforced even today.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Can the minister tell the House whether the government is making a study of mandatory price and wage controls, and does he expect an announcement to be made in the course of the next few days?

Mr. Speaker: The question can be asked of the minister only to the extent that it is within his own administrative responsibility. I agree this can be embarrassing, but I do not think the question can be asked in those terms.

Mr. Stanfield: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The confusion is only normal. Now that the President of the Treasury Board has indicated that the guideline on the postal negotiations in terms of salaries is 6 per cent, is this guideline also going to be applied to other collective bargaining negotiations in which the government of Canada may be involved in the course of the next few months?

Mr. Drury: The answer is yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question to the President of the Treasury Board is supplementary to an earlier question. In view of the urgent public appeal made by the Postmaster General for an early settlement of the postal dispute, will the government make a reasonable offer to the postal employees, one that might be counted on to bring about an early settlement?

[Mr. Trudeau.]

Mr. Drury: Yes, Mr. Speaker. We shall be reiterating what I think is a very reasonable offer again this afternoon.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Will the minister make not just the same old offer but a reasonable one?

Mr. Drury: We have, Mr. Speaker.

[*Later:*]

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): My supplementary question is directed to the President of the Treasury Board. Now that the government has established wage guidelines applicable to the postal employees, does the President of the Treasury Board, in the hope that a settlement of the postal dispute will be reached, intend to impose any communications guidelines on the Minister of Communications, or will that minister continue to make spontaneous speeches and discourses on the negotiations?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

INFLATION—SIX PER CENT WAGE INCREASE GUIDELINE—INCREASE IN DIVIDEND PAYMENTS

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): May I address a supplementary question to the Minister of Finance who has just assured the House that the 6 per cent limitation on wage increases for civil servants is now applicable. Is the government taking cognizance of the fact that figures just issued show an increase in the dividends of banks and financial institutions amounting to some 30 per cent for the first six months of this year, 14 per cent by mines and 8½ per cent generally for all dividend payments? Is the minister taking similar action with respect to this large increase in dividends inasmuch as he is imposing a 6 per cent limitation on civil servants?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): The figures published recently also show that profits were down by 3.8 per cent in the first quarter. With regard to the figures of banks and other commercial institutions which have made an agreement with respect to guidelines, I would expect that Dr. Young would see that they are living up to their undertakings in that regard.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): In light of the statement the minister made yesterday, as reported at page 7839, to the effect that the banks have made an agreement with respect to restricting their

profits, may I ask the minister if it is not correct that the only restriction is that they should keep the spread between deposit interest rates and lending interest rates at a constant ratio, and that there is no restriction in the agreement with respect to bank profits?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member's supplementary question is argumentative.

INFLATION—IMPOSITION OF MANDATORY PRICE CONTROLS ON INDUSTRIES

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary Centre): My question is addressed to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Are the officials of his department working on plans for the imposition of mandatory price controls on the industries of this country?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): The answer given by the Prime Minister applied to the whole government. With reference to what I said in Montreal, this is a clear case of amplification without justification.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Pepin: I was referring to the discussion which had gone on in Winnipeg. It may be that by a slip of the tongue I said "Ottawa" instead of Winnipeg, but it is amazing that this was the only reporter who placed that interpretation on what I said.

[*Translation*]

FINANCE

RETURN TO FIXED DOLLAR EXCHANGE RATE

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance.

Have the banks brought pressure to bear on the government for Canada's return to a fixed exchange rate as soon as possible?

[*English*]

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): There was a question raised yesterday as to whether the Bank for International Settlements had brought pressure to bear on Canada with regard to a fixed exchange rate. I was in contact with the governor of the Bank of Canada whose representative was at those meetings, and such is not the case.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

EFFECT OF ANTICIPATED INFLATIONARY PRESSURE ON INTEREST RATES

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpeque): Since the government professes to believe that the action it has taken will curtail inflation, what steps is the government taking to eliminate at least that portion of increased interest rates which is caused by anticipated inflationary pressure generally?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): I believe interest rates have gone down. As a matter of fact, one of the chartered banks announced a reduction in its prime rate yesterday. There are also indications that our anti-inflation policy is having some effect. Figures published as of now will show a decline in the cost of living in the last month.

INFLATION—INDEPENDENCE OF PRICES AND INCOMES COMMISSION—GOVERNMENT ACTION TO ROLL BACK PRICES

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): My question is addressed to the Minister of Finance. It refers to the minister's statement yesterday that the Prices and Incomes Commission is independent of the government. Can the minister reconcile that statement with the claims of his colleague that action by the government has resulted in the Prices and Incomes Commission effecting some price rollbacks in certain products and services?

Mr. Speaker: I cannot accept the question because it is asked in the form of an argument and I do not believe it is acceptable from the standpoint of procedure.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): May I put it this way, then? Is it possible to ask the minister to reconcile a position he took with another fact?

Mr. Speaker: I suggest to the hon. member and to the minister that when a minister is asked to reconcile one statement with another it becomes a debate or an argument.

HOUSING

INCREASE IN PUBLIC HOUSING RENTS AT HAY RIVER

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development arising from a question I asked in the House on May 27 which was responded to at the time by the Parliamentary Secretary in the absence of the minister. On that occasion I asked whether the minister would investigate what appeared to be a scandalous situation at Hay River in the Northwest Territories resulting from an increase in rent charged old aged pensioners in public housing

projects from $69 to $109 a month. Could the minister indicate to the House whether an investigation of this matter has been made, and can he announce the results to the House?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, the problem does not come directly under my jurisdiction, but rather under that of the Minister without Portfolio in charge of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. I passed the hon. member's question on to him, and he indicated that he would reply personally in the House. I believe he is not in Ottawa today.

[*English*]

PROCEDURE AND ORGANIZATION

AGREEMENT ON TERMS OF REFERENCE TO STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the President of the Privy Council. Now that the western supporters of the government have decided to support the proposals of this party for greater freedom of action and participation in voting in the House and less of the mailed first treatment, would the Government House Leader not support the terms of reference to the Committee on Procedure and Organization that we suggested, and bring them forward so that they will be in effect by next session?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, it would appear that the principles of his party to which the hon. member refers relate to the question of whether the hon. member for Halifax or the right hon. member for Prince Albert is leader of that party, and I think that is a question they should solve themselves.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question that I will address to the Prime Minister since the contrite mood of the President of the Privy Council has not carried forward to the question period. Would the Prime Minister make a statement in connection with the alleged resignation of seven ministerial assistants because of the autocratic rule of the Prime Minister? If that is not correct, would the Prime Minister deny the first part of the question? The second part, of course, is undeniable.

[Mr. Barnett.]

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I will gladly look into the matter. Could I have the reference that the hon. member was reading from?

Mr. Baldwin: I wrote it myself.

Mr. Trudeau: I thought it was a product of your research staff.

POLLUTION

OIL PIPELINE SPILLAGE NEAR FORT McMURRAY

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and it relates to pollution in the north. Would the minister investigate the destruction caused in the area of Fort McMurray by an oil pipeline burst spilling a large quantity of oil into the Athabasca River, which leads to Lake Athabasca and hence into the Mackenzie delta?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, we are investigating this matter and I will be glad to report to the hon. member as soon as I have a report from my department and the National Energy Board.

Mr. Woolliams: When the minister is having this situation investigated, would he be prepared to send government experts into the area to examine this problem with the idea of using the experience that may result from this destructive leakage in the pipeline and its effect on the ecology in the north?

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to consider that suggestion.

TAXATION

WHITE PAPER ON REFORM—DATE OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROPOSALS

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, may I direct my question to the Minister of Finance. Does the minister still hold to the timetable that the implementation of the tax changes proposed in the white paper must be completed by January 1, 1971?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I have said from the beginning that although that was the target date we were completely flexible about it. We wanted everybody to have the opportunity of being heard and to have ample time to draw good legislation when people have been heard.

COMMUNICATIONS

GRANT TO INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES TO BUILD ELECTRONIC COMPONENT MANUFACTURING PLANT

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Communications. In view of the minister's expressed interest in the development of a Canadian controlled computer and communications industry, would the minister inform the House whether he was consulted by the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion prior to his announcement of a $6 million grant to International Business Machines Corporation to build an electronic component manufacturing plant in Quebec?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The question as asked is not in order. It might be in order for the Order Paper; perhaps the hon. member would consider putting the question in writing on the Order Paper.

POLLUTION

OTTAWA RIVER—ACTION UNDER CANADA WATER ACT

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Now that Parliament has passed the Canada Water Act, which gives the government all the power it needs to deal with pollution, would the minister take the next opportunity on motions to outline what steps he and his department plan to take to clear up the massive pollution that one can see simply by looking at the Ottawa River from the back of the Parliament Buildings, pollution that is caused by industry dumping pollutants into that once clear body of water?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to consider that suggestion, but for the hon. member's information there is another part to Parliament, the Senate, which has not yet passed the bill.

Mr. Hees: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Have I the assurance of the minister that as soon as that august body passes the bill his department will get on with the job?

Mr. Speaker: Order. That question is hypothetical.

Inquiries of the Ministry

MIRAMICHI RIVER—PRESENCE OF TOXIC SUBSTANCES—PAYMENT FOR DAMAGE

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. In view of the statement made by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry on June 4 in the House that the department has already spent $500,000 to control toxicity from plant waste of Heath Steel Mines spilled into the Miramichi River, would the minister give the most recent figures on the amounts spent by the government in this area and inform the House whether the efforts of his department to clean up this pollution are having any effect?

Mr. Speaker: Order. Since the first question seeks detailed information I think it is the kind of question that should normally be placed on the Order Paper; I think the hon. member will agree with that.

Mr. Crouse: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question which I might put as my first question. Since the spillage of acids into the Miramichi was due to a construction fault in the piping of a private firm, is this firm going to pay for all the damage caused to the ecology and fisheries resources as well as for cleaning up the area?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): I certainly hope so, Mr. Speaker.

NATIONAL PARKS

CAPE BRETON HIGHLANDS—FUTURE DEVELOPMENT—HOLDING OF HEARINGS AT INGONISH

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. In view of the large-scale protestations from the local residents concerned in regard to the hearings on June 24 with reference to the future development of Cape Breton Highlands National Park, would the minister give consideration not only to holding hearings at Sydney but also at Ingonish in Victoria county, where the local residents would be most affected by any proposed changes?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I will see if it is possible. It has been decided that the hearings would be held in Sydney, and I think it is easy enough for people to get to that city. However, if it is

absolutely impossible for them to do so, perhaps we can arrange for a hearing on the site. Nevertheless, I would prefer the hearings to be held on neutral grounds such as the city of Sydney.

[*English*]

SHIPPING

WEST COAST TOWBOATS—MANNING AND SAFETY REGULATIONS

Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Transport. Since there has apparently been agreement between the parties involved regarding new proposals for manning and safety in the British Columbia towboat industry, is the minister planning to make these proposals public, as he indicated earlier?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I expect to do that tomorrow.

[*Translation*]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—PROVINCIAL CO-OPERATION IN APPLICATION OF SIX PER CENT WAGE INCREASE GUIDELINE

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Finance.

Having stated yesterday that the government supported the move of the Prices and Incomes Commission to set a limit of 6 per cent per year on wage increases and that the provinces have recognized the merits of that principle, can the minister tell us how the federal government intends to enforce that wage freeze if the provincial governments refuse to deal severely with those who will grant higher wage increases, as the Ontario government is doing at the present time?

[*English*]

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I do not think that any of the provincial governments have refused to co-operate with the wage guidelines policy put forward by Dr. Young.

AGRICULTURE

FARM MACHINERY—IMPLEMENTATION OF BARBER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. Would he make a statement on motions some time before the House recesses on June 26 indicating what progress the government has made with respect to the implementation of the various recommendations of the Barber Commission report in connection with high farm machinery costs and the escalating prices of farm machinery repairs?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): As I have pointed out on a number of occasions, the final report of the Barber Commission has not yet been submitted, and part of it will include an inquiry into the costs of both repair parts and services. Inasmuch as we have not received it yet—and I am not sure we will receive it by the end of this session—it would be difficult for me to give an undertaking that I would make a statement on the matter.

FINANCE

REMOVAL OF SALES TAX ON BUILDING MATERIALS

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): My question is for the Minister of Finance. In light of the 40 per cent decline in the construction industry this year, an industry which could provide many jobs, is the government considering the removal of the 11 per cent sales tax on building materials?

Mr. Speaker: This question was asked yesterday. Unless there is a change since yesterday, I would not think the question would be in order today.

Mr. McCleave: Perhaps I could phrase my question in this way: has the Minister of Finance carried out any studies weighing the benefits of having people earning salaries subject to income tax against the disadvantages of having an industry in a slump and not able to pay the 11 per cent sales tax on building materials?

Mr. Speaker: The supplementary question in its new form seems to be rather argumentative, but the minister might be allowed to reply.

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Yes, Mr. Speaker, we continuously look at what is happening in the economy. I should like to indicate, as I did yesterday, that if the government makes a change in its fiscal policy with respect to tax rates this would be announced in the House.

AIRPORTS

REDUCTION OF STOPOVER CHARGES AT CERTAIN POINTS—APPLICATION TO EDMONTON AND HALIFAX

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): My question is for the Minister of Transport. Could the minister indicate, in light of his announcement of greatly reduced technical stopover charges on flights in and out of Goose Bay, Gander and Ottawa, whether or not similar surveys are being conducted at the Edmonton and Halifax international airports?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Yes, Mr. Speaker, the study is comprehensive in its nature. These were the ones in which the airlines indicated they had their greatest interest. But I may also inform the hon. member that arrangements were completed today to spend about $1 million on the Halifax airport for additional baggage checking facilities and for paving the second runway so it will be ready for this kind of thing if it comes.

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, while the minister is being very eloquent with regard to what he is doing in Halifax, would he also see to it that Air Canada comes up with a few extra flights for Edmonton?

Mr. Jamieson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, one each for myself and the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

EXTENSION OF GANDER RUNWAYS

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): May I ask the Minister of Transport whether there are any immediate plans to extend the runways at Gander beyond the present 8,900 feet which does not permit the handling of large international traffic?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I respectfully suggest to the hon. member that this is a question which would normally appear on the Order Paper.

Mr. Lundrigan: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I recognize that St. Scholastique and Toronto are perhaps of greater importance in the international sphere, but certainly this question deserves an answer. It is an urgent matter for the east coast of Canada.

Mr. Speaker: I have no doubt that it is urgent and in view of the hon. member's comments it could be considered at the time of adjournment. That is the purpose of the Standing Order.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—PROPERTY TAX INCREASE IN MUNICIPALITY OF GLOUCESTER—REQUEST THAT MINISTER ATTEND MEETING

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): In view of the anticipated 25 per cent increase in property taxes in the Municipality of Gloucester, I wonder whether the minister along with Dr. Young will attend the meeting there tonight to explain to those people the 6 per cent guideline for restraint?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): There is nothing I would rather do than be there but it is physically impossible.

[*Translation*]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

MONTREAL—MEASURES TO PROVIDE EMPLOYMENT FOR DISPLACED CANADAIR WORKERS

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration.

We have heard that 2,700 Canadair workers in Montreal will soon be laid off. If the minister is aware of this situation, could he tell us if he has taken the necessary measures to provide jobs for these 2,700 people, or if he and his colleagues will make representations to foreign countries in order to negotiate aircraft construction contracts so as to neutralize the effects of this massive lay off?

Mr. Speaker: It seems to me that this question was asked a few days ago, roughly in the same terms.

Mr. Asselin: Mr. Speaker, would the minister say if he answered the question that was asked a few days ago?

Mr. Speaker: I believe an answer was given. Of course, I am not sure whether, in his mind, the hon. member was satisfied with the answer, but indeed the question has been asked.

[*English*]

HARBOURS

COME-BY-CHANCE, NFLD.—BENEFITS TO PROVINCE UNDER FEDERAL AGREEMENT TO BUILD WHARF

Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West): My question is directed to the Minister of Trans-

port. Has the minister's attention been drawn to a recent statement by an official of his department to the effect that the federal government agreement to build a $16 million wharf to serve the planned refinery at Come-By-Chance, Newfoundland, is contingent on certain additional benefits guaranteeing more revenue for the province of Newfoundland and, if so, what are the additional benefits?

Mr. Speaker: I would think that this question could be placed on the Order Paper. Again, if there is urgency I will not fail to ensure that it receives priority if the hon. member wants to have it considered at the time of adjournment.

Mr. Carter: The question is of very great importance to the province of Newfoundland because this refinery plays a very great part in the future economic prospects of that province and the future sources of employment. I think the minister was prepared to answer the question with your permission, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I hesitate to withdraw from the position I adopted a moment ago, but perhaps with agreement the minister might be allowed to reply.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I would call the hon. member's attention to your own ruling that a minister can only answer within the competence of his own department. I suggest that the question be directed to the Minister of Public Works when he is next in the House.

POST OFFICE

POSSIBLE NATIONAL STRIKE—ADJUSTMENT OF GOVERNMENT OFFER IN ORDER TO SETTLE DISPUTE

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the President of the Treasury Board. In view of a report that has been made public, since we were asking questions about the postal situation 10 or 15 minutes ago, to the effect that the negotiating team for the postal workers intends to stay in the bargaining room until a settlement is reached, will the government reconsider its position and make the kind of offer that might get this matter settled?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): The government side is also prepared to stay.

[Mr. Carter.]

FINANCE

INCREASED EQUALIZATION PAYMENTS TO PROVINCES

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to ask the Minister of Finance a question relating to the increase in equalization payments to the provinces of approximately $50 million during the current year which he announced over the weekend and to which he referred in the House yesterday. Does that include equalization payments to the province of Quebec?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Yes, Mr. Speaker, it covers all provinces receiving equalization payments. I do not have the breakdown in front of me. I believe my officials are in touch with the various provinces to indicate their calculations at present, and it is hoped that a final figure will be worked out very soon. As my hon. friend knows, statistics are continuously coming in with respect to equalization.

Mr. Stanfield: The Minister of Finance seems to have this matter somewhat on his conscience. Would he make available to us the statistical calculations upon which his figure is based?

Mr. Benson: I will take this up with officials in my department. As my hon. friend knows, having formerly been a premier, it is a very complicated calculation but I will provide him with information as soon as the final figures are calculated.

Mr. Stanfield: Would the minister not agree that when he gives a figure to the House it should be one that he is able to support with existing statistical information?

Mr. Benson: Based on our present estimates the figure is correct and we think it will be in the area I indicated to the provinces. The additional money that is going to the provinces is not on my conscience. I think they really need it.

TAXATION

WHITE PAPER ON REFORM—USE OF CERTAIN FACTORS AS JUSTIFICATION FOR WITHDRAWAL OR REVISION

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Finance to the one asked earlier by the member for Dauphin about the timetable for implementation of the white paper on tax reform. Regardless of any basic objections to

the white paper that come from this side of the House or from other Canadians, is it not a fact that the unpegging of the dollar, the shaky stock market and provincial objections are going to be used as reasons for the federal government to withdraw in total or revise in part the proposals in the white paper before the committee reports?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, since the white paper was issued I have continuously said that we want submissions from all interested parties. Submissions are coming in, and of course they will receive consideration.

Mr. Nowlan: That really was not my question. You have got all the submissions you can handle, in fact more than the committee can handle because it has imposed a time limit. My question was, are the factors of the unpegging of the dollar, the shaky stock market, and the recent provincial objections on top of all the other objections going to be used by the government as reasons to withdraw in toto or revise in part the proposals before the committee reports?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, the proposals are before the committee. I have said that there will be revisions. I will be appearing before the committee before it finishes its work, and I will be indicating our feelings with respect to various matters to the committee, to aid its members in coming to a conclusion. I do not think any of the factors the hon. member mentioned should argue against developing a tax system which is fair and equitable in Canada.

[*Translation*]

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Prime Minister.

Since a number of members of the Quebec Assembly have hesitated a long time to take the oath of allegiance to the Queen and since the premier of Quebec has stated that the matter of changing this tradition would be discussed during this session, would the Prime Minister tell the House whether he has discussed this matter with the premier of Quebec or if the federal government has any objections to changing this tradition?

Mr. Speaker: I fail to see in what way this question comes under the administrative jurisdiction of this government or even that of the Prime Minister, but he may wish to answer the hon. member's question.

[*English*]

ELECTIONS

INQUIRY AS TO APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY REFORM OF EXPENSE SYSTEM

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the President of the Privy Council. Are steps being taken to constitute the special committee to study reform of the election expenses system as recommended by the Barbeau committee?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I had put forward for comment and suggestion a draft order of reference to be made by the House, and I must confess I have not had an opportunity to consult back on it. I understand there were some objections to it, but I hope to consult within the next day or two so that notice can be given of it and it can be placed on the Order Paper.

NATIONAL PARKS

BONNE BAY, NFLD.—PROGRESS OF DISCUSSIONS

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Could he indicate what progress is being made and when he expects an agreement to be signed between the province of Newfoundland and his department with the regard to the estabalishment of the Bonne Bay park in western Newfoundland?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, the federal government's position is still the same, and we are prepared to sign an agreement with the government of Newfoundland for the development of a second national park. On the other hand, we must wait until that province has set the boundaries of the land to be used for that purpose before we may enter into the agreement.

We hope that the agreement will be finalized within a few months.

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REINSTATEMENT OF SUGAR REBATE TO CARIBBEAN COUNTRIES

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question was to have been directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs but since he is not in the House may I direct this timely question to the Prime Minister. Would he please state to the House whether his government plans to reinstate the sugar rebate to the Caribbean?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): To reinstate what?

Mr. Paproski: To reinstate the rebate on sugar to the Caribbean.

Mr. Trudeau: I will take the question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Paproski: Would the Prime Minister please see if he can sweeten up the pot a little?

COMMUNICATIONS

INTERFERENCE AND OVERLAPPING ON SHORT-WAVE RADIO BANDS

Mr. William Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. Has his department received representations regarding the allocation and policing of shortwave radio bands used for intercommunication by police, industry and Great Lakes ships?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): I will have to make some inquiries, Mr. Speaker. I do not know of my own personal knowledge.

Mr. Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand): While the minister is looking into this, would he also ascertain what steps are being taken to rectify the considerable problem of interference and overlapping on these radio bands?

Mr. Jamieson: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

POST OFFICE

POSSIBLE NATIONAL STRIKE—COMPONENTS OF SIX PER CENT WAGE INCREASE GUIDELINE

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the President of the Treasury Board whether or not the 6 per cent guideline as imposed or as applied in connection with negotiations in the Post Office includes a calculation of what are normally considered to be fringe benefits? In other words, does the 6 per cent increase include a calculation of the monetary value of fringe benefits in addition to any wage increase, or is it simply the wage or salary increase?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I think the suggestion mady by Dr. Young was that the 6 per cent figure should include all wage and monetary fringe benefits.

AIR TRANSPORT

ROUTES GRANTED TO TRANSAIR—REVIEW OF DECISION BY CANADIAN TRANSPORT COMMISSION

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Transport. On April 14 he indicated he had received three appeals concerning the granting of a franchise to Transair for routes from Toronto to Winnipeg via Sault Ste. Marie. What action has he taken with regard to these appeals, has he reached any decision, and if there are documents available would he be prepared to table them?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Yes, Mr. Speaker, a judgment was issued last week in the normal course. I understand it is not normal to table such documents in the House although I would be glad to do that. The gist of them was an instruction to the CTC to review the matter and hold public hearings by September or certainly prior to the start of the fall schedule of the airlines concerned.

TRANSPORT

MARITIME PROVINCES—PUBLICATION OF REPORT OF FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL COMMITTEE

Mr. Charles H. Thomas (Moncton): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport and is a follow-up to a question asked him on May 22 with reference to the publication of the first report of the federal-provincial committee on transportation in the Maritimes. Has the minister had a chance to consult his provincial counterparts? If so, has he had their clearance and when may we expect publication of this report?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I made inquiries of the provinces. I am not sure whether all of

the answers are back, but I think the gist of the report has already been made public. I held meetings with the trucking association in the Atlantic provinces last week and they made some proposals to us relating to the recommendations in this report and they are being examined. I will look into the matter still further and if there is any impediment to releasing the report I will be glad to look into that so that my hon. friend can have it.

Mr. Thomas (Moncton): Is the committee still meeting and, if so, has the minister been in consultation with reference to further recommendations coming from them?

Mr. Jamieson: The committee is still meeting with regard to the proposals they have already advanced to us. They are discussing those with us. It is my intention to invite the provinces and incidentally, to add the province of Quebec, to maintain this as an ongoing committee. I hope they will accept.

[*Translation*]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

MONTREAL—MEASURES TO PROVIDE EMPLOYMENT FOR DISPLACED CANADAIR WORKERS —NOTICE OF MASS LAY-OFFS

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Before proceeding to orders of the day, I think that the hon. member for Charlevoix is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Asselin: Yes, Mr. Speaker. As you said a moment ago, my question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration concerning Canadair has actually been directed to the Minister of Labour who referred it to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, as reported at page 7680 of *Hansard*.

I asked that question in order to determine what the minister and the government intend to do in order to prevent the forthcoming lay-off of many workers at Canadair, as a result of a lack of work.

[*English*]

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member I would want to tell him my officers have been in touch with this situation for some time. They have made available for services of the department to the workers to be affected. If there are any further details I will be happy to look at the record and advise the hon. member later.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Asselin: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary question.

Would the minister be prepared to ask his officials to check whether the province will enforce his legislation so that every employer who wishes to make mass lay-offs has to give a 90-day notice? In other words, will the officials of his department check whether that notice has been given to the province by Canadair?

[*English*]

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to inquire and advise the hon. member of the notice that has been given about these proposed lay-offs.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, may I rise on a point of order. The Minister of Justice, Mr. Speaker, moved first reading yesterday of a bill to amend terms and conditions of the Criminal Code as it relates to bail, and he has given quite a news release on it. We have not yet received the bill. It would seem to me, when the minister gives out these public statements, that surely the opposition and all Members of Parliament—it is really a question of privilege—should at least have the bill to be able to examine the terms and conditions to see if what the minister had to say was pure windowdressing or represented real amendments.

Mr. Speaker: I will look into the matter raised by the hon. member for Calgary North. I have no information on whether the bill is available for distribution. Obviously it should be. The proper steps will be taken to give effect to the hon. member's suggestion.

• (3:00 p.m.)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

ARCTIC WATERS POLLUTION PREVENTION ACT

PROVISIONS RESPECTING DEPOSIT OF WASTE, PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS OF WORKS, SHIPPING SAFETY CONTROL ZONES, ETC.

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development) moved that Bill C-202, to prevent pollution of areas of the Arctic waters adjacent to the mainland and islands of the Canadian Arctic, be now read the third time and do pass.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have the opportunity to make some comments now, and later to move an amendment which has already been moved at the report stage but which Your Honour felt would be better moved at third reading. I make these comments because of the unavoidable absence of the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt), who has done such a notable and yeoman service to this House and the country by his contributions on this subject both in the House and in committee.

It is not my intention to delay this bill since it is designed to prevent pollution of the Arctic waters adjacent to the mainland and the islands of the Canadian Arctic. We unanimously recorded our vote in support of this bill in April. I should like to think that was a great day for Canada, a day when Canadians stood together and in effect said to the rest of the world, "We are not satisfied that international law can safeguard the delicate ecology of the north, and until it can and does we have to take affairs into our own hands".

In recent times in this House and outside we have heard the Post Office described as a sleeping giant, though possibly the Postmaster General (Mr. Kierans) may not wish to make that comment at the present time. We have heard the Arctic described as a sleeping giant, and I might as well go on record as saying that the world is a sleeping giant when it comes to the question of pollution. But when even this government and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) can rub the sleep out of their eyes, then perhaps in the refreshing dawn of enlightenment the world can take encouragement that people everywhere will be sufficiently roused so that in the future countries like Canada will not be forced to take the law into their own hands to deal with pollution. This is what Canada is doing now in this bill.

It is unfortunate that we have been forced into this action. I hope that our concern will act as an example to the rest of the world, and that man may soon cry for a halt in his race to self-destruction through pollution and environmental breakdown. I believe, as do other members of our party, that our legislation respecting pollution is a patchwork and crazy quilt effort. Because of this it is desirable, indeed imperative, to bring all efforts and measures to combat pollution under the coordination of one department or agency which, in keeping with the governmental language of the 1970's could be called Environment Canada.

[Mr. Chrétien.]

This piece of legislation, Bill C-202, originated with the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. We have other legislation involving the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, the Department of Fisheries and Forestry, the Department of Transport as well as other departments that wish to get into the act. There are too many holes in Canada's antipollution net and I, for one, do not wish to be shunted from one minister to another minister, from one department to another department and from one bureaucrat to another bureaucrat, to find out who is doing what, when and how to control and combat the pollution menace. I wish to see one minister responsible, one department involved. I wish to know that our questions may be directed to him and that the concern of the people of Canada may be made known to that minister and his department or agency.

The world has reached a stage when scientists question our very future and predict possible environmental breakdown. This stage has been reached because there has been no global vision; even now it may be too late, but I believe we must project ourselves into the future if only to build our defences against any possible catastrophe that may eventually overtake all of us.

We have discussed at length the sovereignty issue. The history of events in this House, and statements made by the Prime Minister and others outside the House, indicate beyond the shadow of a doubt that the government has been and is reluctant to make any clear, unequivocal statement regarding Canada's traditional claims to possession of the lands, waters and ice of the Arctic. I do not understand why there needs to be or why there should be such a mental block. I do not understand why even the Prime Minister, in announcing this piece of legislation, found it necessary to say, and I quote:

> This is the first bit of legislation—it is not an assertion of sovereignty, it is an exercise of our desire to keep the Arctic free of pollution and by defining 100 miles as the zone within which we are determined to act, we are indicating that our assertion there is not one aimed toward sovereignty but aimed toward one of the very important aspects of our action in the Arctic.

My hope is that the government will make a strong statement on the Arctic sovereignty issue. Perhaps it has that in mind and that was the reason the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) made his statement in this House on April 16. I shall refer to this later when I put my amendment

before the House. We did have this alternative, Mr. Speaker. Leading statesmen of this country, prime ministers and ministers charged with departmental responsibility have, over a period of 80 years or more, made statements which indicate beyond any possible doubt that this country does have sovereignty, within the meaning of the word, over the islands, the waters and the ice of the Arctic.

I should like to think, Mr. Speaker, that far more good could have come about, not from legislation in this form with its complexities, its hesitations, and its refusal to make clearly and certainly the claims which have been asserted, but from the simple reassertion of our claim. It was more than a year ago that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), myself and hon. members from the New Democratic Party began to press the government and the Prime Minister to make this clear, simple reassertion, that we continue to claim what we have always claimed in the past.

I should like to think that if the government had brought a joint resolution reasserting that fact into this House and the other place over a year ago, it would have had the unanimous support of this House and the other place as well as the citizens of Canada. At that time, when it was so very important, the government would have been able to present to the United States and other countries involved, the fact that Canadians stood together in reasserting their claim to uninhibited an unlimited sovereignty over the islands of the Arctic, the waters between the islands and the waters between the mainland and the islands.

I think that simple declaration, passed as it would have been without hindrance or objection in this House, would have been a most impressive document so far as the world is concerned instead of this miserable, puling attitude which the government has taken. We supported the legislation because we had no other choice, and because we had no other opportunity to assert in legislative form what we thought ought to have been brought forward. But I venture to say that if our ideas had been accepted, this country would have had a much more potent weapon with which to approach international negotiations.

• (3:10 p.m.)

Despite what has been said, and I will not traverse ground that has been gone over before because these matters have been debated in the House and in committee as well as throughout the country, we do not know what the government's position is with regard to certain of the waters between and around the Archipelago in the Arctic. Does it have a claim with regard to territorial sovereignty? Does it assert that claim because these waters are part of the maritime belt and constitute the territorial waters of Canada? Does the legislation claim that these are the internal waters of Canada or must we assume, from a certain vagueness of attitude, that there is a considerable vacuum with regard to certain of these waters.

Let me make it plain that more is involved than the mere question of waters, important though the question of waters is. The 1958 convention at Geneva, a convention to which this country is not a signatory, involved very important issues. If these are territorial waters, there is one position to be taken; if they are internal waters, there is another position to be taken. What about the passage of nuclear submarines, whether on the surface or under the waters of the Arctic? If these are internal waters, no foreign submarine may go through the waters because the sovereignty of Canada over these internal waters will clearly permit Canada to prevent passage of such submarines. If they are territorial waters, then there is a limited right on the part of Canada, as there is on the part of any coastal state, to say that there may be innocent passage only. Innocent passage has been defined as relating not to the character of the vessel but to the character of the passage. The same thing applies to the air above the waters. If they are territorial waters, there are certain rights which the coastal state may exercise.

It is all very well, for example, for the United States to make allegations, as it did recently in this controversy, about the high seas and the rights of nations. I am not being overly critical of the United States, but I can recall that when the United States felt its territorial security was threatened by the establishment of missile bases in Cuba, it did not hesitate for one moment to lay down a rule of quarantine that prohibited the passage of vessels of a country with which the United States was not at war through certain waters which can only be characterized as being part of the high seas. I do not criticize the United States. It felt its security was threatened. But I think it is somewhat hypocritical of the United States now to challenge not only the very limited nature of this bill but all that

has been done to establish the unchallengeable supremacy of our sovereignty in the area. This is very important. Consequently, the bill leaves more questions unanswered than are answered.

The Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development, an all party committee, brought down one of the finest reports that the House has seen during the present session. It went north to study the situation, heard witnesses and heard legal opinions. It established beyond doubt something that all Canadians know: that Canada now has and always has had sovereignty in the area, a sovereignty established by every possible test of occupation and usage. We have provided services for the people. Also, since that area is contiguous to and part of the continental shelf of North America, it belongs to that part of North America which constitutes the closest national state. I submit that international law says that our sovereignty cannot be challenged. Former Prime Minister Lester Pearson, an expert in his own right in international affairs, made this categorical assertion in Edmonton a few months ago.

The purport of our amendment is clear. I think the government would have been much more successful if it had not attempted to be so devious. I think the present course was forced on the Prime Minister and the government because they waited too long. They were too timorous. Only when they were finally goaded into acting did they come forward with this legislation. If the government had brought forward a resolution one year ago asserting our claim to sovereignty in the area, we could have avoided the problems that I envisage will haunt us.

I like to think that this country will gain and hold the respect of others; that it will become a leader of nations by setting an example that the use of force is not necessary, and in this way more and more people in the world will live in peace and in harmony with one another. I think the ultimate settlement of this problem must be through an international conference, a conference of the nations which are involved in the Arctic particularly, but which would not exclude other nations. Because of what has happened and is happening in the Arctic, special and unique problems have arisen.

I know that discussions are going on with regard to meetings, but I do not know how far they have progressed. I think that the Soviet Union, the United States, the Scandinavian countries, including Iceland, and this country must necessarily be parties to such conference. I do not think we ought to exclude other parties, because the future promises great things as a result of a co-operative method of developing and using the north. I should like to bring something to the minister's attention. Perhaps he could comment on it when he participates in the debate. Beginning on June 28, there is to be a conference in Malta under the chairmanship of Mrs. Elisabeth Mann Borgese, the daughter of the famous novelist Thomas Mann, entitled "Pacem in Maribus". It is not a conference which, as I understand it, is being sponsored by nations; it is being sponsored by individuals, which I think will be very useful. It will clarify certain complex matters relating to the oceans. If ever there was an important matter to which the public's attention ought to be directed, I submit that this is it. The conference hopes to establish some kind of continuing body which may feed information to the United Nations committee on peaceful uses of the seabed.

• (3:20 p.m.)

I wish to quote from an interesting article which appeared in the June 3 issue of *The Christian Science Monitor:*

> It is not practical, says Mrs. Borgese, to think of handling these questions separately—for example, to start out with a single problem, such as pollution.
>
> "A group of nations, of course, could go together on a specific pollution issue," she says, "and every move in this direction is welcome. But if you take the pollution issue as a whole, on a global basis, it divides the developed from the developing nations."
>
> (The role of the third world, or underdeveloped nations, is the biggest political issue confronting the United Nations seabed committee.)
>
> "In fact," says Mrs. Borgese, "we don't have a strong East-West ideological division here. The Soviet Union and the United States see eye to eye on the problem. It's really between the developed and the developing nations."

I presume that this country will be represented. If there are no plans for representation now, I hope that steps will be taken to see that we are represented. I do not know whether there is an intention to send a parliamentary delegation. A small group from the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development could participate in this meeting. Such participation might have some useful purpose and aid the deliberations of this House.

I do not know what tomorrow holds. Your Honour does not know what tomorrow holds.

In this fast moving world, no one can predict the future. Of course, with this government we know we are going to have inflation in this country for a long time. Forty years ago we did not know that man would be blasting off to the moon in our time, that man would have devastated cities and Pacific islands with nuclear explositions, that man would be communicating via space satellite, that man would be threatening to pollute himself out of existence, that man would be transplanting human hearts, and a hundred and one other marvels and evils we have seen in our time.

How can anyone stand up today and say what will happen in the future? The only certainty, it seems, is that the population of the world will double in approximately 30 years. We know that the problems of today, if not checked or overcome, will be compounded. Beyond that, we cannot even guess. If we look at the vast uncharted space of the Arctic, can we deny with certainty that it will not be used for all the evil intentions of man? Is it too far removed from reality to suggest that it will become the next nuclear testing ground? Will it become the garbage dump for nerve gases and other toxic materials that cannot be allowed within a thousand miles of our cities? Will it be the no man's land of the next war to end all wars?

Will there be a population shift to the Arctic just as there was from Europe and Asia to North America and Australasia? If it is not feasible to bring the resources from the Arctic to the present centres of population, is it not better to move the people north to be near those resources? I am not talking about today, but about the future and no one can say today that these things will not happen. Will the Arctic become ringed with great domed cities where man will survive in a controlled environment? Of course we cannot say what is to happen. But I like to look to Canada as being a country that is to lead the world into the 21st century.

In order that this country may attend international conferences armed with the strongest possible weapons, I propose to move this amendment. It may not conform to all the requirements and rigidities of our present procedures. I propose to quote statements made in this House by the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp). I hope, in light of these statements, that the government will be willing to accept this amendment. When referring to this bill on April 16, 1970, the Secretary of State for External Affairs said:

> This bill aims at meeting a real and imminent problem and provides for the exercise of a limited form of jurisdiction. This exercise of jurisdiction for the purposes of pollution control can in no way be construed to be inconsistent with a claim of sovereignty over the waters between the islands or otherwise. Similarly, the exercise of sovereignty over an area of the sea extending 12 miles from shore in accordance with the provision embodied in another bill that will shortly be under discussion cannot be said to be inconsistent with a claim to sovereignty beyond 12 miles.

We fear that close and detailed study of this bill has suggested ambiguities and invited doubts. We fear that the principles of the bill might well be inconsistent with the principle that unequivocal and specific sovereignty exists. I do not always agree with the Secretary of State for External Affairs. This is one of the few occasions when I have accepted his words. I, therefore, move:

> That all the words after "now" be left out and there be substituted therefor the words "re-committed to the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development with an instruction to amend the bill by adding thereto, immediately after clause 27 thereof, page 23, the following:
>
> "Savings
>
> 28. Nothing in this act shall in any way be construed to be inconsistent with Canada's rightful claim of sovereignty in and over water, ice and land areas of the Arctic regions between the degrees of longitude 60 and longitude 141."
>
> and by renumbering clause 28 of the bill, page 23, as clause 29.

I like to think that long after we have gone there will be those who will remember this Parliament for having assumed responsibility over the Canadian Arctic, not only for the sake of Canadians but for the world, in the name of responsible development of the north and of humanity everywhere.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is the President of the Privy Council rising with reference to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Peace River? The Chair has reservations about the acceptability of the motion proposed by the hon. member for Peace River. If this is the purpose of the minister, I wish to hear him.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): It is on the question of order only, not the question of substance. The point of order was raised by my colleague, the hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Forest), and in a moment he will be referring to the authorities in more detail. The basic point is that the bill does not deal with the question of sovereignty in any sense,

but deals with pollution control. The substance of the argument is that the question of territorial sovereignty does not arise in any way in the bill. Therefore, the subject matter is beyond the bill and for that purpose the amendment is not relevant. I wish to emphasize that the bill, as the House knows, among other things gives the government control of shipping within a distance of 100 miles of the Canadian territorial waters. By that provision alone, it should be evident that the question of sovereignty is not raised in this bill.

• (3:30 p.m.)

It is purely a question of pollution control jurisdiction. The bill does not say that Canada claims sovereignty over an area of the high seas a hundred miles beyond Canadian territorial waters. The government would make it clear that, in taking a position against the acceptability of the amendment, on procedural grounds it is taking no position with respect to the various arguments the hon. member put forward on the question of sovereignty. This is an important question. The hon. member seems to think that the protection of the Arctic would be brought about by a simple resolution of both Houses of Parliament. The government takes a different view, believing that pollution can best be prevented and controlled in Arctic waters by a bill of the kind now before the House creating an administrative regime and providing for criminal penalties. The position we take on the amendment is that not only would it delay the passage of the bill but that it would go beyond the scope of the bill as adopted on second reading, and we therefore submit it should not be accepted. My colleague the hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Forest) will be elaborating on this point and referring to the authorities.

Mr. Baldwin: I do not propose at this stage to go into all the technical aspects of the amendment. I simply appeal to the minister, and to the minister piloting the bill through the House, to take into consideration the fact that this amendment does not purport to assert any claim to sovereignty over and above that which Canada already asserts. It is simply a saving clause. If I may use an expression common in the legal profession, it is one which makes it clear that the bill is without prejudice to the maintenance of those claims which Canada has, in the past, asserted. It is advanced in the honest belief that if you have a valid and reasonable claim and you fail to re-assert that claim in any document or deed relating to it, you might be held to have repudiated what you had claimed in the past. All the amendment purports to do is to say that no language or proposals in the bill shall be deemed to constitute by Canada an abandonment of claims which have been made in the past. If the government cannot accept this simple amendment, I have no great hope for what they intend to do in our north.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I should like to deal briefly with the acceptability of the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) and which is very much similar to the one which the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) introduced Wednesday last, at the report stage. The Chair then expressed some reservations on the acceptability of the amendment.

Contrary to what the hon. member for Peace River said a while ago, I do not believe that the amendment is more in order on third reading than at the report stage. The hon. member for Oxford appreciated it, I believe, when he withdrew his amendment. However, another attempt is now being made on third reading.

Wednesday last, that is on June 3, some hon. members started building up procedural arguments and I simply wish to complete the list of the recognized authorities on amendments, particularly those introduced on third reading. I should like, for instance, to refer the Chair to pages 571 and 572 of May's *Parliamentary Practice,* and I quote:

[*English*]

The procedure on the third reading of a bill is similar to that described in relation to the second reading, but the debate is more restricted at the later stage, being limited to the matters contained in the bill.

[*Translation*]

I skip a few sentences to come to the end of the citation. I quote:

[*English*]

As the debate on third reading should be confined to the contents of the bill reasoned amendments which raise matters not included, in the provisions of the bill are not permissible.

[*Translation*]

I shall not read the summary of that question in full but only two paragraphs of Beau-

chesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, 4th edition. I should like to quote paragraphs 1 and 3 of citation 203 which read as follows:

It is an imperative rule that every amendment must be relevant to the question on which the amendment is proposed. Every amendment proposed to be made either to a question or to a proposed amendment should be so framed that if agreed to by the House the question or amendment as amended would be intelligible and consistent with itself.

And I now quote paragraph 3:

An amendment setting forth a proposition dealing with a matter which is foreign to the proposition involved in the main motion is not relevant and cannot be moved.

I shall quote now citation 406 which sums up the rules regarding amendments to public bills:

Amendments are out of order if they are

(a) irrelevant to the bill, or beyond its scope, governed by or dependant upon amendments already negatived;

I shall quote now citation 418:

All amendments which may be moved on a second reading of a bill may be moved on the third reading with the restriction that they cannot deal with any matter which is not contained in the bill.

I do not want to extend my remarks any longer. I think that the Chair is well aware of the rules of procedure about amendments to bills on third reading. Now, it seems obvious to me that the amendment, as introduced, brings in a new element. It raises the issue of sovereignty in a bill dealing with pollution and the means which the government may use, under this legislation, in order to prevent pollution in Arctic waters. Therefore, it is not consistent with the aims of the bill now before us.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) has proposed to the House by way of amendment to the motion for third reading of Bill C-202, now before the House, the following motion:

That all the words after "now" be left out and there be substituted therefor the words "re-committed to the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development with an instruction to amend the bill by adding thereto, immediately after clause 27 thereof, page 23, the following:

28. Nothing in this act shall in any way be construed to be inconsistent with Canada's rightful claim to sovereignty in and over water, ice and land areas of the Arctic regions between the degrees of longitude 60 and longitude 141.

and by renumbering clause 28 of the bill, page 23, as clause 29."

The arguments put forward by the hon. member in support of the acceptability of his motion are interesting, but I have some doubt as to whether it would be in order for the Chair to accept them. According to my understanding, the hon. member has proposed by way of amendment a motion instructing the committee to insert a declaration of principle asserting Canadian sovereignty over the Arctic. He indicates this is being done in a negative way as a saving clause, but even if it is done in this way it seems to me the hon. member is going beyond the terms of the bill.

There has been protracted discussion on this point ever since the bill was introduced for second reading—questions as to whether this was an antipollution bill or a sovereignty bill—and the hon. member for Peace River, together with a number of his hon. friends, proposed that it should be changed in such a way as to go beyond the terms of the proposed legislation before the House. As the hon. member who has just spoken pointed out, this amendment was proposed originally by the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) in practically the same terms as are used in the one which is now under discussion, and the Chair expressed reservations at the time. I doubt very much whether the amendment should be accepted in those terms. It does seem, if only indirectly, to seek to bring within the four corners of the bill a declaration of a principle which, to my way of thinking, is not there at the present time.

I have been referred to citation 418 of Beauchesne's fourth edition as follows:

All amendments which may be moved on a second reading of a bill may be moved on the third reading with the restriction that they cannot deal with any matter which is not contained in the Bill.

• (3:40 p.m.)

I fail to see how I could ignore this long standing precedent and say that the hon. member's amendment, which does seek to introduce a new declaration of principle, is acceptable.

I would also refer hon. members to the very cogent and learned ruling of the Deputy Speaker reported in *Votes and Proceedings* for June 4, page 937, when a similar amendment was proposed for the consideration of the House. The learned and respected Deputy Speaker referred the House to Beauchesne's fourth edition, particularly citation 418, and also to May's seventeenth edition, page 572. I suspect that this is where the hon. members who have participated in the debate got their

wisdom and knowledge. I would find it difficult to disagree with a ruling so clearly expressed by the learned Deputy Speaker, and I am honoured to have the opportunity to confirm the ruling that he made at that time and to say that it applies on all fours to the situation we now have.

I regret, in the circumstances, that the motion proposed by the hon. member for Peace River cannot be put to the House.

Mr. Doug Rowland (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, this is the first occasion on which I have risen in the House and felt a little fear and trepidation. Having just learned of the sterling qualities of the Deputy Speaker, I am rather abashed at having to speak in his presence. I wanted to indicate the wholehearted support of the New Democratic Party for the subject matter incorporated in this bill, as we have indicated on other occasions. I also wanted to take a moment to endorse the remarks made by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), and I will not attempt to duplicate his eloquence in expressing his aspirations for the development of northern Canada, aspirations which I am sure all of us share.

There seem to be some matters related to this bill which should be drawn to the attention of hon. members before it receives third reading and passage through this House. It would seem to those of us in the New Democratic Party that a logical companion piece to legislation establishing a 100-mile pollution control zone in the Arctic would be legislation establishing a similar zone for the east and west coasts of this country. I also submit that the establishment of these zones represents and even more immediate need on the part of Canada, in terms of protecting our maritime environment, than do parallel provisions for the Arctic waters.

There exists at the present time off our east and west coasts a clear and present danger from the devastating effects of pollution, as the wreck of the *Arrow* off Cape Breton Island amply illustrates. In this regard I should like to cite the statement made to the Commons by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) during the debate on the committee report on Arctic sovereignty. In opening his speech, the minister said that the "totality" of the pollution problem in the world today was a more serious and immediate problem than the potentiality of pollution in Canada's northern areas, since given even the greatest possible technological advances, and even if the decision were made to employ ships for the transportation of oil through northern waters, it appeared that it would be some time—according to the minister, perhaps years—before such voyages could be accomplished.

Nevertheless, and somewhat inexplicably, the minister has supported the wholly commendable action of establishing a 100-mile pollution control zone in the Arctic. At the same time he describes, to use his own words, the "strongly emotional and appealing" approach of taking unilateral action on the matter with respect to our east and west coasts as being in many ways futile in the face of overwhelming opposition by other countries. I suspect that the main thrust of the government's reluctance to incorporate provisions in this bill to establish a 100-mile pollution control zone along our east and west coasts is based on just the sort of argument that was mustered by the Minister of Transport in his speech during the debate on Arctic sovereignty. That is to say, the government believes that because of overwhelming international opposition any such attempt would be futile.

I should like to submit two sets of counter arguments to the approach taken by the government. The first set of counter arguments is based on international law as it stands today; the second set is based on the practicalities of the situation. First, I should like to examine this idea of pollution control zones off our east and west coasts in the light of existing international law. The existing body of international law is composed largely of custom, multi-national accords, agreements, conventions and treaties. But a very strong case has been made on numerous occasions for the use of unilateral national action as a spur to the development of international law.

In this regard, I should like to quote two or three passages from a statement made by three professors of international law from the faculty of law of the University of Toronto, Dean R. St. J. MacDonald, Professor Gerald L. Morris and Professor Douglas M. Johnson. These professors described Canada's action in establishing a pollution control zone in the Arctic as an "initiative of striking importance and relevance in the context of dynamic, creative development of international law". They went on to say:

> It exemplifies the unavoidable resort to unilateral action by a national government faced by the inability of the international community to remedy a critical situation affecting its essential interests.

Let me take a moment or two to provide hon. members with some background to the

subject of international action in respect to pollution by oil from ships, since it has relevance to what I am saying. International concern with the problem can probably be traced to the Washington conference of 1926, but the main progress in establishing international standards in this area has taken place since the second world war. The main responsibility has rested with the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization, although other agencies of the United Nations have been concerned in a peripheral way.

In 1954 an Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization convention laid down penalties for pollution of coastal waters through the discharge of oil by international shipping within a 50-mile maritime zone. A 1962 IMCO convention extended this zone to 100 miles. The shortcoming in both conventions, which this legislation we are now debating takes into consideration, was that they permitted the state affected to take action only after the release of the oil. There was no provision in the conventions for a state to take preventative action. Moreover, only a minority of nations have ratified these two IMCO agreements.

At the Brussels conference of IMCO in November 1969, the Canadian delegation, to its eternal credit, argued very forcefully for the establishment of a convention offering an effective method of environmental protection for coastal states. The delegation, however, was unable to persuade a significant number of states involved in the conference to support its position. It was within this context that I believe the Canadian government finally decided, and in my opinion entirely justifiably, to take unilateral action in respect to pollution control in Arctic waters.

• (3:50 p.m.)

In the document by the three Toronto law professors to which I referred earlier, Canada's action in preparing the legislation on Arctic waters which is before the House was explained in the following words:

> Finally, the Canadian government decided to take unilateral action in the expectation that its proposed legislation would meet critical national needs in the Arctic and at the same time galvanize the international community into a realistic study of the dangers and problems involved. It was believed that these dangers and problems had developed with a speed that international law has been unable to match.

It continues:

> The Canadian initiative should be seen, we believe, as the result of two kinds of failures in the international community: the failure of international law to develop first order principles to govern the protection of maritime environments, and the failure of shipping, industrial and other user states to negotiate agreements for the establishment of institutions, procedures and administrative rules to deal with the problems of risk bearing and distribution of loss in the light of greatly magnified pollution hazards.

I should like to cite one other highly relevant passage from the statement by the three Toronto professors of international law. Their statement presents the following argument:

> Although the international law of the sea provides no exact precedent for the unilateral action of the Canadian government, it is easy to discover highly relevant principles underlying widely accepted practices, claims and decisions. The 1958 Geneva conference on the law of the sea confirmed the general acceptance of the concept of a contiguous zone, within which the coastal state may exercise exclusive authority for limited, designated purposes in a zone within modest limits and contiguous to a narrowly conceived territorial sea. The concept was accepted, no doubt, not only because the limits of the contiguous zone were modest, but more specifically because they were appropriate to the problems and functions envisaged. It may therefore be argued that a pollution zone is not less acceptable because of spatially less modest limits if these limits are wholly appropriate to the problems of pollution and the function of environment control.

It was undoubtedly with arguments of this kind in mind that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) made the following statement, which was quoted in a recent issue of "International Canada". He said:

> We are ready for the opening of the Canadian Arctic for development, and that development is one of our great national objectives. It is with this in mind that we have stressed the desirability of keeping the Arctic waters open for innocent passage. We will do what is necessary for this purpose.
>
> We do not believe that the passage of ships which threaten the destruction or deterioration of the coastal environment can be considered innocent under any interpretation of international law. We have made clear to the world that while Canada welcomes the use of the Arctic waters as a transportation route for the vessels of all flags, the Canadian government will ensure that these waters are used for peaceful purposes and by ships complying with required safety standards.

In short, it can be argued with a good deal of force that the action Canada proposed to take in establishing a pollution control zone in the Arctic, far from representing an unacceptable infringement of the principles of international law, represents a welcome and invaluable initiative in that field. The government obviously accepts this position. If that is true of the Arctic waters where commercial traffic is non-existent, except on an experimental basis at this moment, how much more

true is it of the waters off the east and west coasts of our country?

There is in existence now off our east and west coasts a clear and present danger of great damage being done to Canada's marine environment and coastline from pollution by oil from ships. The danger far exceeds that in the north, despite the special ecological conditions which apply in the north, and despite the additional navigational hazards represented in the north by Arctic ice, because of the immense volume of traffic in the waters off Canada's east and west coasts. The danger confronting us has been emphasized by the director of the Science Council of Canada, Dr. Patrick McTaggart-Cowan, who is heading the task force charged with the responsibility of cleaning up the oil spill from the tanker *Arrow* in Chedabucto Bay. Dr. McTaggart-Cowan said, in somewhat unparliamentary language but very expressively:

> This flags of convenience business is one of the sloppiest damn things I ever saw. If the commercial airlines ran their business like the tankers do, you'd be crashing a DC8 every week and the world would say "stop it".

The dangers confronting us have also been emphasized by such maritime disasters as the wreck of the *Torrey Canyon* off the coast of the United Kingdom and the wreck of the *Arrow* off Cape Breton Island. Therefore, the practical situation confronting us, the obvious dangers inherent in the operation of large numbers of inadequately constructed and equipped tankers off our east and west coasts, demands that Canada, for her own protection, take the same action off the east and west coasts as she is contemplating for her Arctic waters in the legislation now before the House. Indeed, the danger to her marine environment off her east and west coasts is greater and more immediate.

Moreover, it can be argued that because of the greater and more immediate dangers constituted by the shipping traffic off our east and west coasts, failure to establish claims to a pollution control zone extending one hundred miles off each of these coasts may very well weaken our claim to the establishment of such a zone in our Arctic waters. Those opposed to our action in the Arctic may very well say to us, should we not act in a similar manner off the east and west coasts: "If you were really serious about the danger to your environment represented by the operation of shipping in your Arctic waters, why have you not taken some similar action in Canada's coastal areas where shipping now operates?" I submit to the government that that is a very real danger should this legislation ever be disputed, and I would commend to their attention the desirability of establishing pollution control zones off our other coasts similar to that contemplated by this legislation for our Arctic waters.

In conclusion, I should like to express once again on behalf of my colleagues in the NDP our wholehearted approbation of the legislation as it now stands, even though we would have liked to have seen some of its provisions extended to other areas of this nation.

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): In rising to speak on third reading of Bill C-202, it is not my intention to delay the passage of this legislation. Since the introduction of this bill, the official opposition has carried on a vigorous campaign in the House of Commons urging the government to make a clear, unqualified declaration of Canada's sovereignty over the lands and waters of the Canadian Arctic. The campaign was mounted when it became clear that the government itself had sown the seeds of doubt in Canada and the international community by procrastinating and by refusing to take a stand on this issue. The Arctic region, so long regarded as Canadian, is in our view about to be lost through default by this government.

We expressed our concern over Canadian rights in the Arctic at the time of the experimental voyage through the Northwest Passage by the giant Humble oil tanker, the *Manhattan*. This concern came to a head when the Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development, comprised of Members of Parliament who had made a close study of the issue, recommended that the government claim sovereignty over northern land and waters which traditionally had been considered as belonging to Canada. The government resisted efforts to have the committee report brought before the House for discussion, and although the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) eventually won the fight on a motion that the House concur in the committee report, it is a matter of record that the motion was talked into adjournment by the government.

Some Liberal members have asked why the official opposition takes such a strong stand on the question of Canadian sovereignty. I might say it is because of a threefold concern we have which cannot be brushed aside by the government's arrogance. We believe, first of all, that the Canadian citizens of the north must be protected from exploitation, that development of the Canadian north must

remain in the hands of the Canadian people, and that it is Canada's responsibility to prevent an ecological disaster that could affect the people of this country and indeed the people of the world.

• (4:00 p.m.)

I spoke on this bill when it was first introduced in this chamber. I attended the joint committee sittings. The bill purports to deal with pollution control on the one hand and with Canadian sovereignty on the other. We are now aware from studies of other bills, for example Bill C-203 and Bill C-204, that the government is not asking Parliament to assert sovereignty over any waters beyond 12 miles in our Arctic. However, these are waters over which most Canadians thought we had claimed sovereignty for many years.

I ask the government, why have we now changed position? I ask, what waters are we now claiming as our own? What waters will be classified as high seas? Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, we on this side are not critical that the government has gone too far with this legislation; we are critical that the government has not gone far enough. How will these proposals, as spelled out in the bill, be enforced without declaring sovereignty? For example, under this bill will we be prohibiting tanker voyages in the Arctic? The bill calls for a line measuring seaward from the nearest Canadian land a distance of 100 miles. I wonder why the government selected 100 miles? Why didn't it take 50 miles or 150 miles? In spite of all the questions that were raised in committee about this 100 miles, I submit we have never received an adequate answer. Perhaps the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald), or the minister guiding the bill through the House today, will give us some explanation.

This bill, like the amendments to the Fisheries Act, gives permission to pollute. That is right, Mr. Speaker. It gives permission to pollute since its terms do not apply to any water quality area designated under the Canada Water Act. By fragmenting authority between this bill and the Canada Water Act, by amending the Fisheries Act plus the Canada Shipping Act, I submit we so divide authority that we make effective pollution control in Canada next to impossible. At the same time, we place a bureaucratic nightmare on the shoulders of our hard-pressed industries who find themselves unhappy partners with the federal government in pollution control, with the industries paying the bill.

When it comes to declaring sovereignty, I cannot help but wonder what happened to change the views of our Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) on this matter. The *Globe and Mail*, in September, 1969, carried an article headed "Ice Pack Defined as Land in Canadian Bid for Rule." It began with these words:

> Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau said yesterday Canada will seek to persuade other nations to accept the ice pack of the Northwest Passage as land for the purpose of establishing Canadian sovereignty in the area.
>
> The Prime Minister told students at a high school forum that the proposal, first advanced by External Affairs Minister Mitchell Sharp, was one of several Canada would advance in seeking to establish its sovereignty in the Arctic.

Later, on his return from that trip, the *Globe and Mail* carried another article which read in part:

> In a press conference, after a three hour cabinet meeting, Mr. Trudeau declared that his government was giving "a high priority" to the sovereignty statement, which is expected some time this fall.

Those are our views, Mr. Speaker. We believe sovereignty should be declared over the islands in the Arctic. We believe sovereignty should be declared over the water between those islands. Obviously, the Prime Minister shares our views, although he referred in his statement to this water as the ice pack; but whether it be ice pack or water the logic is the same. It is this vast area of ice and water and land which we claim should be established without any doubt in the minds of all Canadians as Canadian territory.

We must be mindful of our responsibility to the native people of the north, the Indians and the Eskimos, who stand the risk of being exploited by commercial plunderers before they can be said to have even benefited from today's enlightened society. Their living conditions, if we are to listen to the proposals and representations they are making to us from time to time, are wretched. They have the highest mortality rate among Canada's native people. Infant mortality in the north is four times the Canadian average, and the death rate of Eskimo children up to the age of four is 13 times the national average. Even in 1964, the average age at death of the Eskimo was 32.3 years.

If Canada does not assert its claims to sovereignty, then these people are exposed to the risk of being bulldozed out of existence, or left with the scars of exploitation that already disfigure the permafrost of their land and threaten to eliminate the northern wildlife upon which they depend for existence. I ask

you, Sir, can we ignore the rights of these people so that a more affluent society should benefit? The answer of course is no. But they can be protected only by a clear declaration of Canadian sovereignty.

In the view of the Official Opposition, northern development must remain in Canadian hands. While a good many people are today greedily eyeing Canadian resources, we do not for one minute intend to be a party to any give-away of these resources without a true inventory of Canadian needs for the future. There are many who say that the north is Canada's future life blood. Therefore, it is for Canada to discover and develop the north. If there are vast resources of oil, as exploration indicates, it is for Canada to regulate the growth of its development. Without Canadian sovereignty being asserted we will have every Tom, Dick, and Harry eager to stake a claim to the north and to engage in unregulated off-shore drilling in Canadian waters. I submit Canada alone must exercise pollution control over the Canadian Arctic. It cannot be left to the United Nations; it cannot be left to shipowners; it cannot be left to oil companies or any other body. It is, I submit, Canada's responsibility alone.

Already Canada has been exposed to needless danger by a government that, at the least, has been extremely haphazard in its approach to the pollution menace. It was the Official Opposition that pointed out to the government that the *Manhattan*, on its first voyage, carried twice as much oil for fueling purposes as that carried as cargo by the ill-fated *Arrow* which broke up in Chedabucto Bay, Nova Scotia, earlier this year. Those of us who live in that province, and certainly many who live outside it, are well aware of the tremendous damage that was done to the fisheries and the entire ecology of the area by that mishap. Scientists have been warning us of the dangers of pollution, pollution of the land, of the air and of our water. Doubts have been raised as to the very future of mankind unless we show some respect for nature and the environment in which we have been given the privilege of life.

The risk of a *Torrey Canyon* disaster hangs over all of our heads. The best insurance policy in the world would not and could not possibly compensate for the damage to our environment if a disaster of the *Torrey Canyon* magnitude happened in the north. A disaster of that proportion would upset the delicate balance of nature in the Arctic and might lead to a complete ecological breakdown. It could reach out to every man, woman and child on this earth. These are some of the threats posed by new scientific and technological advances. However, I believe if a technological society is to continue, technology itself must be put to work to clean up its messes. On the land and in the water, a Canadian presence has been established in the Arctic by Canadian explorers, Canadian police, Canadian courts and Canadian commerce.

• (4:10 p.m.)

Those who object to Canadian sovereignty of the Arctic waters argue that the Northwest passage should be regarded as an international waterway because it connects two sections of the high seas. However, international law has established that a passage between high seas is international only if it has been used, frequently and without serious challenge, by international shipping. This is not the case with the Northwest passage.

Sovereign control of the Arctic does not imply interference with innocent and peaceful passage throughout the waters of the north. But it is for Canada to determine and ultimately decide what constitutes innocent passage, and Canada must retain the right to make and enforce regulations which protect our national interests. In my view, a vote against Canadian claims of sovereignty is a vote against Canada, its people and against humanity itself.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, in moving third reading of this bill, I do not have much to add except to thank hon. members who, on second reading, voted unanimously for this bill to set up a hundred-mile area for the control of pollution in the Arctic.

That unanimous gesture on the part of the House of Commons has done much to help Canada on the international level, towards the humanitarian purpose proposed by this bill. Because of the special problems in the North and also for the benefit of the native peoples of the North, it was imperative for our country to act immediately instead of waiting for a catastrophe, for ships have always started navigating in that area and the North will soon be open to shipping.

During a trip to Washington where I discussed problems pertaining to the North and

other related questions. I found that American politicians were particularly impressed by that unanimity.

I should like also to make a few comments on what was said by the hon. member for South Shore (Mr. Crouse). On several occasions, he suggested that our Canadian sovereignty was not established over the Arctic islands, the continental shelf or the waters surrounding the Arctic islands. On several occasions in the House it has been clearly proven that our sovereignty had been established for a long time in that respect.

The hon. member mentioned explorations for oil on the Arctic islands and the continental shelf. I would just like to point out to him that at the present time, in our Canadian North, anyone who wishes to carry out explorations for oil on the Arctic islands and the continental shelf, must ask the Department of Indian Affairs and Nortnern Development for a permit for that purpose. Such permits are now held by American, French, German and Japanese firms.

The only question that remained to be solved had to do with the limits on our territorial waters and my colleague the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) brought forward a bill that leaves no doubt about that. It provides that Canadian territorial waters extend 12 miles off from shore. That bill had a very clear objective: the prevention of pollution on the high seas, because we knew it was impossible to come quickly to an agreement at the international conference level, after the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Trudeau) had met the Secretary General of United Nations in September, to know if we could make rapid progress in that field in international circles. Following the international conference on the law of the sea that was held in Brussels in November, it became quite obvious that Canada could not expect an early conclusion of any international agreement on pollution control on the high seas. We took unilateral action by asserting our jurisdiction in matters pertaining to the policy concerning water pollution up to a 100 mile limit off our coasts. We are still willing to find an international solution to this problem. The first international conference on pollution on the high seas will be held as early as 1970 and Canada, thanks to the unanimous consensus of the members of the House, has taken a very important step towards the development of international law in this field.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I thank—

[*English*]

I should like to thank all members who participated in the debate for the unanimous vote on second reading and quite obviously they will do the same on third reading.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

CANADA ELECTIONS ACT

MEASURE TO CONSOLIDATE AND REVISE

The House resumed from Thursday, May 28, 1970, consideration of the motion of Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale) that Bill C-215, respecting the franchise of electors and the election of members to the House of Commons, be read the second time and referred to the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, you will be happy to know that my remarks will be very short and, I hope, very significant this afternoon. When I spoke on this bill about ten days ago I mentioned that it dealt with the franchise of electors who choose the members of the House of Commons, and I said that there should be a companion bill dealing with that other august body, the Senate. We in the New Democratic Party have been on record for a long time as saying that the Senate should be abolished. If it is not abolished in the near future I think it should be an elected body. Reform of the Senate as it is presently constituted, is beyond question. No amount of young blood or joint committees of the House of Commons and the Senate to deal with questions of poverty and guaranteed annual income will rid it of the stain of political patronage. I think the Senate has to become significant, and publicly and politically acceptable. New qualifications should be required for it and it must adopt a new image. Having said that, I hope my friends on the other side will note my remarks and the government will act accordingly in the near future.

I should like to remind the House that in my last speech on this particular bill I gave credit to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) for bringing forth changes in proxy voting. Now prospectors, students, fishermen and mariners will be permitted to vote. I hope in his wisdom and liberality the minister will include railway construction workers, loggers and longshoremen. These men should not be deprived of their right to vote, even though they do have the opportunity to vote at the advanced polls. I think it

is even more important that the President of the Privy Council should include the inmates of our penal institutions. In the past, so many people have considered such inmates as a breed apart from other Canadians. By incarcerating a man, not only do we strip him of his personal freedom but we strip him of his civil rights as well. If we are to make these men dignified, responsible and integrate them into society, the least we can do is allow them to vote so that they can take their rightful place in society.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Last week I had the privilege of travelling across parts of Canada and visiting penal institutions. The indelible impression left on my mind is that there is a need to create a proper relationship and understanding between the inmates of our penal institutions and the general public. It is necessary to make those inmates feel they are part of the community. I think that giving them the right to vote would be a step in the right direction.

My third point relates to reducing the voting age from 21 to 18 years. My party has been on record for some time as approving of this principle. I expect the government hopes to gain some advantage from the one million new voters. The leaders of the different political parties will face a challenging time in bringing to the new voters of this nation their political platforms. This will be one of the great challenges of the next general election. Today, our young people are much better educated than in the past about political matters, and the question that arises in my mind is this. Have those young people accepted their responsibilities and are they sufficiently socially mature to vote? In other words, have they graduated from childhood to adult status? At present, a person acquires adult status automatically when he reaches the age of 21. He is then allowed to vote, to enter into contracts, to hold real property, to undertake jury duty, to marry without parental consent, to drink beer and to establish a separate domicile. These are his rights.

By lowering the voting age to 18 years, will we also lower the age at which our young people can assume these other rights? Will an 18-year old be allowed to serve on a jury, to enter into contracts and so on? In other words, will these rights be given to 18-year olds automatically in future? I entertain serious doubts about this matter. It seems to me that they should earn their adult status. Perhaps I could draw an analogy between young people and those who wish to become Canadian citizens. A person becomes a Canadian citizen only after he has learned one of our two main languages. He must have some knowledge of the history and geography of our country and possess evidence of good behaviour. In other words, he must have no criminal record, must appear in Citizenship Court and, after submitting evidence of his fitness to be a citizen, he takes the oath of allegiance and becomes a Canadian. Why should we not require something similar of our 18-year olds? They should prove that they are worthy of adult status, that they are of good behaviour, that they are willing to accept responsibility and are socially mature.

What criteria would govern the granting of adult status? These young people I submit, ought to contribute their time and talents to the public service. Thousands of choices are open to them. Of course, we must provide jobs and opportunities for them; but this should not be difficult because there are 700,000 young students who want summer employment. Instead of being a burden on the government, we could provide these young people with the opportunity to be useful. For instance, if a young man is an artist, he could contribute his time and talent by decorating public and private institutions. If he is an athlete, he could teach youngsters to play hockey, baseball and skiing in the winter. If he is the cultured type, he ought to play in a youth orchestra or participate in some drama group. Other young people could serve by conducting tours, by helping to clean up our pollution problem, by helping crippled children or elderly adults, by baby sitting for young married couples and so on. They could perform services like these and, after a time, they would earn their adult status.

Of course, they would have to show evidence of a record of public service and good behaviour. Perhaps they could appear before a court similar to the citizenship court and bring forward two or three witnesses who would testify to the truth of statements concerning their public service. At that time they could be given their social security card, which would be an indication that they had graduated from childhood and assumed adult status and responsibilities. Then, such young people ought to have the right to vote. A young man could then perform jury service, enter into contracts, hold real property, marry without parental consent and so on. This is my own view, Mr. Speaker, and is not

a view which is totally acceptable to the members of my party.

An hon. Member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Gilbert: Nevertheless, it is a view that I think should be put forward because, when you reduce the voting age from 21 to 18 years, you are imposing on young people a social responsibility. We must make sure that they are ready to assume that responsibility and are mature enough to vote and participate in the affairs of the community.

My last point relates to election expenses. My colleague, the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) has set forth the position of my party on election expenses and on the necessity of implementing the recommendations of the Barbeau Commission. I submit the time has come for us to take active steps to implement the recommendations of the Barbeau Commission concerning election expenses. I submit that the bill relating to that subject ought to have preceded the bill we are discussing.

I read "The Shape of Scandal" by Richard Gwyn. It deals with the trying time the government faced as a result of scandals during the early and middle 1960's. In the epilogue are two paragraphs bearing on the subject of election expenses which I should like to read to hon. members. The author writes on page 242:

> Only one element of the content of the scandals deserves lasting concern and that is what Pearson, after the publication of the Dorion Report, called, "the sinister and growing involvement of crime in politics." The connecting link appeared to be the election fund. The traditional system of fund raising and fund spending by both the major parties has in the past been based upon an obsessive and impenetrable secrecy. Rarely has this secrecy hidden anything more ominous than the understandable wish of business firms to conceal their political affiliations from their customers, some of whom are bound to be supporters of the unfavoured political party. Nevertheless, as demonstrated by the winter scandals, secrecy is an invitation to misuse and, to the public, it invites the assumption that misuse is commonplace.
>
> The importance of money in elections has been consistently over-rated, particularly by the professional organizers who approach the subject with the reverence of acolytes. Under-financed parties, such as Réal Caouette's in 1962 and John Diefenbaker's in 1963, have been able to rise above empty war chests, while over-financed parties, such as Pearson's in 1963, run the risk of arousing public resentment. Nevertheless, as the realistic Israel Tarte said of Laurier's victory in 1896, "Elections are not won by prayers alone." At election times money is a useful adjunct to virtue, but the present system of collecting has outrun its usefulness.

• (4:30 p.m.)

> The solution is relatively obvious and has already been effected by the Government in Quebec. A proportion of the election expenses of all the national parties should be paid out of the public treasury and all election expenses should be subjected to rigorous control and scrutiny. As the *Toronto Daily Star* commented, "Having the taxpayers pay the bill of political candidates may seem a strange and unpleasant idea at first sight. But it is surely preferable to having the tab picked up by people like Lucien Rivard."

I hope that the President of the Privy Council will be very active in setting up the committee to consider election expenses. I hope he will do this forthwith. On that note, I end my comments on this particular bill. I will have more to say at the committee stage.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Roland Godin (Portneuf): Mr. Speaker, it is my duty to take part in this debate on Bill C-215, whose purpose is to modernize the Canada Elections Act and to pronote democracy in this country.

Democracy is a form of government which originated after monarchy, that is after the period when kings and queens inherited the throne through succession. In democracy as we know it, the people become their own king and appoint their representatives through elections.

All citizens are equal in a democratic election. Each citizen has only one vote to cast in the ballot box and the majority decides which members are elected. It is the principle of one man, one vote. In an election, this principle of the citizen's equality and quality constitutes the basis of democracy and it must be respected by everybody.

Why should a member of Parliament have to make his backers known? Why does this obligation not apply also to political parties with considerable campaign funds? Why are privileges granted to the powerful and refused to the little, the weak, the members of small political parties or still to independent candidates who are always free to express themselves during an electoral campaign? Why not require of the large political parties that they reveal the sources of their campaign financing? We ask the question as bluntly as possible in order to avoid any misunderstanding.

Why are the small political parties compelled to disclose the names of the contributors to their compaign funds, while the two large ones do not have to do so? Why is it possible for the large parties to conceal the

names of their backers? We are asking that question merely to know why the principle of equality among citizens is not enforced as far as the obligation to disclose the sources of compaign funds is concerned?

This is not the first time that the question is raised and remains unanswered. Indeed, the same unacceptable excuses are given and the people who are always asking the same questions are far from satisfied. They know how to get information and are quite aware that as far as the excise tax is concerned, there are some injustices.

We do remember that at a certain time the Canadian government passed a legislation to levy new taxes. All taxpayers were supposed to pay to the federal government the tax provided in the new legislation. But through amendments and withdrawals of some customs tariff items, we managed to establish a favoured list. The best example of this is to be found in Bill C-198, that was passed on June 23, 1966. I take the liberty to quote some excerpts of that bill according to which would be exempted from the federal 12 per cent sales tax:

(f) tractors...for use exclusively in the operation of logging, such operation to include the removal of the log from stump to skidway, log dump, or common or other carrier.

Nothing was forgotten. In fact, the article even added this, that can be read in the text, and I quote:

(h) machinery, logging cars, cranes...blocks and tackle and wire rope—

All these articles were also deleted from the famous taxable machinery list. While loggers still pay the federal sales tax on powersaws, special iron-capped shoes, and iron helmets, the wearing of which is compulsory, the lumber company which buys equipment is only required to sign a form and forward to the government to get back the 12 per cent excise tax. All mining and oil companies which develop Canadian resources enjoy the benefits provided for in the item which appears on page 6076 of *Hansard* for June 7, 1966, and I quote:

(e) gasoline-powered and diesel powered self-propelled trucks...for off-highway use exclusively at mines and quarries.

The following were also exempt from the famous tax:

(j) machinery and apparatus, including drilling bits...for use in exploration for or discovery or development of petroleum, natural gas or minerals.

While those companies are exempt from the famous 12 per cent tax, the worker who uses the tools essential to the maintenance of his machines always has to pay it. Once again, we have a double standard. And oil companies, forestry development companies and mining companies are just the ones we suspect of contributing to the old parties' campaign funds.

As regards income tax, the situation is the same: one rate for the worker and a different rate for the companies. As far as I am concerned, most of the injustices that Canadians have to suffer at the present time have their origin in campaign funds. Because they contribute to the latter, exploiters of all kinds successfully press for the passing of the legislation of their choice and in the manner that is most profitable to them. The present scarcity of money, which is an invention of the banks that wish to increase their interest rates, is a further example.

• (4:40 p.m.)

Recently I gave a copy of the Canadian Constitution to a young man of 19. He was quite surprised to learn that, according to the Constitution, the central government has the right and the duty to fix interest rates. However, he did not see why banks are now increasing their rate of interest. Proofs in hand, I explained to him that conditions had changed since the Canadian government gave up its rights in this regard by passing on March 21, 1967, Bill C-222 respecting banks and banking.

In passing this bill containing a very precise section in that connection, the government was simply giving up its rights and privileges regarding the establishment of interest rates.

Though this bill was sponsored by the former Minister of Finance, the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Sharp), under the Liberal government of Mr. Pearson, I shall never forget that on March 21, 1967, 60 Progressive Conservative members preferred to abstain from voting and did not take part in the division. Therefore, for all these reasons and many more, I suspect also that banks contribute important amounts of money to the campaign funds of the old parties.

On the occasion of the reform of the Canada Elections Act, I think it is necessary not to request an explanation but to call for the final suppression of this unjustified practice whereby the big political parties are free to collect funds for their campaign treasury without having to disclose the identity of the contributors. This is clear! We demand that the big political parties be

compelled to give the names of all the firms that contribute to their campaign funds as well as the total amount of their campaign expenses, as it is the case for political parties that are financed almost exclusively through public subscriptions, by passing the hat at public meetings or coffee klatches.

Equality in this respect between small and large political parties would be a sign that hon. members really want to respect the equality of citizens in all of their acts during a democratic election in view of electing new members.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to ask the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) to answer us. He will find a way to make all political parties produce the names of the contributors to their campaign chests. Under a democratic system of government the election of members of Parliament by the people perhaps reflects the best the image of the people, because they choose their members amongst the very people who make up the nation.

In a democracy, the people choose their representatives from among themselves. Those elected automatically become the official representatives of authority. That is why all citizens should be better acquainted with their real power to choose their own representatives. That is also why electoral laws should give citizens every possibility to make the best possible choice of their future representatives. The Canada Elections Act should therefore do away with all practices that make it possible to exercise undue influence on the voters' will and that is why it is necessary to reveal the names of all those who contribute to elections funds covering advertising, canvassers and other election workers. There is no way of getting this information now as far as the major political parties are concerned, perhaps because our present legislation does not demand that it be revealed.

However, when one sees now the ministers behave towards some privileged groups, one is lead to believe that these groups are involved in some way in election funds.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot help noting the utter flexibility of our ministers in connection with their activities in the legislative field.

For instance, during the same week, allegedly to fight inflation, the government has proclaimed that no wages shall be increased by more than 6 per cent yearly and has decided to raise the minimum wage from $1.25 to $1.65 per hour, i.e. an increase of about 33 per cent. Those are inconsistent measures.

In the past, the lists of Canadian Forces electors were always kept secret. Now, under the provisions of item 61, one may have a furtive glance at them. When you read item 62, however, you discover that this privilege is hereby cancelled.

It may seem odd, when all the lists of electors are made public, that every conceivable effort should be made to conceal the names of our gallant soldiers, ready to shed their blood for their fellow-countrymen.

Since the Valcartier base is located in the Portneuf riding—which I have the honour to represent—there are more than 500 military personnel entitled to cast their vote in Portneuf. Under the previous act, the lists of Canadian Forces electors were unavailable, even to the members of the House. And the election officer of the riding, who is one of my friends, made no bones about telling me: "I have the lists in a file but I am not entitled to let you see them."

It is quite all right to keep secret a list of 50 names, but questions should be asked when 500 names are concealed.

As a matter of fact, the ballot papers on which members of the armed forces are to vote change size, pattern and colour in the process. And the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Matte) was a witness to the fact while attending a judiciary recount.

I do not know if that should be called a transcription or a transposition, but anyhow this method has already resulted in changing electoral results. I have in mind the case of the Sherbrooke riding during the June 1969 election. On election night, the Creditiste candidate was first elected but following the results of the military vote, he was beaten. When time came to recount the votes, the judge phoned Ottawa to obtain the list of Canadian Forces electors who were entitled to vote in Sherbrooke. But he was simply told: Your Honour, this is impossible, the list is confidential. The judge was being asked to pass judgment on a list of names he had not seen, and on ballots of a doubtful origin. I do not know whether this was done for honour or dishonour but, in any event, I doubt that this procedure was regular; I would even go so far as to say the Creditiste member for Sherbrooke may have been defeated by strangers.

Indeed a childhood friend of mine, still in the army and who lived in Portneuf at one

time but who has now been living in Montreal with his family for some 25 years, is still entitled to vote in Portneuf.

Worse still, in the last election, he was being treated in an Ontario hospital and was approached by another soldier who went to his bedside to make him vote for a Portneuf candidate. There was no witness in the patient's room. It was the month of June. It is recalled that the weather was beautiful, which explains why the witnesses waited out in the street. You have there as many opportunities for manipulation. Even in a hospital bed, one could already "play" with those famous ballots.

Now, as ridiculous as it may seem, the most deserving citizens are beyond the reach of publicity in national elections. The ordinary citizen assumes his responsibilities of full citizen through his franchise, by participating in public affairs, the economic activity of his country, but soldiers are not entitled to see their name on the list of electors.

In the summary of the main amendments published on page 7419 of *Hansard* for May 27, we read the following in item 61:

A candidate or his accredited representative will be authorized to inspect, in the office of the returning officer, the list of Canadian Forces and Public Service electors, entitled to vote under the Special Voting Rules...and make extracts therefrom—

Yet, item 62, at page 7420 of *Hansard* for the same day, reads as follows:

The list of Canadian Forces electors prepared by each commanding officer is no longer open for inspection by candidates or their representatives—

• (4:50 p.m.)

So those lists are prepared by commanding officers. From now on, they will not be open for inspection.

Under items 61 and 62, of the Summary of the main amendments, should I, at the time of the next election, ask the returning officer for my constituency to examine that secret or semi-secret list of electors, and make extracts therefrom that could eventually prove me right, the returning officer could refuse my request by resorting to item 62 and deny me a privilege granted under item 61, to know the electors in my constituency.

Is it not legitimate for an out-going member to know the electors of his constituency, even before the election, especially in the case of those who have enough courage to expatriate themselves in order to defend their fellow-citizens, their member of Parliament and their minister? If so, why not say it exactly, without hiding anything?

[Mr. Godin.]

Mr. Speaker, I call for the deletion of item 62, in which the broader provision included in item 61 is cancelled concerning the list of Canadian Forces electors.

I also request that the list of Canadian Forces electors be given the same publicity as those of residing electors in a constituency where a general or by-election is held.

I leave the drafting of the motion to that effect to the efficient staff of the House of Commons.

I hope that the government members also consider the possibility of introducing an amendment to Bill C-215, in order to make the carrying of the identification card compulsory. Other countries have such a card. We would just have to imitate them. Unfortunately, we choose to imitate others even when they do wrong. The time has come now I think to imitate them when they do something right.

In short here are my suggestion. First, I do agree with the reduction of the voting age to 18. Whether we admit it or not, a lot has been asked in the past of our young people. It is the young people in general who have cleared our land. In fact, they cleared the Abitibi area for instance. Some years ago young people went abroad to defend Canada and today again young people are expecting a lot from us who have nothing now to offer them. We offer them to clear the land and to build Canada. We ask them to defend their country in times of war but in times of peace we have nothing to offer them.

I know the young people and I know that they lack patience. If, being older, we tolerate a policy of trial and error on the part of governments, I know that those under 20 will not accept it for very long. By extending to them the right to vote, we are simply giving them the opportunity to make known their wishes and to compel the government to act.

Furthermore, as I said before, contributions to electoral funds should be made known to the public.

The list of electors in the armed forces should also be revealed to the public and finally a compulsory identification card should be carried at all times. If we want to increase the confidence of the Canadian people in our parliamentary institutions, we will have to do everything possible to avoid fraud with regard to the exercise of the franchise. Studies have already been carried out in that respect. Time has come to discuss them and to effect the required changes since honest elections are the basis for a just society.

[*English*]

Mr. Doug Rowland (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, by the time someone of my distinct lack of seniority rises to speak in a debate such as this, the minister who is piloting the bill must worder why in heaven's name we do not all sit down. Since he has had the courtesy to come into the House, I thought I would let him in on a little opposition strategy. Debate is initially an attempt to impress upon the government through rational and cogent argument the virtues of the opposition's case. If the government does not then immediately accept the rationality of those arguments and make the necessary amendments that will incorporate our thinking in their bills, we adopt the tactic of the Chinese water torture, that is of repeating our arguments incessantly until hopefully the minister, out of sheer horror at the prospect of having to hear them again, decides to adopt our suggestions. It is in the noble cause of reducing the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) to a quivering mass of jelly that I dedicate these few remarks.

This is the first appropriate opportunity I have had publicly to thank the chief electoral officer, Mr. Duhamel, for the extremely competent and eminently fair way in which he conducted the Selkirk by-election. Though it is not particularly relevant to the bill, I should like to put that on the record. He did a wonderful job under sometimes difficult conditions. I should also like to draw the attention of this House to the exemplary conduct of the returning officer for the Selkirk constituency, Mr. Grant del Bigio, whose impartiality was unquestionable and whose accessibility to the candidates and their agents left absolutely nothing to be desired. In all of this, I might add, he was most ably assisted by his wife, who is both charming and competent.

At the risk of sounding unctuous, I wish to say that the legislation before us is not really an appropriate vehicle for partisan speeches. All hon. members must be equally concerned to ensure that the electoral laws of this nation provide the greatest possible opportunity for electors to exercise their franchise with the minimum possible opportunity for the abuse of that privilege and right. I mention these truisms only because the bulk of the remainder of my remarks will, in the interest of brevity, be devoted mainly to a discussion of what I consider to be shortcomings in this legislation which, on the whole, represents a considerable improvement. In short, my remarks are offered in the spirit of constructive criticism. I hope that hon. members will accept them in that light, and that when we come to the Committee of the Whole House debate we will give consideration to at least incorporating the principles of the suggestions I am about to make into the legislation.

One of the major considerations in any electoral law should be that of ensuring that it eliminates to the fullest extent possible any artificial inequities between individual candidates and between the various political parties contesting an election. It is in the interest of the proper functioning of the democratic system that members be elected, in so far as is possible, by the exercise of a rational choice by the electorate on the basis of such considerations as the candidate's ability, training, experience, the merits of the program which he and his party espouse, and the quality of leadership that his party displays. We should, for example, seek to eliminate the effect that the amount of money available to a candidate can have upon his fortunes at the polls.

I would reiterate the point made by my colleague, the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert) that there is a need for a companion piece of legislation to this reform of the electoral law which will regulate election expenses. This need still exists, despite the fact that the Barbeau committee report on election expenses is now so old it is growing whiskers. I understand that the President of the Privy Council contemplates taking action on this question shortly, and I welcome the undertaking. However, I think it would have been more appropriate to introduce that legislation prior to the bill we have before us.

However, there remain means that we can employ within the context of this bill to reduce the effect of financial disparities upon the outcome of an election. This can be done by reducing the length of time allotted to campaigns when an election is called. I understand that the standing committee examined this problem at some length and reached the conclusion that the type of machinery—such as permanent voters' lists—which would be necessary for a reduction in the length of campaign time would be prohibitively costly. However, I do not feel like giving up on the idea yet, and I hope that the committee stage of this bill will provide an opportunity to seek means of achieving the highly desirable goal of reducing the length of time devoted to campaigning.

Another principle that should govern the drafting of electoral law—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order; it being five o'clock the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's Order Paper, namely public bills, private bills, notices of motions.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Harding)—Shipping—Safety standards of foreign-registered ships operating in Canadian waters; the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin)—National parks—Request for development of facility in light of pollution of Lake Erie; the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave)—Violent disturbances—Montreal—Bomb explosions—Co-operation by Royal Canadian Mounted Police with other forces.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

NAVIGABLE WATERS PROTECTION ACT

MEASURE TO PROVIDE FOR REMOVAL OF VESSEL CAUSING POLLUTION

Mr. David Anderson (Esquimalt-Saanich) moved that Bill C-39, to amend the Navigable Waters Protection Act (prevention of water pollution), be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I believe a minor error has arisen, although perhaps we should deal with it later, when we find out whether there are more speakers on the bill than there is time available. I do not think that the committee on Health and Welfare is the right committee to which to send the bill. It should more properly be sent to the transport Committee, but perhaps we could rectify this error later. In any event, my Bill C-39 would amend the Navigable Waters Protection Act and insert after clause 15, a provision which would make it possible for the minister to order the owner of a vessel which has gone aground and is causing pollution to remove the wreck or to have it destroyed, and to order that the owner of the vessel or cargo pay the full costs of such actions. Section 16 of the act as it now reads permits this to be done only in the case where the wreck in question is obstructing navigation. The purpose of this amendment is to enlarge the minister's scope so that the same powers will be granted to him to permit the removal of wrecks or other vessels when they become a danger from the point of view of pollution.

[Mr. Rowland.]

• (5:00 p.m.)

This matter has a fairly lengthy history. It first came to my attention when a vessel of the Holland American line, sailing out of Rotterdam, grounded and eventually sank off the west coast of Vancouver Island on January 3 1968. This vessel was the *MS Schiedyk*. It had on board 150 tons of heavy diesel fuel, 120 tons of light diesel oil, and a certain amount of lubricating oil. The payment of the cost of cleaning up the pollution damage that resulted from this wreck was by the government of Canada; in other words, the taxpayers of Canada. The purpose of the amendment to the act I am proposing would be to shift that burden of cost from the government and taxpayer to the people who should be responsible, namely the vessel owners as well as the people who own the cargo of that vessel.

Hon. members will recall that in the Canada Shipping Act amendments, which were considered a little over a year ago, the government attempted to introduce a provision similar to this. Those amendments were in Bill S-23, which came before the Senate in 1969. The particular clause in that government measure which would have had the effect of my amendment to the Navigable Waters Protection Act was clause 24, which was unfortunately struck out by the Senate committee on transport and subsequently by the Senate itself. The Senate did this after hearing representations from shipping interests, the International Chamber of Shipping and other such bodies and their Canadian equivalents. The debates, which are most interesting and which I recommend to hon. members, are in the Senate proceedings of the committee on transport and communications Nos. 6, 7 and 8 of February 27, March 6 and March 13 of 1969.

It was decided by the Senators that as the provisions of clause 24 of Bill S-23 would cause Canadian law to be somewhat out of line with the legislation of other states, it

should not be passed until the international organization which concerns itself with such matters, namely, the International Maritime Consultative Organization, dealt with the matter at their meeting in Brussels in November of 1969. The meeting was held, and the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) represented Canada. He made a statement at this meeting in which he put forward Canada's view, and the line of argument which is behind both my amendment today as well as clause 24 of Bill S-23 of last year.

Unfortunately, at the meeting of the International Maritime Consultative Organisation in Brussels there were many states represented, some of which have no coastline but large oil interests, and some of which have coastlines but also have extensive shipping interests. Naturally, these states are less concerned about oil pollution at sea than we are. The results of pollution coming from a tanker was absolutely liable, regardless of fault, for the Canadian position that the vessel owners as well as the cargo owners should be made not accepted by the majority of states there. Some progress was made at that conference, but I think it is clear that the Canadian view did not get very far at the meeting. Let me discuss for a moment why we did not succeed. The arguments put forward, which are contained, by the way, in the Senate references which I have given the House, suggested that the nature of marine insurance would make it impossible to apply unlimited liability upon a shipping company. This argument was put forward at length. It is one that I have considered and that I reject. I would be very surprised indeed if the insurance business, which is a flexible business—we have all heard that Lloyds will insure anything—cannot find some way of insuring vessels at sea for the ultimate consequences of any shipwreck or disaster at sea. I am quite sure that if the industry put its mind to it, there is a way of insuring vessels regardless of the limit of liability. Certainly, in the case of commercial aircraft the liability of the insurer is almost unlimited. One instance which I was given showed that $80 million was paid by Insurance Companies for one airline disaster. If they can find it possible to insure a single aircraft for up to $80 million, I think it is incredible that they should argue they can only insure a ship up to a total upper limit of $10 million to $15 million.

So, I reject their argument because I think if we insist upon the idea first of a limitation and second of liability only in case of fault, we will make it quite impossible for the innocent people who may have marinas, fishing camps, or who may be commercial fishermen, all those people who live along the shore and gain their livelihood from the sea, to collect from these large oil interests. Thus they will suffer from the disasters rather than the people who I think should be responsible for the costs, namely the shipping and oil companies.

It was suggested that perhaps a voluntary organization of shipping interests might be the best way to deal with the problem. It was mentioned to the committee and elsewhere that the Tanker Owners Voluntary Agreement Concerning Liability for Oil Pollution would satisfactorily take care of this particular matter. I think that the existence of such an organization does not make such legislation as I propose unnecessary. In my opinion, it is quite essential for us to have absolute liability, and to have it without necessarily requiring proof of fault on the major oil carriers.

The argument was put forward that ultimately the consumer will have to pay for any increase in cost, if the cost of shipping oil is increased and that this is bad. I submit that the consumer of oil is precisely the one who should pay, not the taxpayer, not the general public, not the people who happen to live along waterways which are frequented by these enormous vessels, but the people who use the oil. If the insurance is going to be expensive for such carriage of oil, well, that is tough; and if it increases the cost of oil, that is tough, too. However, why should the people who use that oil not bear that cost and risk? I say the people who use that oil, but naturally the company will pay in the first instance, and then will pass on the cost to the consumer. But why should the general public be responsible for the clean up, and why should little people be subjected to disaster simply because of this legal difficulty which oil companies and shipping interests see?

• (5:10 p.m.)

There is a second point which is most important here, and which is especially important to Canada's northland. If we continue with our present way of placing the risks on others than the oil companies and others than the consumer, we distort the costs of shipping by sea as opposed to shipping by pipe line. I think hon. members can appreciate the point, that if we allow the taxpayer to bear the cost of cleaning up oil pollution and do not put the cost where it should be, on the shipper or oil company, then we have created

a subsidy, a sort of hidden extra benefit for the oil company that intends to ship by sea. The pipeline, which perhaps might be an alternate and better method of transporting oil is not given this, subsidy and so the cost comparison, which may involve hundreds of millions of dollars or even billions of dollars, is severely distorted.

I think we should reject the arguments put forward by the shipping interests, although I must say they were most interesting and ingenious, and go back to the position of Canada prior to the Brussels meeting at which, as I have stated, we unfortunately failed to have our views accepted. It is, therefore, my purpose in moving this particular amendment to the Navigable Waters Protection Act to do precisely what should have been done last year with Bill S-23, clause 24.

As it happens, my Bill C-39 was written in 1968 before I had any knowledge of last year's government bill. Nevertheless, the way things have turned out, perhaps my bill is as valid as ever. Had Bill S-23 been passed in its entirety and not been amended by the Senate, then perhaps my bill would have become redundant. However, there are two events which have occurred since then. One was the rejection by the Senate of the clause I mentioned. The second was the failure of Canada to succeed at the International Maritime Consultative Organization meeting. Therefore, this particular amendment once more becomes one of considerable validity.

I cannot in all fairness see why we should except oil and shipping interests from the cost of pollution, an exception which makes pollution something to be borne by the public, just as the results of an act of God must be borne by the public. Pollution such as I have described results from some human action, such as somebody putting oil on a ship and somebody else having that ship go from A to B. The suggestion that if the ship is cut in two by another ship, or hits a rock through no fault of the owner, the captain or the company, then that is an act of God, the costs of which should be borne by others, is obviously absurd. Human direction has been given to put that ship where it may get into difficulty. It is only logical to assume that the people who initiate such action, the person who puts oil on board, and the shipping company should bear the cost of any subsequent cleanup. We are not dealing with small sums of money. We are dealing with enormous figures. I understand the sinking of the *Torrey Canyon* led to cleaning up costs of something in the neighbourhood of $12 million to $20 million. The Santa Barbara disaster off the California coast, which was not caused by a ship but by oil seepage from the seabed, led to property damages estimated at $1 billion. We are in an area in which there is tremendous cost.

I think that only by forcing all shipping lines and oil companies which transport oil by sea to take out the appropriate and necessary insurance are we ever going to make sure that we really do get around the difficulty posed by these disasters. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that this particular bill will not be talked out, and that it will be possible to amend the motion so as to send it either to the committee on environmental pollution or the committee on transport, rather than to the one on health and welfare as the motion now reads.

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, once again I find myself in the peculiar position of rising to address myself to a motion moved by the hon. member and being in agreement with the principle but having a few questions at the back of my mind about the practical realities of the bill itself. I appreciate the hon. member's remarks about what seems to be the intent of government. I think the intention of the government is clear, and I think it is a step that we can not only support, but upon which we can urge the government to move more swiftly. If the hon. member's bill has that effect, then he has done a good service indeed. However, Mr. Speaker, there are some things in the bill that surprise me because the hon. member is a seafaring man.

I do not know whether his yacht is still in our delightful province, or whether he has it en route to British Columbia. However, I am tempted by the lack of his awareness, at least as indicated by what is in the bill, to say that while the hon. gentleman does have some knowledge of bathtub races and concrete boats,—he is somewhat of an expert in the latter thing—he has not addressed himself in his bill to the practical reality of ownership of a vessel or its cargo at the time of an accident to the vessel.

It must be borne in mind that accidents with vessels on the high seas, in coastal waters or in our ports are not deliberate things. They are indeed acts of God and the owners of these vessels have taken—perhaps what is no longer valid in terms of the dangers from pollution—reasonable precautions to insure and protect themselves against loss. I think all of us are aware that this has

presented the very difficult problem, in terms of pollution particularly, in the first few days of an accident of determining just exactly who does own a vessel, just exactly when a vessel is abandoned, just exactly when ownership changes from one party to another party or from first parties to second or indeed even third parties in connection with the insurance of cargo.

Many ships sailing around these days carry cargo which is worth a lot more than the ships themselves. This is one of the points the hon. gentleman was trying to make, and I agree with him. In some cases the insurance on these vessels is relatively low, and in terms of the total value of the vessel and the cargo, the greater amount is on the cargo.

This question is there, and I believe all of us on this side would have wished that the hon. member might have attempted to address himself to the problem of ownership by perhaps changing the emphasis of what he is seeking to achieve. I suggest he might have done that by seeking enabling legislation authorizing, and indeed directing, the Department of Transport or other agencies to take what action is required to immediately remove the effect of the pollution or whatever the difficulty happened to be. He could then come along and hit them, as he has quite properly done, with a provision for financial responsibility. There may be other practical reasons why such an approach cannot be made, Mr. Speaker, but it suggests what we can do within hours of the occurrence of an accident.

• (5:20 p.m.)

The explanatory notes to this bill refer to a shipping accident. They indicate that four months passed between the time of the accident and when it was finally cleaned up. In Nova Scotia, we have just experienced a disastrous accident and all Nova Scotians are aware of the sorry and dreadful state of affairs which obtains when such a disaster is not swiftly and effectively dealt with, particularly when it involves oil. The emergency should be dealt with within hours, not days or weeks. It is to this point that I think comment should be and hopefully will be directed by those who are working diligently on the preparation of a report on the *Arrow* disaster in Chedabucto Bay in Nova Scotia.

Speaking personally and not for my party, I believe that in cases such as the *Arrow* and the *Torrey Canyon*, where we are talking in terms of massive bulk carriers of 250,000 or 500,000 tons—I understand that Lloyds of London in the last year or two have introduced insurance provisions for a one million ton tanker—our action immediately following an accident is vitally important. No amount of organization, laws, regulations and up to date equipment are going to prevent an accident. The accident curve is real and those who believe accidents can be prevented are whistling in the dark.

It is my belief that stretching from the tip of Vancouver Island north, crossing into the Arctic, across the Arctic and down the eastern coast, we should have a series of "fire stations" if you will. These should be staffed by highly trained, skilled personnel headed by a scientist or a man highly trained in the techniques of combating oil pollution. The crew should be trained in the effective use of the latest and most adequate equipment available to deal with pollution. Such crews should be stationed along our coasts at convenient intervals, but not more than 150 miles apart. Perhaps the stations should be under the jurisdiction of the armed forces with the crews on duty 24 hours a day, even if they stayed there for months and months without, we hope, ever being called upon.

The cost of maintaining these stations, compared with the losses resulting from an accident of a supertanker the size of the *Manhattan* is infinitesimal. These tankers are no longer dreams but are realities on the high seas. I think it is regrettable that the hon. member did not address himself in the bill to more practical considerations of this nature because that is something we support.

It is regrettable that the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) was not able to persuade other countries of the advantages of this proposal and the absolute necessity for it. I hope there is no member who would wish to talk this bill out, because we would take some pleasure in supporting it although, as I have mentioned, it is deficient in that it avoids one or two practical realities.

Mr. Leonard Hopkins (Renfrew North): Mr. Speaker, in speaking on this particular measure I think it must be said that, as a result of the *Arrow* catastrophe, we all recognize this is a very important bill in principle. It is also important for the reason expressed in the explanatory notes to the bill itself.

First of all, I should like to state that the Navigable Waters Protection Act is presently being considered and will be amended to cover such situations in the future. In making this statement, it is only fair that I make

reference to many other items that have been taken up in this House and which concern over-all anti-pollution measures in Canada.

One such important measure considered in this session is Bill C-203, an act to amend the Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act. This deals with extending the fisheries limit from three to 12 miles. Another is Bill C-204, an act to amend the Fisheries Act which enables the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) to act on a continuing basis on water research in order to prevent pollution. The Minister of Fisheries can now act before the fish die instead of waiting until dead fish are found. A good example of this occurred in Newfoundland a short time ago when the Minister of Fisheries caused a company to close down its operations until such time as the water pollution was cleaned up. This measure prevented the further death of fish in that particular area.

Another important piece of legislation in this session is Bill C-202, an act to prevent pollution of areas of the Arctic waters adjacent to the mainland and islands of the Canadian Arctic. This bill will have far-reaching effects in an anti-pollution program.

One thing that has come out of the *Arrow* disaster, Mr. Speaker, is that by and large the international community, not just Canada, is lacking in research and in practical procedures for the cleaning up of oil pollution in water. This is probably one of the most important reasons why we should prevent oil pollution instead of facing the situation after the spill has occurred.

• (5:30 p.m.)

I think it is only fair to point out that Canada is one of the countries leading the world in the study of oceanography. When the members of the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works about a month ago visited the Bedford Institute of Oceanography in Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, we learned that the institute had begun studying oil pollution in offshore waters. The hon. member sponsoring Bill C-39 will probably be interested to learn that Victoria will be the site of one of the major research centres in Canada. Its activities will cover the western provinces of Canada, embrace much of the Yukon and Northwest Territories and cover all of British Columbia and its offshore waters. He is one member who will probably derive a great deal of satisfaction from the establishment by the federal government of this research institute in Victoria, British Columbia.

[Mr. Hopkins.]

I commend the hon. member for his interest in protecting the offshore fisheries of British Columbia. In the past he has displayed an interest in protecting the inland waters of British Columbia. We in this House recognize that British Columbia is a very beautiful province, but no matter whether we live in central, eastern or western Canada, we are Canadians first. We must work together in the common interest of protecting the beauty of our country.

The Institute of Oceanography at Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, sponsors vessels which undertake research in the ocean. In this regard a great deal of co-ordination and co-operation is going on among federal departments such as the Department of Transport, the Department of Fisheries and the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources. These departments co-operate with the provincial agencies concerned. The importance of checking oil spills was brought home to the members of this House by the oil spill on the east coast of Canada. What happened demonstrated that this country and other countries in the world lack the necessary technology to deal with such spills. I submit that it is important for the government of Canada to put more money into research devoted to solving this problem. If we want to continue playing a leading role in the field of oceanography and research of the seas, we must be willing to safeguard the sea. We can only do that by using all our scientific knowledge and by giving the scientists the necessary tools with which to do their work.

In this country, as well as in other countries, scientific programs involving research into fields such as these and into atomic energy have been most expensive to carry on. When governments spend large amounts of money on certain projects, the people naturally look for results. Often the results of this research are not immediately apparent. I think the people of Canada must learn to be patient and not expect something to happen on the spur of the moment. They must be willing to accept the necessity of long range programs which will enable us to handle problems like these.

I am delighted to learn that the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) will seek to amend the Navigable Waters Protection Act and to do that which Bill C-39 seeks to do. We have been talking about the west coast; I see that the explanatory note to the bill refers to Vancouver Island. I think it is also important for us to consider Bill C-187 in this context, the bill respecting inland water resources in the

Yukon and Northwest Territories. The subject matter of that bill will also be the concern of the research institute to be founded in Victoria, B.C.

While considering this matter we must also remember the Canada Water Act, which is really a water management act. It is mainly concerned with inland river basins and water quality management, and complements the amendments to the Fisheries Act. The Fisheries Act amendents will cover those areas of Canada that are not covered by the Canada Water Act which was read the third time last week.

We have heard it said in this House that there is a lack of communication between government departments, and that these departments should co-operate and co-ordinate government programs. Having visited the Inland Waters Centre at Burlington last year, and the Bedford Institute of Oceanography at Dartmouth earlier this year, I can say that there is a great deal of co-operation among federal government departments and that they in turn are co-operating with provincial agencies. The Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works also learned that there is extensive co-operation between certain American states, Canadian provinces such as Ontario and the federal government with respect to international boundary waters. In this field the International Joint Commission has done a most commendable job.

I presume most reports regarding the *Arrow* disaster off the east coast are accurate. If they are, it is obvious that the shipping firm concerned was very much to blame for what took place. It is important that Canada, in its work on such problems, should not be isolated from the thinking of other countries. There should be international agreements in this area. As a result of our visit to Dartmouth we learned that on this matter there is considerable co-operation among countries in the western world. We hope that as a result of our new look toward Asia there will be growing co-operation among countries in the Far East and Canada and that this will upgrade the rules and regulations governing shipping companies, no matter from what countries they hail. We must make sure that these companies improve their standards.

• (5:40 p.m.)

There is very little use in a country having strong legislation which protects its coastal waters if other countries do not do likewise. Canada must play a leading role with regard to oil pollution off the coast of any country. Canada should promote international meetings and conferences so that all shipping countries of the world will be impressed with their responsibility in keeping the waters clean.

There are many other matters that could be dealt with, such as migratory birds, fish, plant life and sea life in general.

An hon. Member: Liberal birds.

Mr. Hopkins: If they are Liberal birds, they will be very strong flyers. We can get things done in this House by flying over some of the tactics of the opposition. Canada should play a leading role in international politics to promote conferences among the shipping countries of the world. These countries should realize that they have a moral responsibility to prevent oil pollution. It is natural to assume that industrial complexes in various parts of the world will grow at the same rate as the population of the world. As these complexes grow, shipments of oil and gas will increase.

The hon. member is to be complimented on presenting this bill for protection from pollution off our shores. I hope that our scientists who are working diligently at places such as the Bedford Institute of Oceanography, the new Research Institute at Victoria and the Inland Waters Centre at Burlington will accept this new challenge. I hope they will make constructive suggestions which can be incorporated into legislation. We must have legislation with teeth in it so that the regulations will be enforced.

This is a vast problem. The International Court must be the means of ensuring that countries toe the mark with regard to the waters of other countries and international waters. It is very important that a standard of law be developed at the international level. This would result from laws developed at the national level by the various countries of the world. The next step would be enforce the regulations.

Oil slicks that appeared on our waters from time to time were not looked upon seriously until we had a catastrophe. The hon. member who sponsored Bill C-39, and other members who treat this as an important issue, create in our country a mental climate in which people are willing to provide services and accept constructive legislation in order to arrive at a program of anti-pollution. The Canadian people can be proud of those working in the

fields of science in this country. They have made a great name for this country at the international level. All hon. members have a moral obligation to support research programs, not only those in our own country but in the developing nations. Standards of living throughout the world can be improved by having anti-pollution legislation.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): I am very pleased that Your Honour has been able to overcome your obvious bias to belatedly recognize me. I hope Your Honour will continue this practice in the future without having any misgivings.

I am pleased to participate in this debate upon request. I congratulate the hon. member for having introduced this bill. I think it represents the thought of many Canadians that pollution is being created by outside sources over which we have no control. It is a subject in which the average person must participate because of the magnitude of the disaster that can be created. Canada is not a shipping nation; we have a very limited number of ships. However, we have an immense seabed and seacoast and there is a tremendous amount of shipping in our waters and along our coasts.

Since this bill was introduced by the hon. member, there have been a number of disasters. The recent *Arrow* disaster has been mentioned. A very large sum of money is being spent to clean up that problem. Part of the cost of cleaning up pollution must be borne by the country, because of its nature, but the main portion should be borne by the industries that are polluting our waters. The people of West Africa were faced with a problem with which they were not able to cope. World attention was focused on the sinking of the *Torrey Canyon.* Disasters such as these are not local problems. There was also a disaster off the coast of California. When disasters such as these occur, the area in which the disaster occurs must be compensated.

I listened with interest to the previous speaker, who referred to everything but the bill. The bill is limited. The hon. member raised a number of very important points. He mentioned that we are only now developing the techniques, know-how and research necessary to provide leadership in solving problems created by this type of disaster.

• (5:50 p.m.)

The disaster on the west coast which prompted the hon. member to bring forward the bill was a relatively small one. The *Arrow* mishap cannot be placed in that category. Maybe the next accident will be four or five times as serious. All our resources will be needed to deal with such situations, including the equipment necessary to restrict damage to as small an area as possible and to make clean-up possible before the damage has reached its peak.

Today we are probably in a much better position to accept legislation of this kind than we were in the past when several amendments having the same general intention were put forward by my hon. friends. I hope this proposal will go before the Transport Committee and that consideration will be given to it. Everyone in the country gives a great deal of credit to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) for the way in which he has exercised his responsibility to the fullest extent under the laws which now exist for combating or preventing pollution in areas over which he has control. We hope a similar kind of control will be exercised by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) following the amendment of our laws.

I am not sure whether this object can be achieved under the Navigable Waters Protection Act in exactly the way suggested, but no doubt the committee hearings will establish the mechanisms by which the object can be effected by legislation. Under the bill the minister would be given power to demand that the company concerned should undertake the necessary salvage operation, or alternatively the nation as a whole would do so, the cost being borne by the user of the facility. The average person who is interested in this problem will be most unhappy if the government, through its supporters, talks out this legislation today instead of allowing it to go to committee where it could receive a favourable hearing.

Mr. William Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take part in this debate on pollution control. It is a subject which is occupying the minds of more and more Canadians throughout our land. If the mail of other hon. members is anything like my own, not a day goes by when they do not receive letters from concerned citizens asking what is being done to control pollution. I therefore congratulate the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Anderson) on introducing an amendment to the act which will assist in clearing up a problem in

his own locality which has been brought forcibly to his attention.

I think he is perfectly correct in saying that we should not continually expect the taxpayers of this nation to foot the bill for pollution which has been caused through no fault of their own. I think he is well within his rights, and Parliament would be well within its rights, to make it clear that the polluter must pay. This was the principle which lay behind the recently passed Canada Water Act. We sought to make important amendments to the legislation. Every one of us felt that the underlying principle was that the polluter should pay.

What concerns me about the whole question of pollution is the government's method of attacking it on a scattergun basis, like a man using a shotgun loaded with buckshot in the hope that one pellet will hit the mark. The hon. member for Renfrew North (Mr. Hopkins) put on record a list of legislation and amendments thereto which have sought to deal with pollution. It seems to me our work would be more effective if one department of government were given the responsibility for dealing with all forms of pollution. It may be impossible to amend all our legislation along these lines, but a start must be made somewhere.

The Canada Water Act sought to make the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources the focal point for pollution control in this country, especially as it relates to water. Recently, general support was expressed for the government's decision to set up a committee to study environmental pollution. Perhaps this is the committee in which the first step will be taken to draw together all forms of pollution control. We do not like to see new departments of government set up, because their number has gone beyond reason already. However, there must surely be a way of centralizing pollution control.

I think there is a danger in this country that we may get scared of pollution and become unrealistic about it. Professor Hans Carol, of the Department of Geography, York University, Downsview, wrote a timely letter—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. The hour appointed for the consideration of private members' business having expired, I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CANADA ELECTIONS ACT

MEASURE TO CONSOLIDATE AND REVISE

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale) that Bill C-215, respecting the franchise of electors and the election of members of the House of Commons, be read the second time and referred to the committee of the whole.

Mr. Rowland: Mr. Speaker, when I was overtaken by the coming of private members' hour this afternoon I was saying that another principle which should govern the drafting of electoral law is that of maximizing the opportunity of electors to exercise their franchise. Although the legislation before us moves a long way in that direction, nevertheless in my opinion there remain some shortcomings within the legislation. Before I address myself to them I should like to take a moment to express my pleasure at the intent of this legislation to reduce the voting age to 18.

Three Canadian provinces now permit voting at the age of 19 and four at the age of 18. Reduction of the voting age to 18 was one of the first acts of the CCF administration when it assumed office in Saskatchewan; and it was one of the first acts passed by the legislature under the New Democratic Party government in Manitoba. Experience in at least six of these seven jurisdictions indicates that the measure has merit. I am most pleased that we at the federal level may see fit to follow suit.

To return to those areas where there would seem to be shortcomings in the attempt to maximize opportunities for the exercise of the franchise, I should like to make brief but specific reference to the problems associated with placing people on electoral lists in urban polling divisions when through some misfortune they have missed being enumerated and have also missed the court of revision procedures. This is not uncommon. I think that if the legislation is to fulfil its purpose in maximizing opportunity for electors to vote, it should take into account the fact that people can innocently miss being enumerated and miss the court of revision procedures,

and make some provision to accommodate them.

My colleague for Regina East (Mr. Burton) has an interesting suggestion in this regard which I hope will come before the House when it is assembled in committee of the whole. The procedure that he envisages involves a person being able to swear that he is a qualified elector. His ballot, on being cast, is placed in an envelope on which his name would be found. A list of persons thus casting ballots would be supplied to each candidate in the election so that he could challenge any of the names listed. The person or persons so challenged would then be notified so they could make representations at the time the ballots were to be counted. Once this procedure had been completed, the ballots would be taken from the envelopes, put in the ballot-box so they remained completely anonymous, and then counted. This is a suggestion to which we might devote some attention in committee of the whole.

Another way to maximize opportunities to vote relates to the polling hours that are allocated. In this regard I would strongly urge the House to consider an extension of the voting hours from the seven o'clock p.m. as provided in the legislation before us to eight o'clock p.m. This would accommodate a great many industrial workers as well as people who work in white collar jobs in commerce and service industries.

Another area that we might well examine in committee of the whole with regard to maximizing voting potential concerns the number of days allocated to advance polling. There are difficulties in regard to accommodating some sectors of our population, such as the railroaders, within the two days at present allowed for advance polling. It may well be advisable to increase the number of days allotted to advance polling.

Related to the need to maximize the opportunity to vote is the necessity to minimize the opportunity for abuse of the right of voting. In this regard I am somewhat nervous about the extensive provisions for proxy voting contemplated by the bill. While such a system is obviously needed for certain groups in our community—an outstanding example of such groups being fishermen—most other groups would be equally well served, I submit, by a comprehensive system of absentee balloting. A system of absentee balloting would, I believe, be less subject to abuse than that of proxy voting and would serve the needs of the community equally well.

A further principle which should govern the operation of election machinery in a democracy is that of unassailable impartiality on the part of electoral officials. The office of Chief Electoral Officer undoubtedly meets that standard, as does its current occupant. So, too, does the current method of redistributing seats. However, I believe that despite the irreproachable conduct of the vast majority of our returning officers, the causes of impartiality and objectivity, as well as efficiency, would be better served if these officials were appointed by the Chief Electoral Officer after the positions had been advertised and a competition had been held to fill them.

There is one further, rather small omission in the bill as it now stands which I should like to draw to the attention of the House, one which is of particular interest to those of us who represent constituencies which are partially urban and partially rural. I am referring to the difficulties involved in recognizing officially the change in character of a polling division from rural to urban and governing the operation of that poll accordingly.

• (8:10 p.m.)

Once again, one of my colleagues will have a suggestion to place before the House in this regard. I am referring to the hon. member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Rose) who will submit his excellent suggestion to the House in the form of an amendment seeking to designate automatically a polling division as being urban if it has a postal walk. As I say, he will be introducing an amendment to that effect, and I heartily recommend it to the House, assuming of course that the Postmaster General and Minister of Communications (Mr. Kierans) does not attempt to reduce his numerous problems by totally eliminating the posties.

I would like to conclude by saying I consider that the legislation which is before us represents a considerable improvement upon that which has in the past governed elections in Canada. The kind of principles and suggestions which we have been putting forward from the opposition side in the last few hours of debate are, I think, well worth the attention of the House. I hope they will receive that attention when we reach Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey): Mr. Speaker, in taking a very brief part in the discussion of this momentous Bill C-215, which runs to no

less than 355 pages and appears to me to cover every conceivable aspect or contingency having to do with voting, I intend to confine my remarks to two or three general areas and to give broad support to what is being proposed as being better than that which the voters have had in the past.

There is one particular provision of the bill in which I am interested. It has to do with proxy voting, as outlined in the proposals on pages 236 to 239 of the legislation. In the province of British Columbia there are more than two million people, and over half of them live in less than one-half of one per cent of the land area of the province—that is, around the metropolitan area of Vancouver and in the Lower Fraser Valley. In those places there live a great many industrial workers—fishermen, miners, construction workers and loggers. This general group of industrial workers over many years of federal elections has been to a substantial extent disenfranchised through the failure of the existing electoral legislation.

Every summer thousands of these industrial workers on the mainland of British Columbia, whether they be fishermen, loggers or miners, take off for the hills, the seas or the mines to carry on their work. They work out of town, away from the one half of one per cent of the land area of the province. Very often when a election takes place, which is often in the summertime, they have been long gone from their home constituencies prior to the holding of the advance poll, which is therefore of no use to them. Being away from their constituencies during the campaign and on voting day, they virtually lose their vote. Large numbers of them have lost their vote. This has had a detrimental effect with regard to one party and an advantageous effect with regard to other parties.

It is no secret that the party I represent here, the NDP, is most closely allied to and representative of the industrial workers of many areas. Consequently, the fact that many of these workers are unable to vote in their home areas has a considerable and tangible effect on the outcome of the election in those areas. Generally speaking, I think the effect has been to create an artificial result in some of the constituencies, giving added weight to the older parties and less weight to the party which the majority of those workers support.

I am glad to see that in the legislation before us this situation is tackled, to some extent at least, in the provisions regarding proxy voting. My hope is that the new system of voting proposed in the legislation before us will enable many workers who cannot now vote in their home constituencies to have a vote there. That is better than the system we have had, to the extent that something is better than nothing.

I hope that if this legislation passes it will succeed in achieving a truer political expression of the people in many areas of Canada where industrial workers are often removed from their home base at election time. I wonder whether fuller consideration might not be given to this aspect of the proposed amendments to the Canada Elections Act. It may be that we should urge that the matter be referred back to the committee for further consideration to see whether what is put before us will be practical in solving the voting problem of a great many industrial workers.

I commend very highly the provisions for proxy voting for incapacitated people, the blind and those who have physical disabilities which prevent them from getting out to the polls and voting by themselves. I think the proxy vote will be very beneficial for those people, for the electoral system and for the country.

In connection with what is proposed in regard to the service vote, the members of our party—and I imagine many members from other parties—have long questioned the situation where any votes in an election are made public, where a group of voters have had their votes made public. I refer, of course, to the fact that in a federal election there is a service vote and after the election the result of that vote is tabulated. We are all familiar with the news headlines stating that the armed services vote went this way or that way. I object to that: I think it infringes on the right to secrecy of ballot. I think this practice should have been stopped before now.

• (8:20 p.m.)

My colleague, the usually well-informed, excellent and astute member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert) made two or three suggestions today when he was speaking on this measure. I say he is usually well informed, astute and wise, but personally I wonder at some of the proposals he made. As I understood him, he would set different restrictions or regulations on the reduction of the voting age from 21 to 18 years. He felt this was a good move. He suggested that in order to qualify for the franchise, younger people should be required

to perform a useful public service. I do not believe in that, Mr. Speaker. If we set qualifications with regard to who should vote, they should be applied equally to adults as well as to the young. If the franchise is extended on an age basis, this principle should be universally applied.

I may say I am surprised to find myself so much in contradiction with what my colleague said today. He also suggested that the franchise be extended to the inmates of penal servitude institutions. His idea is that this would encourage people in prison to feel they were truly citizens because they could take part in our democratic processes. I am of the opposite view. People in these institutions have yet to prove themselves citizens in the full sense of the word, much as we may wish them to become that. Rather than give them the same rights as citizens who are law respecters, I believe we should maintain the present situation and not extend the franchise to those in penal institutions until they have served their term of imprisonment.

As I say, I am surprised at the hon. member's suggestions. I admire and usually respect the judgment and viewpoints of my colleague. But this goes to illustrate the very interesting aspects of the legislation. I support much of what is proposed in the bill. It represents a step forward. We in our party will have a number of amendments to propose, and we will do so in the hope of improving the reforms which we have been discussing.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Théogène Ricard (Saint-Hyacinthe): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the Canada Elections Act, which undoubtedly ranks among the best in the world, is to allow every eligible citizen to exercise freely his right to vote.

Some time ago, a special committee was instructed to consider this legislation, and without having been closely involved in its proceedings, I have no hesitation in saying that its members have surely done a fine job, and that they deserve our consideration. All their efforts aimed at one thing, to make our act even more effective, if possible.

Many recommendations of the committee have been incorporated to the bill before the House, and I support them with a great deal of satisfaction. Other recommendations I view with less enthusiasm, while I am in total disagreement with some others. I agree with the committee that in our day and age, young people of 18 should be enfranchised and allowed to make their views known.

[Mr. Mather.]

Until recently, we have always considered young people eligible only to the privilege of defending the country. But the maturity they have shown—and this must be admitted—entitles them to be recognized as full fledged members of our democratic society, and I am pleased to see that the committee has decided to grant them franchise.

I am also in favour of the steps taken to improve the voting procedures for the armed forces. We often have to wait several days to learn the final results of the vote in some constituencies. Needless to say that those delays result in real inconvenience, not only for the candidates themselves, but also for the population. The committee therefore deserves our gratefulness and our thanks.

I am not too very keen about the proposal which would allow vote by proxy. In my opinion, such a step would give rise to many abuses. The intent of the legislation should not be criticized, but evil-minded persons should be prevented, especially at election time, from committing abuses and even depriving certain persons of their franchise, because of the proxy vote.

• (8:30 p.m.)

Before granting proxy voting, all aspects of the matter should be considered because in each election, there are always some trouble makers who take advantage of elections to do their own little business.

The law should be as good as it can be because there will always be some ill-intentioned people to get around it. If the law enables those sad specimens of humanity to carry on their activities, I recommend that we reconsider the matter in order to fill this gap in the legislation.

I would be in favor of establishing temporary polls in hospitals or similar institutions. This would enable people who until now have always been prevented from voting to do so without any worry, knowing that they will not run the risk of having their name struck from the electoral list by unknown persons who would vote in their place, since they could not cast their ballot at the ordinary polling station.

I am also in favour of indicating political affiliations on ballots. In addition, the address of candidates should still appear on ballots. It could be added in small print, which would enable the electors to know with whom they are dealing because, in any election, there may be catapulted candidates. As a rule, people in our electoral ridings do not like them.

I see across from me the hon. member for Gamelin (Mr. Portelance) who, like myself, had to deal with a catapulted candidate. He defeated him at the political convention held in his riding, I myself defeated a like candidate in the election. I do not doubt that we are both happy with the results of the 1968 election. Of course, I am only voicing a personal opinion.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that even though a candidate does not belong to a group with a slate of 75 candidates, his affiliation to a party should appear on the ballot. If often happened in the past that for one reason or another legitimate candidates were not chosen at a political convention but were nevertheless elected as independent members. It would therefore mean discrimination if we set at 75 the minimum number of candidates of a political party before party affiliation could be mentioned on the ballot.

Along with many others, I would favour a shorter election campaign. Everyone knows, Mr. Speaker, how exhausting it is, especially for party leaders, to travel across Canada. With the present media at our disposal, that is, radio, television and newspapers, I think that we might with advantage shorten election campaigns because they are exhausting, and sometimes we end up so weakened physically that it takes months to recover.

As for the identity card and the permanent list of electors, I think that a lot more time will be needed to consider the merits of those two proposals.

There would surely be some advantages in carrying an identity card and in establishing a permanent electors list. But I wonder if we have made enough progress to introduce these practices, and if it would not be more advisable to postpone those projects in order to look more fully into the matter.

As for election expenses, I am in favour of some degree of control in this connection. I came to that conclusion mostly after the last election campaign during which I went through an astounding experience. Everybody knows that my opponent was a minister and apparently, his supporters were quite determined to get him elected at all costs, because the methods used in St. Hyacinthe by my opponent took us back to the bad old days. In fact, I would not dare to use some of these methods. It was not at all edifying. But enough said. However, I would like at least these things to be put on record.

I could cite numerous examples and I feel I have to tell you what happened at the Hotel-Dieu of Saint-Hyacinthe, on the morning of the polling day in 1968, around nine o'clock, when a busload of teen-agers invaded the Hotel-Dieu and scattered through the various floors of the hospital. At that time, the hospital employees were helping old people to wash and dress. These oldsters were taken without any more ado to the poll set up in the hospital. Some people believed that such tactics would be to the advantage of my opponent, but out of 727 eligible voters, I won by a majority of 225 votes, in spite of the candies and gifts distributed to the hospital personnel a few days before the poll.

Must I recall that during the last elections, a federal minister has been defeated by the electors of Saint-Hyacinthe, and needless to say, to my great satisfaction. As I was saying at the beginning of my remarks, no efforts have been spared, although the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) came twice to visit my riding. A number of ministers also came to visit my riding. Several senators spent a week or two there, going from "door to door" and in spite of all that, as in the constituency of Gamelin, the "catapulted" candidate was not accepted.

Mr. Speaker, those are the few remarks I wanted to make concerning this bill. I thank you.

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure and a duty for me to rise today and express my views on the bill now before us, Bill C-215 entitled "An Act respecting the franchise of electors and the election of members to the House of Commons".

I am not at all in agreement with the previous speaker, the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe (Mr. Ricard) when he claims that election campaigns are exhausting. In my opinion, they are not exhausting because it is a good opportunity to visit each voter personally.

First of all, I should like to commend the government on the proposed changes to the Canada Elections Act through this bill as a whole. It is very important that the Elections Act be as impartial as possible and that is the purpose of most of the amendments brought forward. I do say "most of the amendments". Indeed, I would like to draw the attention of the House on clause 13 of this bill with which I entirely disagree.

The second part of this item reads as follows, and I quote:

> —any new party that wishes to be identified on the ballot papers must have candidates officially nominated in 75 electoral districts in Canada on the 28th day before polling day.

I strongly object to the second part, because I feel it is not up to the government to decide which party will be or will not be an official one according to the number of candidates of that party running in an election. If we do not amend this item, we will rightly be able to accuse the government of discrimination against the people seeking to elect a group of individuals who might be as efficient as any member of any party.

• (8:40 p.m.)

I should like to draw the attention of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) on clause 13 and ask him to delete the figure of 75 in the second part of the item and to replace it by: "a minimum of 10 to 20 per cent". I think the same suggestion was made by the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin) and by the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin).

Mr. Speaker, the President of the Privy Council stated in the House, on May 27, that the drawing up of a permanent electors list would cost $13 million to the government and that, therefore, he rejected that possibility.

I know that it is sought in the act to be as fair as possible, but you will agree with me that many irregularities take place at election time. I feel therefore that we must absolutely find a solution which would encourage honesty at election time, and I endorse the views of many a member who would make it compulsory to carry an identity card that the elector would have to show to the clerk and to the representatives of the various parties, failing which he would have to sign an affidavit or to take the oath under clause 39. I believe that this amendment to the act would protect the elector and eliminate frequent frauds.

The amendments to clause 4 provide that when it has been necessary to suspend voting at a polling station on polling day by reason of a particular circumstance, the Chief Electoral Officer is empowered to extend the hours of voting at the polling station beyond the hour fixed for the closing of the poll.

I feel we should set a closing time for the polling stations, otherwise there might be delays in knowing the final results for the riding concerned, and this could influence the vote of those who might vote after learning the results in other polls of the same riding or neighbouring ridings.

In closing, I should like to congratulate the government for having inserted section 14 in the bill now under study. I am very pleased to welcome this new concept of maturity in our people. I feel that Canadians between 18 and 21 can doubtless be considered as being mature people.

In our modern world, where communications media are lightning-fast, where education has become compulsory and accessible to almost every one, and where we feel an overall awakening in our young people, I feel that it is very wise to allow them to use the fundamental right of man, that of choosing his administrators.

I have heard many people say they believe those young people would vote according to the opinions of the group rather than according to the personal value of a candidate.

I believe we are all aware of the influence of opinion polls prior to elections, of the part played by the psychological climate of a community which influences the vote of numerous electors. I believe young Canadians will vote with far more seriousness, which will prompt politicians to present more realistic platforms than in the past, in order to solve the problems we have to cope with.

Students are often much more critical than older people. They are looking for faults and they find them. Being very active, whenever they dedicate themselves to a cause, they do it thoroughly, which could give a more rational and realistic meaning to our elections.

I believe however that we should find ways of letting people know what is going on in the House. That question deserves consideration.

Once again, I congratulate the government for inserting in the bill clause 14 which gives the franchise to every person of 18.

However, I think that we should consider the majority at 18 years of age which would grant privileges in all other fields: insurance, licenses and the right to go into beverage rooms. We should have more confidence in our young Canadians who want to grow up with a sense of participation in the life of the community as full-fledged Canadians.

In closing, I should like to ask the President of the Privy Council to give us the assurance that the report of the committee set up to study election expenses will not be left to gather dust because I am convinced that as long as we have not "tamed" the money which runs freely during election campaigns, it will still remain the main asset.

I should like to repeat some words spoken by my colleague from Lotbinière who sat on

the committee set up to study the Elections Act and who stated on Wednesday May 27:

> I say and I repeat that until we overcome the problem of money in politics, until we give the same rights to all political parties insofar as money is concerned, as long as the candidates of the various political parties are enslaved by money during election campaigns and as long as governments kowtow to finance, democracy will only be a farce—
>
> There are perhaps many young people and older people too who believe less and less in democracy, because they know as well as I do that money is the master in politics.

As far as I am concerned, although money may not be the determining factor, it is no doubt one of the most powerful tools.

> That is why I can only urge that specific regulations be annexed with regard to the expenses incurred and authorized by political parties during an election campaign.

I therefore whole heartedly endorse the statements of my colleague and I hope that the President of the Privy Council will take good notice of the statements I have just quoted and will make a point of taking action in this respect for it is a question of the utmost importance.

[*English*]

Mr. Mac T. McCutcheon (Lambton-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I shall not delay the House very long. There are one or two points that I should like to bring to the attention of the House. I agree with many of the changes in this new Elections Act which have the effect of extending the franchise. I have one suggestion to make to the government in that regard. It seems a little incongruous to me that three provinces grant the franchise at age 18 and three provinces grant it at age 19, but according to provincial statutes, in order to become a full citizen one must be 21 years of age. You must be 21 to sign contracts and do all the other things that go with becoming a full citizen. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is much more important to young people to be accepted as full, first-class citizens than it is to be handed in such a patronizing way the sop of the vote at age 18.

Our young people have not, in my opinion, particularly pressed for the franchise. I suggest that what they want is to be recognized; they want to be involved. The young people I know want to accept responsibility. I suggest they should be made to feel they are citizens. We should not just throw them a sop. I have a suggestion to make to the government. I hope they will act upon it and take the initiative in this regard. At the next federal-provincial conference the government should recommend that when our young people are granted the franchise they should also be given the responsibility of full citizenship.

• (8:50 p.m.)

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in this debate on Bill C-215 I wish to set forth my ideas with regard to this lengthy document which encompasses 355 pages. I shall take a minute or two to enunciate some of my ideas. Bill C-215 escapes many of the very pressing problems with regard to Canadian elections which it should face squarely. It does come to grips with the question of the privileges of teenagers with regard to elections. It lowers the voting age from 21 to 18 years of age. However, it does not come to grips with the question of election expenses.

If hon. members wish to check *Hansard* they will see I opposed a private member's bill which suggested that the government should pay election expenses. I made a thorough study of the report of the election expenses committee which was set up some time ago. Two very prominent members of this House were on that committee. I refer to the former leader of the CCF Party, Mr. Coldwell, and the former member for Calgary South, Mr. Smith. That committee comprised five members. After studying the whole question of election expenses the committee made some very worth-while recommendations. Bill C-215 does not incorporate some very good recommendations that were made to previous Parliaments, to this Parliament and which will no doubt be made to future Parliaments. Bill C-215 should not be passed by this House without an exhaustive study of the report of that committee.

The committee made a number of recommendations, including the appointment of a commissioner of elections. It was suggested that a commissioner of elections should set a limit on how much time should be spent by each candidate on television and radio, and how much space he should have in the daily press. The main concern of that committee was that money should not buy a seat in this House; money should not have the direct influence that it sometimes appears to have during elections; money should not have the influence in Canada that it sometimes appears to have in our neighbouring country to the south. This commissioner was to rule that each party should be given so much time on television and radio and so much space in the

daily press, and having acquired over 25 per cent of the votes the government should underwrite a certain amount of the cost of the election for the various candidates.

When this concept was initially introduced in a private member's bill six or seven years ago, I spoke against it. At that time I had just been re-elected. In the election campaign there were six candidates in my riding, some with party affiliations, some without party affiliations, some founding new parties and some running as independents. I felt this concept would be impossible to administer and to underwrite. After reading and understanding how the committee's report could be implemented, I feel there is much in it that should be considered by this House. I am disappointed that Bill C-215 does not encompass more of the desires and wishes of that committee.

We are fast approaching a period in this country when the private citizen is being deprived of the power and strength of his vote. This is because it is becoming assimilated with cliques and the power of money. There is a mercenary strength of ideas and a mercenary strength of personal gain within this concept. If this concept proliferates and is further expounded, democracy in its true sense will be destroyed. This is the greatest omission from Bill C-215.

• (9:00 p.m.)

The bill is more than 300 pages long and it might well have encompassed more of the principles enunciated by the royal commission. Many people are especially concerned about two or three of the principles set out in the bill. The one that most people latch upon is that the voting age should be reduced from 21 to 18. I was first elected at the age of 30 and I have long felt an affinity with youth, an affinity with change, an affinity for the notion that young people have a great many ideas which should be incorporated in legislation and readily grasped by the leaders of our society and by this chamber.

I shall not try to convince you, Mr. Speaker that I wholly endorse the setting of the voting age at 18. While I have no intention of opposing the reduction of the voting age, I would have preferred it to be 19 years. My reasons are simply explained. Young people can hardly learn the full meaning of responsibility unless they have taken upon themselves some manner of responsibility. It is true that the age at which young people graduate from high school or leave the home is usually in the neighbourhood of 18 years. But the period between the age of 18 and the age of 19 is usually a time of tremendous transition during which immense advances are made in knowledge, wisdom and a sense of responsibility.

I shall not attempt to explain why the age of 21 was fixed as the voting age, the age at which young people had a full sense of responsibility. I say quite simply that I would much prefer the age to be 19 rather than 18 years established in this measure. From my own personal experience I can say that I went through a tremendous transitional period between 18 and 19 years of age. I have now seen my offspring pass through the same period and noted the progress he made during that important year. I think he has acquired some knowledge and that he will continue to acquire knowledge, wisdom and responsibility as he progresses in life having left, partly or wholly, the environment of the home.

It may well be said that young people of 18 in most cases are still dependent upon their home environment and that this is bound to influence their judgment as to the way they should vote. If we really mean what we say in this legislation, we are asking these young people to judge the issues as individuals, not to vote on the advice of the mother, the father or others in the home. In my judgment an individual decision could best be expected after a young man or a young woman had left the parental home for even a temporary period.

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

Mr. Horner: Certainly.

Mr. Rose: I was very interested in the hon. member's remarks and I should like to ask whether he intends to come out against the concept of lowering the voting age to 18. Further, I should like to ask whether he has in mind any specific knowledge based on scientific studies as to the age at which young people acquire the knowledge to make meaningful electoral choices.

Mr. Horner: The question is an interesting one. I thought I had elaborated at length. I even though I had repreated myself a couple of times. I see that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson), who is well used to my repetitious remarks on a number of subjects and who has apparently got the drift of what I meant to say to the House, is nodding his head in approval of what I have said.

Mr. Olson: No. Just agreement as to the way you said it.

Mr. Horner: I can testify as one who experienced, not too many years ago, the full meaning of responsibility. I was fully within an environment of my own, I was living entirely within my own earning capacity, and I had sufficient knowledge to pass judgment on the issues raised at elections when I was 18 years of age. Yet only after I had reached 30, with the passing of my father, which was a great and tremendous loss, did I realize I was really alone and accepted, maybe, the full responsibility for my own thoughts and judgments. One progresses in knowledge and wisdom throughout the period of adulthood to the point at which one is conscious of one's full responsibilities.

Though I was fully responsible for my finances and credit at the age of 18, it was many years before I realized I was not acting solely on my own judgment, without the help of my environment or without the help of the creditors upon whom I leaned. The reason I mention creditors is that very few people at the age of 18 are leaning upon many creditors. They may well be leaning upon the creditors of the family, but they do not have financial responsibilities of their own because they have not yet left the environment of the home. However, at 19 many young people have left the home and have borrowed money in their own name and had to pay it back.

• (9:10 p.m.)

There is one other provision that I would support, and that is the placing of party affiliation on ballots. We in western Canada have no hesitation in accepting this concept. When a person runs as a candidate of a political party, his party affiliation should be on the ballot. Although I think there will be wide acceptance of this provision, some exception may be taken to it in the province of Quebec and in the Maritimes where from time to time it has been the policy to nominate members of like name. But in Western Canada we like to face an election issue as squarely as we can and judge the matter accordingly.

In closing may I say I have no hesitation in voting for the bill and in trusting the judgment of the 18-year olds, particularly the 18-year olds in western Canada whom I know best. They have been raised in an environment that has schooled them well in the art of politics, and they judge just as wisely as many people throughout Canada have judged them in the past.

I rose to put my reservations on the record. I believe that one reaches a transitional period between the ages of 18 and 19 when one is better able to cope with the political jargon thrown at one during an election campaign, and judge it accordingly. At the age of 19 one has left, partly or wholly, the environment of the home and is able to judge an issue as one sees it in the context of his own environment.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Keith Hymmen (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have the opportunity of speaking on Bill C-215. It is somehow difficult for me to take the floor after having listened to my two good friends, the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) and the hon. member for Lambton-Kent (Mr. McCutcheon).

[*English*]

I should like to make a few points. I submit that the bill before the House is of extreme importance. In spite of what the members of the opposition have said this afternoon, the bill makes a start in changing the electoral procedures of this country. This bill makes provision, for the first time, for university students such as those at the University of Waterloo—with which I am very familiar—who spend four months at university and four months in practical training, to exercise their franchise. It is just as important for these students to exercise their franchise as it is for the members of the armed forces of Canada and the longshoremen about whom we heard this afternoon, as well as many others. In spite of what the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) said, if at 18 someone is old enough to serve his country, he is old enough to vote for the people he wants to govern his country.

I am not going to delay the progress of this bill because I know the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) and others are anxious to proceed with consideration of the legislation in Committee of the Whole. However, there is one other matter that I think is very important. The members of the New Democratic Party have raised the old bogey about vested interests tying themselves to certain political parties. I think what is more important is that the 20 million citizens of Canada take an interest in their country, align themselves with one of the three or four political parties in Canada and work for that party and the future of the country. I do not care

whether they join the Conservative party. I have many friends in the Conservative party. which has provided many years of good government in this country. Neither am I interested in whether people work for the Liberal Party, the New Democratic Party or the Raillement Créditiste. But I do think that those who make donations to political parties should be allowed by the Department of National Revenue to deduct such donations from their income tax. There are a few people in Canada who join one of the political parties, but the majority of the people of the country could not care less what happens to any political party or to the Dominion of Canada.

The white paper on tax reform has been published and there are many important problems about which decisions have to be made. The Liberal party is supposed to have a tremendous fund, but I have been unable to find it. Union organizers work for the New Democratic Party, but no record is kept of their hourly contributions, though it cannot be denied that these contributions must be taken in to account. That is all I can say.

• (9:20 p.m.)

Mr. Howard (Skeena): What about union organizers who work for the Liberal party?

Mr. Hymmen: We have a bill presently before us which will provide the opportunity for those over 18, who are good enough to fight for their country, to vote for those who will represent their country. We have provided an opportunity for these young people—some of whom may be students at the University of Waterloo, who take an orientation course and are part-time at the university and part time in industry—to exercise their franchise. Someone mentioned longshoremen this afternoon. We have taken an important step in the interests of responsible government, but let us give a great deal of thought before we go into the second stage of our consideration of the bill, which the President of the Privy Council mentioned, before we decide on the important question of political expenses.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Would the hon. member permit a question before he concludes his remarks?

Mr. Hymmen: Certainly.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): With the consent of the hon. gentleman I ask whether he would include within his proscription regarding so-called union organizers working for a political party, in determining the cost, a union organizer of whom I know, a former member of the Trotskyite group and a member of the Communist Party who worked assiduously for the Liberals during the last election?

Mr. Hymmen: I am not familiar with this matter and I am not at all embarrassed by the question because I do not know what goes on in the province of British Columbia. All I know is that we have our own problems in Ontario and the hon. member has his in B.C.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this very important bill in order to complete what has been said so far. I intend to be brief.

Like others, I cannot but support this measure because of the importance and the quality of some of its amendments.

I am in favour of the provisions in the bill which are aimed at lowering the voting age to 18. In my opinion, since young people are more dynamic and more competent, this responsibility which we are giving them will ensure our country of a co-operation that will never force hon. members to regret this gesture.

I am among those who believe that these increasingly active young people will be able to use their franchise in a positive way, which will result in a better and greater participation of the Canadian electorate.

I also want to mention that I am particularly interested in the representation at polls. I do hope that at the committee stage we will be able to amend the legislation in such a way as to allow the official opposition party to be officially represented at polls.

Presently, the Elections Act authorizes government members to reserve the right to designate their representatives at polls. In a "just society", it would be perfectly just to let the official opposition designate a representative at polls, since the opposition parties which do not always have the necessary election funds are without a representative at those polls. I think that all the members recognize that the government party as well as the party of the official opposition should be represented.

I hope that in a near future, at least before the next elections, we will have passed a legislation on the financing of election campaigns.

Heaven knows how hard it is to organize an election campaign. I do not think that I am the only one to complain. We all know that the party in power can always fill its election fund more easily. I take the liberty of inviting all members to seriously consider the opportunity of introducing a bill to provide any candidate with a *per capita* subsidy, such as exists for instance in Quebec for provincial elections, where an amount of 50 cents per elector is granted to official party candidates if they obtain a certain percentage of the vote. This makes it possible to pinpoint legitimate candidates. As certain candidates are financed by the government, the election campaign is run in a freer and fairer way.

I hope that we might at least benefit from such financing over the next election campaign. I am hopeful that a legislation to that effect will enable any serious candidate advocating the platform of a recognized political party to be adequately financed and to undertake an election campaign with all possible freedom.

I do not know of a better way to win the confidence of the people than to allow those candidates to make election campaigns financed by the state, at least in part. A legislation ought to be passed to guarantee the population that a candidate can run without having his hands tied, without being at the mercy of some speculators, as it has been too often the case unfortunately.

Mr. Speaker, those are the few remarks which I wanted to make, while taking the opportunity to say that I am in favour of the bill. This will prove once more that an opposition member can, in a very wise and concrete way, endorse good government legislation, and at the same time hope that eventually the members of the party in power will approve of the good suggestions from opposition members.

• (9:30 p.m.)

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, just a few words to point out that the legislation under study is important, though it contains some legal fictions.

It gives franchise to 18 years olds. It obviously expresses our faith in the maturity of our young people, and it might lead them to realize the importance of the responsibility which is being handed to them.

We should also point out that when franchise is given at 18 years this represents a legal majority which in some provinces is fixed at 21 years. In fact, at age 21, a Quebec citizen is empowered to go to law, to act validly without the backing of a person who has reached majority or of a guardian appointed for that purpose.

We know that in Quebec, an 18-year old who wants to bring an action against somebody must have a guardian designated by a family council before he can act. If anybody under 21 is prosecuted, a guardian must again be chosen by the family council and defend the minor person's interests.

I think that when the committee has made a detailed study of this bill, it will have to ensure that the provinces facing legal difficulties regarding majority will modify their legislation accordingly, so that the rights granted to people coming of age at 21 in Quebec, should be granted also to an 18-year old. In other provinces, a citizen comes of age at 18 years, as is the case in British Columbia, I believe. But, if we want to enfranchise the citizen at 18 years, we must also give him the contractual and legal responsibilities proceeding from the laws in force in Quebec and in other provinces.

I am not against giving the franchise to electors of 18 years, but I say that the committee should provide with this right all the legal effects involved in the coming of age according to the Quebec Civil Code.

Under this bill, a person of 18 will be entitled to vote or to run as a candidate in an election. However, this right will only have any sense provided that under the Civil Code this person is given the corresponding legal competency.

In fact, young people of 18 or less are teenagers, legally incapacitated. They cannot undertake legal actions or sign a deed before a notary without the assistance of a person of full age appointed by the family council. They are, as I said earlier, legally incapacitated.

If we want to give the young a sense of responsibilities by granting them the right to vote at 18, the provinces should be asked to amend their legislation with regard to majority. As for the Quebec government, it should lower the full legal age from 21 to 18. The bill contains a legal fiction that I find strange. The President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury) who is responsible for the bill—

Mr. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, it is rather the President of the Privy Council.

Mr. Asselin: —the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) who is responsible for the bill should consult the provincial governments where the legal age is still 21 in

order to know whether they would be prepared to lower the legal age to 18.

That is all I had to say about this bill. I shall deal again with it when it is discussed in the committee of the whole. I hope that in the meantime, the President of the Privy Council will be able to tell us whether he got in touch with certain provinces on this matter and whether those provinces are prepared to amend their legislation concerning the legal age in order to grant to the young people of 18 all the legal powers ensuing from the franchise.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. I must advise the House that if the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) speaks now, he will close the debate.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to comment on a number of the themes which have been recurrent throughout this debate, and in particular to refer to some of the possible amendments which have been put forward. First, as to the comment on the physical size of the bill, I agree it is a monster. I think, for those who are not lawyers, this is the best evidence of why a regulation-making power is desirable under our statutes. This is one bill in which it had been decided, long past in this Parliament, that we would not have the details spelled out by way of regulations. For this reason we have to include every comma within the statute itself.

Another subject touched on by many hon. members was that of a permanent voters' list. Hon. members who spoke on this question included the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Dumont), the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin), the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings (Mr. Hees), the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie) and a number of others. I would say again, as I did in opening the debate, that the decision not to proceed with a system of a permanent voters' list was not taken lightly. It was only taken after consideration of the position taken by the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections in both sessions of this Parliament and, as I said, in both cases the committee recommended against a permanent voters' list system.

One of the suggestions put forward by the hon. member for Lotbiniere was the provision of a "carte d'identité obligatoire," a card of identity. I am not sure if "obligatoire" would imply that we would have a compulsory registration system. Unfortunately, I gather that the hon. member did not put this proposal before the Standing Committee on either of the two occasions when it considered the question of a permanent voters' list, and therefore I suggest it is a little late in the game for him to be making it now.

The basic reason the committee arrived at its decision was that, as I said in opening the debate, a permanent voters' list risks having fewer voters on the list than is possible with our present system of enumeration before each election campaign. I should like to refer to an interesting authority recently published on this question, by Professor T. H. Qualter of the University of Waterloo, entitled "Canadian Politics".

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Not published yet.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Well, shortly to be published. On page 29 he sets out statistics in comparing with the percentages of the total voting age populations which are registered on official voters' lists in various jurisdictions. It is interesting to note in the table provided that in three of the Maritime provinces, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland, over 95 per cent of the persons of eligible voting age are registered as electors. A further group, including Saskatchewan, Alberta, Quebec and Manitoba, attain between 92 per cent and 95 per cent of the total population of eligible voting age, and the percentage of the total voting age population in Canada as a whole which gets on the voters' list is 91.2 per cent.

• (9:40 p.m.)

Interestingly enough, at the bottom of the list of percentage registration for election purposes is the one province that has a permanent electoral list—British Columbia. While I have said that 91.2 per cent of the persons eligible in Canada generally are on the voters' list with our enumerating system, British Columbia with a permanent electoral list has only 74.5 per cent of the eligible population listed.

Professor Qualter points out on page 29:

> Despite this intensive effort—

He is describing the effort made in British Columbia to add voters to the list,

> —it is quite clear that voluntary registration schemes of the type in use in British Columbia produce far less satisfactory results than the enumeration procedure used elsewhere in Canada. To this general criticism one qualification ought perhaps to be added. If the continuous roll were more

widely used in Canada, so that the procedure became more familiar, then it might be more successful. As it is, people moving to British Columbia from other provinces will have been enumerated in the past and will in many cases continue to expect to be enumerated. Similarly, electors within the province itself will have been enumerated for federal elections and not all will be fully aware that something more is expected of them in provincial elections.

I have already indicated, in reference to the system in the United Kingdom, that one of the shortcomings of a permanent electoral list is that even on theoretical grounds, and without a compulsory registration provision such as there is in Australia, you do not get a very high percentage of the population on the list and the list goes stale quite quickly. Even in Australia, with the compulsory registration system, up to 5 per cent of the population may not be registered. From the standpoint of making sure that the maximum number of eligible persons get on the voting list, our system of enumeration can claim an advantage over the permanent list system. I assume that is the reason why the committee decided, on two separate occasions, not to recommend the permanent voters' list system to the House.

Extensive reference was made to the question of election expenses. I would repeat the remarks I made at the start of the debate, that the timetable that I set before the House on April 1, 1969—which may be found at 7359 of *Hansard* for the last session—dictated a certain order of priorities for dealing with election problems. That order of priorities, which I believe was generally accepted in the House, established that in the first place these general changes to the Elections Act should be considered by committee first and then dealt with by bill in the House, this to be followed by changes with regard to election expenses.

The reason I set out at that time—and I think it is worth while to remind the House of it—is that the Chief Electoral Officer has made it clear that when and if the voting age is changed to 18, the electorate will be increased by about one million electors and he will only have under two years to prepare for the next federal election. On the other hand, he feels that with a better election expenses system such as that recommended by the Barbeau Commission, he could be ready in about a year's time. I think, therefore, it is obvious that prior considerations should be given to the general changes in the Elections Act.

We have drawn up the terms of reference to establish a special committee and I expect in the next day or so a notice will be appearing in my name on the Order Paper. A number of amendments have been suggested, a useful one by the hon. member for Coast Chilcotin (Mr. St. Pierre) to include under the proxy voting system the occupation of loggers. The hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert) added a number of other occupations to that suggestion. There are various suggestions which we would be interested in hearing in committee, so perhaps somebody will be moving an amendment not only to refer to specific categories but perhaps in more general terms to the effect that any person who by the nature of his occupation cannot attend at the advance polls or on election day in his own poll should have the privilege of proxy voting.

The hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin) made reference to a change which had some appeal to me, though I cannot say to what extent it was considered in committee. That is to give to the service electors the further anonymity of the vote to the extent it can be given by combining service electoral results and those of the advance polls. I suspect the number of votes cast by service electors may outweigh the advance polls, but it would be one step further away from identifying this group by electoral results. The House may want to consider such an amendment.

One suggestion which, subject to correction, I do not think has been widely considered by the committee and the House is that made in debate this afternoon by the hon. member for Broadview and the hon. member for Surrey (Mr. Mather), which I believe would find support and may have originated with the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard). It is that persons incarcerated in jail or penitentiary should not be deprived of the vote. I can well understand the argument behind that proposal. If, indeed, the purpose of the incarceration is part of a rehabilitation program, then they should continue to be treated as citizens within the community. Whatever may have been the former view, perhaps the present practice should not be continued.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I think, Mr. Speaker, it would be useful if I called particular attention to that suggestion. I hope it will receive publicity, because as far as I know it has not been considered widely in the

past and members may wish to focus attention on the proposal so that it may be considered when the bill gets into committee.

I believe the hon. member for Pembina (Mr. Bigg) raised a question with respect to the provision which would amend the statute to the extent that at revision one might remove the name of an elector who was wrongfully on the list. He took exception to this, but I think there are good reasons for it. There are many persons who by way of nationality and through the unavoidable ignorance of the enumerators may be included on the electors' list though they do not wish to be. A bizarre incident was brought to my attention by the Chief Electoral Officer which, with our changes, would not occur again. In the last election campaign the entire resident staff of the Australian High Commission was enumerated and put on the electoral list. The interesting thing is that all those members of the High Commission staff who had been resident in Canada for 12 months were entitled to be on the list but, obviously, in the position of a friendly and Commonwealth country they would not wish to exercise the Canadian franchise. But there was no way of correcting the electoral list at revision.

The question was raised that if the age of qualification of candidates and the qualification of electors was to be fixed at 18, why not the qualification for returning officers as well? I will be referring to the remarks of the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Asselin) in a moment, but the answer is that the federal government does not have jurisdiction to reduce the age of legal ability from 21 to 18, or at least the jurisdiction in this regard is disputed. The situation heretofore has been that while no person should feel compelled to contract with an 18-year old candidate, it is basically the problem of the 18-year old candidate being supplied with services, printing and otherwise.

Since the returning officer is a public appointee and has to submit to a strict timetable for having services rendered, particularly printing, we should be certain that in every part of Canada the returning officer would be protected from a reluctance on the part of business people to deal with him because he was not of the age of majority. So until the age of majority is reduced below 21, the government deemed it wise to retain the age at 21 for that purpose. There will be many other detailed suggestions which I am sure will be dealt with as we go through the bill.

[Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale).]

• (9:50 p.m.)

May I refer at this point to a discussion which has taken place among the representatives of the parties with respect to the procedure that might be followed in the clause by clause study. I think there will be general agreement to a procedural order whereby the consideration of the committee could be focused first on those changes which are sidelined in the bill and which involve a novelty in the Elections Act as compared with the previous act and, second, on those particular sections to which hon. members would like to offer amendments. On that basis I would propose a procedural order along the following lines:

That when Bill C-215, an act respecting the franchise of electors and the election of members to the House of Commons, is being considered in committee of the whole, only such clauses, and other provisions, or parts thereof, that propose the enactment of new or amended provisions in relation to the Canada Elections Act and which are indicated by vertical rules shall be open for consideration and amendment;

That all other clauses and other provisions, or parts thereof, when called from the Chair shall be deemed to have been adopted without amendment or debate;

Provided that any clause, subclause or other provision referred to in paragraph two above, may be brought under consideration by any member who rises and forthwith proposes a motion to amend any such clause, subclause or other provision of the bill that may be accepted by the Chair.

To put it more simply, the motion proposes that the debate in Committee of the Whole be confined to the clauses, subclauses and parts of the bill marked vertically, plus such other parts as a member on rising may indicate he wishes to amend. On that basis I would commend the bill to the committee. Perhaps the question could be put to the House as to whether a motion in those terms is acceptable.

Mr. Macquarrie: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think we are agreeable to this suggestion. There have been discussions and it was my understanding that we would obtain a moral commitment from the minister that in this part of the session we would institute proceedings to move toward the setting up of machinery under which the other parts of the act relevant to election expenses would be examined. If that is the case, we will go along with the suggestion.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I confirm this again. The hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) made a comment

on the draft that I had prepared in this matter. I was not able to speak to him in the latter part of today. I might mention that we are having a House Leaders' meeting at 9.30 a.m. tomorrow and that motion will be brought forward. I think it would be desirable if the Elections Expenses Committee could meet before the House rises for the summer. The plan is to give the public notice of its proceedings in the fall.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, the suggestion of the Government House Leader with respect to how we are to deal with the bill in Committee of the Whole is agreeable. I have one thought but it has nothing to do with unanimity in accepting the suggestion. It has been some time since the House proceeded on a bill in Committee of the Whole, and some time since the House considered a bill of such complexity. It is sometimes the practice of the Chairman to proceed rather quickly from clause to clause of a bill of this nature. Clause 18 of the bill takes up 41 pages. It has innumerable subclauses. I think that when we are in committee the Chairman should not proceed with too much dispatch; hon. members should have the opportunity of finding their place in the bill and indicating which parts they wish to amend. I know from past experience that there is sometimes a tendency for us to move along rather quickly. If we bear that in mind, the suggestion is quite agreeable.

Mr. McCleave: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It seems to me that the motion proposed by the Government House Leader needs two more words. I say that because a situation could arise under which, if clause 80, say, were amended, we would have to turn back and make a consequential change to clause 46. I am plucking hypothetical examples out of the air. I suggest that the last paragraph of the motion should be changed so that the relevant part reads, "may be brought under consideration or reconsideration." The two new words are "or reconsideration," which are necessary because the motion does not refer to any consequential amendment.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) moves:

That when Bill C-215, an act respecting the franchise of electors and the election of members to the House of Commons, is being considered in committee of the whole, only such clauses, and other provisions, or parts thereof, that propose the enactment of new or amended provisions in relation to the Canada Elections Act and which are indicated by vertical rules shall be open for consideration and amendment;

That all other clauses and other provisions, or parts thereof, when called from the Chair shall be deemed to have been adopted without amendment or debate;

Provided that any clause, subclause or other provision referred to in paragraph two above, may be brought under consideration or reconsideration by any members who rises and proposes a motion to amend any such clause, subclause or other provision of the bill that may be accepted by the Chair.

Motion agreed to.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): The question now is that the bill be read the second time and referred to the Committee of the Whole. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Committee of the Whole.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

SHIPPING—SAFETY STANDARDS OF FOREIGN-REGISTERED SHIPS OPERATING IN CANADIAN WATERS

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, on June 3, I raised the following question in the House of Commons, as reported on page 7682 of *Hansard*:

In view of the reported statement by Dr. McTaggart-Cowan that the safety standards on ships flying flags of convenience are disgraceful and that if similar standards existed with application to aircraft there would be a crash a week, I would ask the minister whether his department has laid down any regulations with respect to standards applicable to ships operating in Canadian waters, especially for those ships carrying cargoes such as oil which would cause serious environmental damage should a sinking occur?

The minister partly answered this question two days later when a similar question was asked in the House. However, I welcome this opportunity to expand on the very important principle involved, for Canada must move quickly and effectively to protect our coastal environment from the type of costly damage which we witnessed in the recent sinking of the oil tanker *Arrow*. Canada should insist that all shipping plying our territorial waters

be adequately equipped for navigational purposes and conform to a high standard of safety regulations.

A few days ago Dr. McTaggart-Cowan, who heads the present task force which was set up to investigate and clean up the oil spill from the *Arrow* indicated that there should be an international agreement controlling the equipment and operation of oil tankers similar to the regulations which control commercial aircraft. He went on to say:

• (10:00 p.m.)

This flags of convenience business is one of the sloppiest damn things I ever saw. If the commercial airlines ran their business like the tankers do you would be crashing a DC-8 every week and the world would say stop it.

He went on to point out that in 1944 the International Civil aviation Agreement was written, which sets out safety standards, requirements for navigation aids and control of commercial aircraft. A commercial aircraft, wherever it flies, is under its control although the essential prerogatives of the pilot are preserved in emergencies. All the nations of the world adhere to the International Civil Aviation Agreement. He felt there was no reason why countries which co-operate in the aviation field could not get together in the marine field. This is certainly a desirable objective and one which we should press for vigorously.

The flags of convenience ruling allows a vessel to cperate under the shipping regulations of a country with lax rules if it flies the flag of that country. It is an easy way out for any unscrupulous owner or company to avoid those standards of safety and operation upon which their own country might insist. It allows shipping to ply international waters with dangerous cargoes whether the ship is seaworthy or not. Over the next few years we will see immense damage to the world environment unless steps are taken to remedy the situation.

I feel Canada must lay down some very strict regulations for the shipping that enters our territorial waters. Full and adequate safety standards must be insisted upon. We want no more incidents such as we witnessed in the sinking of the *Arrow* on the east coast. It does not make sense to ban the drilling for oil in the Gulf of Georgia if we allow oil tankers with inadequate navigational aids, etc., into the area. The risk of another costly oil spill in our territorial waters will be greatly reduced if adequate amendments are made at an early date to the Canada Shipping Act.

[Mr. Harding.]

In the international field, of course, we should press vigorously for adequate safety standards in shipping because the ecology of the oceans is also our concern.

It seems that this is the appropriate time for Canada to examine its need for a merchant marine. All the ingredients are present for a successful move into this field. We are one of the greatest importing and exporting nations in the world. We have one of the longest coastlines in the world. We have a slowly dying shipbuilding industry on both the east and west coasts. We have the skilled craftsmen and the workers to operate a shipbuilding industry. It would not only provide employment and a monetary return, but we could build into our merchant marine those safety standards required to give the best possible protection to our coastal areas. I hope this matter, together with adequate safety standards, will be high on the list of priorities at the next session of the House.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the member for Kootenay West (Mr. Harding) for his interest in pollution.

You may remember that this very afternoon, the member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Anderson) introduced a private bill on pollution. We are know that pollution is now the object of very timely studies and comments.

As for the question of the member for Kootenay West, on June 3, the member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken) asked a very similar question on June 5 last, as reported in *Hansard* at page 7767, which proves once again the interest of all the members in this matter of pollution.

I should like to recall only a few words of what the minister said in reply to the member for Parry Sound-Muskoka. I quote:

—In fact, we did so in Brussels in November of last year. In addition, as I have advised the House from time to time, we are presently working on considerable and substantial changes in the Canada Shipping Act which will have the effect of bringing about the improvements that Dr. McTaggart-Cowan along with others, myself included, agreed with.

It is true that recently the famous *Arrow* incident in Nova Scotia opened many people's eyes. This will encourage the department to bring out more rapidly regulations on pollution.

All hon. members will remember that before the *Manhattan* undertook its trip, the

Department of Transport required that many improvements be made to it before tackling northern ice. Similar measures will apply in the future until such time as the government can introduce its bill on the steps to be taken to avoid pollution.

We cannot but congratulate the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) who, during the Brussels conference in November, advocated an international agreement on the steps to be taken to fight pollution. Unfortunately such an agreement could not be concluded during the international conference. However, inside as well as outside the House, the minister said on several occasions that the government would introduce legislation to that effect as soon as possible. The department's officials are engaged at the present time in drafting that legislation and, knowing how the minister feels about it, I am sure that within a short time, perhaps before the end of this session, legislation to establish standards so as to prevent incidents like the one that happened recently in Nova Scotia—I refer to the *Arrow*—will be passed and that we will thus be able to prevent the pollution we dread so much and which spoils rivers and streams.

Perhaps the hon. member did not expect such an answer, but—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. The time allowed the Parliamentary Secretary has expired.

[*English*]

NATIONAL PARKS—REQUEST FOR DEVELOPMENT OF FACILITY IN LIGHT OF POLLUTION OF LAKE ERIE

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday last I asked the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien) the following question:

> In the light of the deplorable state of Lake Erie and the need for environmental rehabilitation, and having regard to the fact that the people of Ontario are being barred from using the beaches of Lake Erie, will the minister give consideration to the development of an East Erie National Park?

I welcome this opportunity to enlarge on the urgency of this question and to hear the minister's answer. The need for action by the federal government is based on two imperatives. The first is to be in a position to clean up the pollution of Lake Erie. I quote from an article in the *Canadian Churchman,* which is the national publication of the Anglican Church in Canada.

> It is no wonder that sometime during the last decade Lake Erie died. The largest fresh water lake in the world is now being turned slowly into a weed-choked swamp. The water near its shoreline cannot be used for cooking or drinking. Not even boiling or chlorination can remove the contamination.

The other imperative is that the urbanized industrial heartland of Ontario, with rapidly expanding population pressure, has no adequate national parks. There are no adequate recreational facilities for the public, especially for those in low-income groups who cannot afford vacations in northern cottages. Ontario has only 12 square miles of national parks, compared with Prince Edward Island which has 7.9. The matter has been fully discussed in a study by Dr. John S. Jackson of Brock University, entitled "Recreational Development and Erie East Lakeshore," in which he says that the public are restricted to narrow road allowances while vast stretches of unused beach lie on either side. He even suggested that private business interests have erected fences into the water to prevent people using their legal right of access to the beaches. My information comes from a brief presented to the federal caucus of the New Democratic Party at Hamilton, by the Association for the Preservation of Erie East Lakefront, whose initials spell APEEL.

• (10:10 p.m.)

I address an urgent appeal to the government on behalf of numerous Canadians living in the Niagara peninsula to deal with the problem in the only way available, by developing an East Erie National Park. If the minister accedes to this plea he will earn the gratitude of numerous Canadians of this and later generations who will by his action be able to enjoy an improved quality of life.

Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I think all of us would agree with the appeal made by the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin), both with its principles and with his desire—a desire that we all share—with respect to what my hon. friend described as the horrible pollution of Lake Erie. There are some problems arising from this, of course. As my hon. friend knows, this government, the government of Ontario and the municipalities concerned are taking steps to make a more direct attack on pollution than by way of establishing a national park, though I am not derogating from this very good suggestion.

One problem is the availability and very high cost of land in this particular area. I do

not have the sort of knowledge of the area that my hon. friend has. But as I say, the principle is good. My minister has been very active, as has the government, in the pursuit of more national parks in Canada, and he has indicated that by the year 2000 hopefully we will have a total of 80 to 100 national parks. During the last year three new national parks have been established and there are six or seven presently under negotiation with the provinces.

For example, only last Friday the minister, as part of a series of discussions extending over the last two or three months, discussed with Hon. Rene Brunelle the substantial enlargement of an existing national park in Ontario as well as the establishment of a new park. Only yesterday the minister had the agreement of the province of Quebec to the establishment of a new national park, and there is a second national park now under negotiation in that province. And so it goes across the country. I think there are seven or eight parks now under consideration.

I agree with the hon. member for Greenwood on the importance of establishing national parks in what he described as the heartland of Ontario—this applies to other provinces too—those urbanized areas where people cannot travel some distance to enjoy the facilities of a national park. The minister has held discussions in several provinces along this line and the whole matter is being pursued very actively. I thank the hon. member for bringing the matter to the attention of the House. The matter is an important one; we are conscious of it and indeed are doing a great deal about it.

VIOLENT DISTURBANCES—MONTREAL—BOMB EXPLOSIONS—CO-OPERATION BY ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE WITH OTHER FORCES

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, I am sure all Canadians have the same sense of outrage that we in the House have this evening at the recent bombing activities in Westmount in the city of Montreal. This is what brings the Parliamentary Secretary and myself together for a brief exchange this evening.

It began last Friday when I asked the Solicitor General (Mr. McIlraith), as minister reporting to the House for the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, whether he had had an opportunity to check the serious allegations that the RCMP were not co-operating with other police forces in connection with the investigation of the outrages in Montreal in the last few days.

The Solicitor General replied:

> Yes, Mr. Speaker. Immediately I saw the story published in the paper I had this matter checked into and find—

My seatmate, the hon. member for Fundy Royal (Mr. Fairweather), interrupted and asked:

> Is it a canard?

The Solicitor General replied:

> Yes, it is. That is precisely the point, and today's newspapers so indicate.

When the Solicitor General agreed it was a canard I believe he was ducking the question, because I think he was relying on senior officers of the RCMP who could only be expected to say that there was all the co-operation in the world. Yet, sir, a year ago, as Your Honour would well know, in the province of Quebec the Prevost Royal Commission reported about the joint workings of the police forces in that province and singled out for special observation what it regarded as the somewhat secretive work of the RCMP, who apparently set themselves apart from the other police forces there. So my first question to the Parliamentary Secretary is: What has been done to overcome the criticism voiced in the Prevost report?

I do not expect a detailed or full answer. I understand the minister's position. One cannot probe too deeply into matters of this kind. I realize that, but I think that if he could give us and the country a general reassurance it would be helpful. I have checked with members of the press gallery and others who have followed the events of that day in Westmount and in the city of Montreal. I was told the Westmount police chief was sort of tagging along while other police forces rushed on to the new bombings that occurred. He was left behind waiting for his own car to catch up with him. I think the reports of the press about the co-operation, or lack of it, in dealing with this very serious problem in the city of Montreal add to the feeling of disquiet. I am told specifically by the press—and I suppose that I either have to eat my words in this regard or prove them, and if I have an opportunity I feel I can do that—that there is a feeling that the lower levels of those three police forces simply do not get along.

My second question, therefore, to the Parliamentary Secretary is: What sort of thing has been done to see that all levels of these

police forces work together? As I have said, sir, I have spoken to people whom I regard as serious journalists, one of them being the best journalist I have worked with in 30 years in that profession, and I count on his word and on his diligence. I think it takes more than the answer that I received the other day to remove the disquiet that I have in my mind.

I should like to say in closing that I have no desire in any way, in making the speech that I do this evening, to give comfort to the people whose activities can only lead to loss of life unless they are caught—and I hope they are caught and put away for a long, long time. But I think we must have some kind of statement for the public I hope the Parliamentary Secretary will now be in a position to give one that everybody across Canada, whether they live in the metropolitan area of Montreal, in Eekum Seekum or in Vernon, B.C., will find reassuring. We hope that in future all the police forces in the Montreal area will act in harmony in dealing with a very serious national problem.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say, first, that we all share the hon. member's feeling regarding the recent rash of bombings in Montreal and in the city of Westmount. We all hope this bombing will stop and that the culprits will be brought to justice.

• (10:20 p.m.)

I want to assure the hon. member that the utmost co-operation exists between the RCMP, the provincial police and the municipal police. I am informed that this week a special meeting took place among representatives of these police forces and a co-ordinating committee was set up to exchange information, to try to act in a co-ordinated way against these bombings and to try to achieve joint action in bringing the people responsible to justice.

RCMP services have always been available to all provincial and other legitimate authorities seeking them. Meetings and exchanges of information are always going on, on a general basis. As I say, a special meeting was held this week among representatives of the three police forces, and we hope that by the concerted use of their facilities we will have better prospects of bringing peace to the city of Montreal and to the city of Westmount I share the feelings of the hon. member in this respect. I will bring his remarks to the attention of the Solicitor General (Mr. McIlraith), who may wish to make a further statement. I assure the hon. member that close co-operation is taking place among the three police forces.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.24 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

The House met at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER ON DELAY IN PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Speaker: On Thursday, May 28, 1970, as recorded at pages 7423-24 of *Hansard* a question was raised concerning the delay in the publication of proceedings of the standing and other committees of the House. Since then I have looked into the detailed operation of the printing and publication of committee proceedings. Speaking in a general way, I have to state that even in the face of the most difficult circumstances this work is being discharged quite efficiently by the responsible officials of the House of Commons. Of course, there are some shortcomings, as was pointed out by the hon. members who raised the question by way of a point of order. I can give them the assurance that efforts will be made to improve the system and give the best possible service to the committees and to all hon. members.

May I briefly state to the House some of the many and varied problems involved. Initially, it must be said that the translation and printing of the daily *Hansard*, the Order Paper, *Votes and Proceedings* and bills, including reprinting of bills as amended by committees, for the use of both Houses must be given priority over our other work. That in itself is a problem of some magnitude, but if reference is made to the translation and printing of blue books such as the estimates, the Auditor General's report and other publications, it will be seen that the problem of co-ordinating the work of the House with the efforts of the translation and printing bureaux is not entirely within our direct administrative authority.

Neither should it be overlooked that a fundamental change in the committee system was effected in January, 1969, halfway through the last session. The full impact of those changes, from an administrative standpoint, has been felt most seriously during the last few weeks. At the end of the last session it was recognized that adequate accommodation and additional staff must be provided. Until that space became available, recruitment and training of staff could not be implemented in the manner thought desirable. That space became available in April of this year when our committee branch and supporting staffs were moved into the Vanguard Building. The actual moving of the staff set the whole pattern of our work back several weeks.

May I now briefly refer to what is entailed in the preparation, translation and printing of committee proceedings. For example, on Tuesday, May 26, 1970—that is, shortly before the matter was raised in the House—no fewer than nine committees were scheduled to meet. Four of those committees scheduled morning, afternoon and evening meetings; the other four scheduled one meeting each on that day. Assuming that no additional meetings were booked, there would be a total of 18 meetings listed for that day. On Thursday, May 28, 1970, ten committees were scheduled to hold 16 meetings, a program comparable with that of Tuesday, May 26, 1970. As a further example, 10 committees and two subcommittees met yesterday and held a total of 22 meetings. When consideration is given to briefs, exhibits and other documents which form part of a committee's printed record, it is reasonable to say that the preparation, translation and printing of committee reports on each of those days was the equivalent of nine daily *Hansards* in both languages.

• (2:10 p.m.)

It must also be emphasized that it has been the practice to give priority to the proceedings of committees dealing with bills that must be reported back to the House. As of May 28 last, all outstanding copy for the Standing Committee on Agriculture was either in the hands of the translators or the printers. Here again, an effort is being made to provide a priority for the Agriculture Committee's proceedings in respect of Bill C-196, the Canada Grain Act bill.

There is also the question of committees meeting outside the city of Ottawa. Such committees need supporting staff and it will be apparent that the translation and printing processes of publication in regard to such sit-

tings are necessarily slowed down. I need not dwell on the question of subcommittees other than to say that each subcommittee must be staffed and supported in the same manner as a main committee and that the proceedings of the subcommittees which have to be reported, translated and printed are often as extensive as the proceedings of the committees themselves. By way of example I would mention the Finance and External Affairs Committees, which have each set up two subcommittees. Effectively, our staff is thus required to process the proceedings of six committees rather than just two. In those circumstances hon. members will appreciate that some delay in the preparation of reports of proceedings is only normal.

In conclusion I might outline in a few words our plans or objectives in regard to committee work. As training and efficiency progress, and this must also flow into the translation and printing services, it would be our objective, as of next session, to provide a 36-hour service in the publication of committee proceedings on bills and other questions allotted priorities. With regard to the proceedings with respect to the consideration of estimates and other general references, it would be proposed that such material be made available within a week; that is to say, committee proceedings on a Tuesday in relation to a general reference will be published not later than the following Tuesday.

In order to further those objectives, may I also refer the House to the report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization presented to the House as recently as Thursday, May 28, 1970. In that report the committee recommends the standardization of the size and format of all our publications. We believe that standardization will contribute to shortening the time required for production of our printed records.

As a final comment I might mention to hon. members that a limited number of copies of typewritten transcripts of a committee's proceedings, including the interpretation thereof, are ordinarily available through the committee clerk the day following a meeting.

Again I think I express the feelings of all hon. members when I express the appreciation of the House for the efficiency and devotion of all employees of the committee branch. These officials have the full confidence of the House. We know that we count on their continued co-operation and on their devotion to the service of the House to overcome the difficulties with which they are confronted from time to time.

I thank the hon. members who raised this question. Their intervention has given us an opportunity to review the situation and to engage in even more determined action to provide the hon. members the service to which they are entitled.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

ORDER RESPECTING BILL C-197—ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION THIS DAY

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, there have been some discussions about today's business. In particular there have been expressions of interest during the past week in having government order No. 84, Bill C-197, completed with respect to the second reading stage and referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture. I believe there would be general agreement in the House for an order along the following lines: That after a further two hours' debate on the second reading stage, including any amendments on that bill, all questions would be put in order that a decision of the House might be taken and, in particular, in order that it might be referred to committee.

I might indicate that on behalf of the government I would give this undertaking: First, the government will not oppose any motion in committee to hear representatives who may wish to appear before the committee, as indeed had been the intention. Second, the government will undertake, at least in so far as it can give an undertaking, not to oppose in committee on technical grounds any amendments, other than those involving financial considerations, that may be brought before the committee.

On that basis, and assuming this order is acceptable to the House, the order of business for today will be changed. Instead of dealing with the Canada Elections Act, we will have a two-hour debate on the second reading of Bill C-197. This will be followed by government order No. 100, the amendment to the Aeronautics Act. This in turn will be followed by government order No. 68, the shipping conference amendment to the Combines Investigation Act. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if it

could be determined whether there is general agreement to limit the debate on second reading of Bill C-197 to two additional hours, after which all necessary questions would be disposed of.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): As far as we are concerned, Mr. Speaker, the statement made by the hon. gentleman continues to show that spirit of flexibility which marked his appearance in the House yesterday. We highly approve of it. We are prepared to accept an order of the House which will limit debate on Bill C-197 to two hours in the terms mentioned, provided an undertaking is given by the minister along the lines which I asked for some time ago in the House. I asked the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) publicly and privately that the government not oppose the moving of motions in committee and allow groups or organizations to make representations in person or by brief with suggestions as to change in substance. I asked that the government not raise technical objections to amendments dealing with matters of substance which might be proposed following such representations. I say, in a spirit of complete benevolence, that in the past we have been lured and seduced into committees—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baldwin: —and there have found the government trying to place the most narrow and rigid interpretation upon the rules. They have refused to allow witnesses to attend to make their views known. I am referring to witnesses and organizations who were supremely and vitally interested in the matter before the committee. In addition, valid amendments offered by this party have not been accepted. It was said they were contrary to the principle of the bill which had been approved on second reading.

I hope this action represents a change in view on the part of the government. If so, I welcome it. I recognize that the government cannot bind itself or anyone with respect to questions involving financial changes. However, if during the course of representations to the committee proposals are made by groups or by opposition parties which involve a variation of the financial recommendation, I hope the Minister of Agriculture, with that same degree of flexibility which marked his presence on this side of the House a number of years ago, will attempt to persuade his colleagues to accept it. I hope that all vitally interested groups will be allowed to be present and that the bill will be changed so as to be more in accordance with the views of the people of this country.

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, we are certainly prepared to agree to an order for a two-hour debate in the House so that Bill C-197 can then proceed to committee. We have received representations from organizations which wish to appear when the bill is in committee, and we are very pleased with the attitude of the government in this regard. We are glad to know that those who wish to appear as representatives of the farm organizations and of agricultural business generally can attend and make their views known. There will be an opportunity for fruitful debate in the committee and we can put forward some of the proposals we have made in the House.

• (2:20 p.m.)

Our position is clear. We think this bill is important, that it is essential to the welfare of a great many farmers, and for this reason the government can certainly count on our full co-operation to expedite this marketing measure.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, we are in complete agreement with the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) who would like us to deal as soon as possible with Bill C-197, and we are ready to co-operate entirely with him.

This, Mr. Speaker, does not mean that we intend to approve the principle of the bill which seeks no more and no less than the socialization of Canadian agriculture and we have in fact so reminded the House on several occasions.

However, we want to give the members of the committee an opportunity to hear representatives of the different agricultural organizations of Canada and to question them. We feel that by proceeding in this fashion we might be able to change the principle of the bill, since the Ralliement créditiste does not agree with the government's policy to establish the National Farm Products Marketing Council.

[*English*]

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I sent a note to the Government House Leader a few moments ago asking him whether the government intended to move concurrence in the

fifth report of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, but he slipped it under his papers.

Mr. Speaker: Order. We have not yet concluded the business on the point raised by the President of the Privy Council. I assumed the hon. member intended to refer to the same matter.

The terms of the order have been proposed by the minister, and conditions have been suggested by representatives of the parties in opposition. In any event, hon. members have heard the terms of the proposed order suggested by the President of the Privy Council and I have to ask the House whether it is so ordered.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: It is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

CONCURRENCE IN FIFTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): May I ask whether the Government House Leader intends to present a motion for concurrence in the fifth report of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections? I would just as soon it came from the government side, but if it does not I can ask unanimous consent to move it.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): I think it should come from the chairman of the committee and I will ask him to give notice of it in order to place it on the Order Paper and in that way bring it before the House.

Mr. Nielsen: I do not wish to sound impatient, but concurrence could be moved now by unanimous consent. This is a normal procedure and the committee was unanimous in its report.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I am certainly agreeable to that if the House will waive the requirement of two days' notice.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members have heard the proposal that the fifth report of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections be concurred in. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Motion agreed to.

[Mr. Nielsen.]

ELECTION EXPENSES

ESTABLISHMENT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, there have also been discussions between representatives of the parties with respect to referring the question of election expenses to a special committee to be constituted for the purpose. If there were found to be general agreement I should like to suggest that the following be made an order of the House:

That a special committee, constituted of 12 members to be named at a later date, be appointed to consider the question of the limitation and control of election expenses in Canada and to report from time to time its observations and opinions thereon;

That the committee be empowered to send for persons, papers and records; to sit during sittings and adjournments of the House; to print from day to day such papers and evidence as may be ordered by the committee; and to delegate to subcommittees any of its powers, except the power to report directly to the House.

As I say, if there is found to be general agreement among hon. members this might be made an order of the House.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: It is so ordered.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN THIRD REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

On the order:

Mr. Bell—That the third report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, presented to the House on Wednesday, May 13, 1970, be concurred in.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, in view of the unanimous agreement within the Public Accounts Committee that concurrence in this motion not be moved—there was a discussion of this subject on Monday last—I wonder whether the hon. member might not be agreeable to withdrawing his motion.

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): Yes, Mr. Speaker. In view of the apology the minister made yesterday we shall cooperate in the matter.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster have the unanimous

agreement of the House to withdraw the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

DRUGS

TABLING OF LeDAIN COMMISSION REPORT—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43 which permits a motion to be moved by unanimous agreement in cases of urgent and pressing necessity after an explanation has been given by the mover, I seek consent to move such a motion preceded by an explanation as to the urgency and the necessity for taking action quickly.

As every day goes by the misuse and abuse of drugs in this country becomes wider and wider, with the problem multiplying in intensity particularly among our younger people. Inasmuch as the public paid for the LeDain commission to conduct an inquiry into the subject matter of the non-medical use of drugs, inasmuch as the interim report of the commission has been before the minister for some two or three weeks, as well as before the cabinet, inasmuch as we are not asking for a decision on what the government intends to do with respect to the recommendations in the interim report but are simply asking the government to make available to the public a report which they paid for, in view of the growing abuse of the use of drugs I ask unanimous consent to move the following motion:

This House expresses the opinion that the government should forthwith table the interim report of the commission of inquiry into the non-medical use of drugs.

Mr. Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimity and therefore the hon. member's motion cannot be put.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, may I point out that there is not unanimity within the cabinet committee that is studying this question either.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed Bill C-187, an act respecting inland water resources in the Yukon territory and Northwest Territories, with an amendment, to which the concurrence of this House is desired.

SHIPPING

TABLING OF PROPOSED REGULATIONS ON MANNING OF STEAMSHIPS

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 41(2) I am pleased to table the proposed regulations relating to the manning of steamships. In order to meet my commitment to hon. members to lay them on the table today, I am tabling two copies in English, with the translation to follow, I hope, later today.

NAVIGABLE WATERS PROTECTION ACT

APPLICATION OF CONDITIONS AND APPROVALS TO GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-221, to amend the Navigable Waters Protection Act.

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Speaker, may I say by way of explanation of the purpose of this bill that, in my view, many activities of the governments of Canada and the provinces and their agents now affect navigable waters in ways similar to non-governmental activities. It is therefore proper and necessary that the Act clearly require that governmental activities are subject to the same conditions and approvals.

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

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

SUPPLY BOATS AND BARGES LOST IN ARCTIC WATERS

Question No. 995—**Mr. Harding:**

1. (a) How many supply boats or barges operating in Canadian Arctic waters have been lost within the past three years (b) when were these carriers lost (c) in what part of the Arctic were they lost

(d) what was the cause of the loss of each carrier (e) what was the cargo on each carrier, and (f) who was the owner of each carrier?

2. (a) What department investigated the sinking of these supply boats or barges (b) when were these investigations carried out (c) who made the investigations (d) have any of the sunken carriers been located (e) are reports on these investigations available?

3. (a) If oil or other pollutants were part of the lost cargoes, what amount of each was estimated to be in each individual sinking of a boat or barge (b) what steps have been taken to recover any lost cargo of possible pollutants (c) has any pollution of Arctic waters taken place through the loss of (i) oil supplies (ii) other supplies (d) what steps are being taken to prevent the further loss of cargo carriers in the Arctic?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. (a) Two, the towed barges *L.A. Learmonth* and *Johnny Norberg*. (b) August 22 and August 24, 1969, respectively. (c) In Viscount Melville Sound, S.E. of Byam Island. (d) Ice damage. (e) The *L.A. Learmonth* loaded with mining equipment and steel pipes, the *Johnny Norberg* with light diesel oil and aviation fuel (J.P. 4). (f) Both barges were owned by Panarctic Oils Limited, Calgary.

2. (a) Department of Transport. (b) September 10, 11 and 29, 1969. (c) Officials of the Marine Regulations Branch, Department of Transport. (d) No. (e) A summary report of the investigation is available.

3. (a) 2000 short tons light diesel oil and aviation fuel in the *Johnny Norberg*. (b) None. (c) (i) and (ii). No, as far as is known. (d) Work is in progress on the establishment of new safety standards to be applicable in these waters, to be made compulsory under the new Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act (Bill C-202).

NORTHWEST PASSAGE—POLICY OF CONTROL

Question No. 1,236—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the federal government have a policy of control of the Northwest Passage and, if so, does the policy include the co-operation of any other government?

2. To what extent does the federal government intend to police the Northwest Passage?

3. Will the Canadian Forces be involved in the security of Canada's north and in asserting sovereignty in the north and, if so, to what extent?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. The Government intends to open the Northwest Passage as a waterway for passage by ships of all states, subject to necessary conditions required for preservation of the Arctic environment. That policy is reflected in the Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Bill and the Bill to Amend the Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act. The Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Bill would provide for co-operation with other countries by empowering the Government to exempt from the application of Canadian anti-pollution regulations the public and naval vessels of other states which substantially comply with Canadian standards; the Government has also indicated its intention to consult with other countries regarding the safety regulations to be adopted under the Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Bill.

2. The Government intends to police Canada's coastal waters, including the Northwest Passage, in a manner which will achieve the purposes of existing and proposed legislation with respect to those waters.

3. The Canadian Armed Forces will be involved, along with other agencies of the Government of Canada, in protecting the security of Canada's North and in promoting Canada's sovereign interests in the area.

FOREIGN OWNERSHIP

Question No. 1,304—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. For the years 1967, 1968 and 1969, what are the Dominion Bureau of Statistics figures regarding the degree of foreign ownership and control of Canadian industry (a) manufacturing (b) petroleum and natural gas (c) mining and smelting?

2. If the above figures are not available, on what date is it anticipated that the Dominion Bureau of Statistics will publish such figures?

3. What are the reasons regarding the delay on publishing the foreign ownership and control figures for the above years?

4. Is the section in the Dominion Bureau of Statistics responsible for the publication of such figures now suffering from inadequate staff and, if so, will this situation be immediately corrected?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): 1. (a) Assets of corporations principally engaged in manufacturing and in which the majority of voting shares are owned by non-residents amounted to $22.4 billions or 56.7 per cent of the total reported by all manufacturing corporations which filed 1967 Canadian income tax returns. (b) Assets of corporations principally engaged in the oil and gas wells industry and in which the majority of the voting shares are owned by non-residents amounted to $3.7 billions or 82.6 per cent of the total reported by such corporations filing 1967 Canadian income tax returns. For petroleum refining, assets reported by concerns in which non-residents owned the majority of the voting shares amounted to $4.1 billions or 99.9 per cent of the total

reported by such corporations filing 1967 Canadian income tax returns. (c) Assets of corporations principally engaged in the metal mining industries and in which the majority of the voting shares are owned by non-residents amounted to $1.8 billions or 42.0 per cent of the total reported by all metal mining corporations which filed 1967 Canadian income tax returns. Total assets of mining corporations which were at least 50 per cent owned by non-residents amounted to $6.6 billions or 60.6 per cent of the total reported which includes metals, non-metals and other mining. Assets of corporations in the primary metals group of the manufacturing division in which at least half of the shares were owned by non-residents amounted to $3.0 billions or 55.6 per cent of the total. The smelting and refining component of this group included corporations in which the majority of shares were owned by non-residents which reported assets of $2.4 billions or 84.9 per cent of the total. It should be noted that the measurement of the degree of foreign ownership given above is based on the value of assets. Data for 1968 and 1969 are not yet available.

2. It is anticipated that the Report for 1968, Part I, Corporations, Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act will be published by November 30, 1970. The 1969 Report is expected to be published approximately one year later.

3. The figures above are based on returns under the Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act and corporation income tax returns. Substantially all returns for any given year must be on hand to establish the intercorporate relationships required to estimate non-resident ownership. It is approximately one year after the close of the calendar year before all tax returns become available (the Income Tax Act allows six months after the end of a corporation's tax year for filing a return). The complete processing of many thousands of complex financial statements, although automated, requires a further period of twelve months. A close to two-year lapse of time between the end of the calendar year and the publication of statistics is the result of the above factors.

4. The Section of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics responsible for the publication of such figures is not now suffering from inadequate staff. While improvements in automation procedures are expected during the next year, the timeliness of reports is substantially affected by matters referred to in Part 3 above.

AIR REGULATIONS AND NOTICES TO PILOTS

Question No. 1,480—**Mr. Hales:**

1. Under what section of the Air Regulations does the Minister of Transport or those to whom he may delegate this authority derive such authority to order the owner of an unlicensed aerodrome to cease to allow private aircraft operations to take place from this aerodrome?

2. What regulatory type of notice to pilots has been adopted by the Department of Transport as normal standard procedure to advise pilots that they are prohibited from landing at certain aerodromes?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. Notwithstanding Section 4 (1) (c) of the Aeronautics Act, no Air Regulation presently authorizes the Minister of Transport to order the owner of an unlicensed aerodrome to cease to allow private aircraft operations therefrom.

2. An Air Navigation Order published in the Canada Gazette, Part II, prohibiting navigation of aircraft over the specified area, supplemented by a Notice to Airmen distributed to all licensed pilots advising of the prohibition.

ARDA—FEDERAL ASSISTANCE IN QUEBEC AND ONTARIO 1968-70

Question No. 1,649—**Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse):**

What amount of money was paid by the federal government during the fiscal years 1968-69 and 1969-70 under ARDA in Quebec and Ontario?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion):

	Ontario	Quebec
	$	$
1968-69	5,629,000	6,302,000
1969-70	9,560,000	5,232,000

[*English*]

CANADIAN FLOUR MILLS

Question No. 1,661—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

1. How many flour mills do business in Canada and what are (a) their names (b) their locations?

2. For each of the past five years, how much wheat was used by each of these companies in the milling process (a) what was the price per bushel (b) is this grain purchased through the Wheat Board?

3. Is wheat for milling available from sources other than the Wheat Board and, if so (a) from what sources (b) in what quantities (c) at what prices?

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

Questions

Bureau of Statistics lists 41 active mills in the flour milling industry in 1970. In addition, small quantities of flour are produced by firms classified to other industries, e.g. feed manufacturers, breakfast cereals, and co-operatives. (a) and (b) Prince Edward Island: Leard, Warren, Coleman.

Nova Scotia: Dover Mills, Halifax.

Quebec: Cie de Minoterie Rozon, Montreal; Minoteries Phénix Ltée, Montreal; Ogilvie Flour Mills Co. Ltd., Montreal; Robin Hood Flour Mills Ltd., Montreal; Vanix Inc., Ste-Catherine; Moulin Bleu, Erg., Ste-Roche.

Ontario: Acton Flour Mills, Acton; Arva Flour Mills Ltd., Arva; Almonte Flour Mills Limited, Almonte; Ancaster Mountain Mills, Ancaster; Cherry Taylor Flour Mills Ltd., Chatham; Cherry Taylor Flour Mills Ltd., Preston; Cullen James & Sons Limited, Woodstock; Great Star Flour Mills Limited, St. Mary's; Hayhoe Mills, Pine Grove; Howson & Howson Ltd., Blyth; McCarthy Milling Co. Limited, Streetsville; Maple Leaf Mills Limited, Port Colborne; Maple Leaf Mills Limited, Toronto; Ogilvie Flour Mills, Midland; Reid Milling Limited, Streetsville; Robin Hood Flour Mills Limited, Port Colborne; Smith, E. A. Flour Mills Ltd., Scotland; Springwater Flour Mills, St. Thomas; Strathroy Flour Mills Limited, Strathroy.

Manitoba: Kent, B. P. Flour Mills Ltd., Virden; Ogilvie Flour Mills Co. Ltd., Winnipeg; Maple Leaf Mills Limited, Winnipeg; Soo Line Mills Limited, Winnipeg.

Saskatchewan: Quaker Oats Co. of Canada Ltd., The, Saskatoon; Robin Hood Flour Mills Ltd., Saskatoon; Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, Saskatoon; Wynyard Flour Mill, Wynyard.

Alberta: Ellison Milling & Elevator Co. Ltd., Lethbridge; Maple Leaf Mills Limited, Medicine Hat; Maple Leaf Mills Limited, Calgary; Ogilvie Flour Mills Co. Limited, The, Medicine Hat; Pillsbury of Canada Ltd., Calgary.

British Columbia: Millstream Flour Mills, Victoria.

2. Information not available for individual firms. The following table shows total wheat used by flour milling industry.

Crop Year Ending July 31	Wheat Milled (Million Bushels)
1965	87.2
1966	97.9
1967	90.1
1968	84.8
1969	85.0
six months 1969	44.0
six months 1970	46.2

[Mr. Pepin.]

(a) Prevailing prices as established by the Canadian Wheat Board. Present price is $1.95½/bu. for No. 1 Northern basis in store Thunder Bay, with appropriate differentials for other grades. (b) Western wheat is purchased through the Canadian Wheat Board.

3. Yes. (a) Ontario wheat is purchased through the Ontario Wheat Board, or directly from a dealer or farmer. (b) In the 1967/8 crop year, 7.6 million bushels (included in total shown in item two above). (c) Prices are negotiated for each purchase.

ACREAGE OF CELERY

Question No. 1,706—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. For each of the past ten years, what was the acreage of celery under cultivation for commercial use?

2. How much celery has Canada imported over each of the past three years and from what countries was it imported?

3. What was the customs duty on this product for each of the past three years?

4. What was Canada's total celery production for each of the past three years?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): The Dominion Bureau of Statistics reports that: 1. For each of the past ten years the acreage of celery under cultivation for commercial use was as follows:

Year	Acreage
1968	1,168
1967	1,103
1966	974
1965	1,050
1964	1,110
1963	1,200
1962	1,170
1961	1,290
1960	1,220
1959	1,380

2 and 3. Imports of celery with duty collected thereon for each of the past three years are shown on the following table:

Year	Country	Quantity (lbs.)	Value ($)	Duty ($)
1967	U.S.A.	122,399,543	6,598,032	171,427
1968	U.S.A.	119,817,532	6,657,070	214,985
1969	U.S.A.	123,653,664	8,210,813	258,834

4. Canada's total celery production for each of the past three years is shown in the table below:

Year	Production (lbs.)
1968	43,716,000
1967	36,618,000
1966	38,790,000

APPLICATIONS FOR INCENTIVE GRANTS

Question No. 1,752—**Mr. Serré:**

Since the inception of the Regional Development Grants Act (a) how many applications for grants were received from Ontario (b) what projects have been approved to date (c) what is the location and amount allotted to each project?

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): (a) Fifty-five.

(b) and (c) This information is contained in the reports which are tabled in Parliament each month.

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION—SPECIAL AREAS

Question No. 1,770—**Mr. Burton:**

What criteria was used by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion to select special areas as announced by the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion in Parliament on March 11, 1970, for the Provinces of (a) Newfoundland (b) Nova Scotia (c) New Brunswick (d) Quebec (e) Ontario (f) Manitoba (g) Saskatchewan (h) Alberta?

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): That priority measures to facilitate economic expansion and social adjustment in the areas would be especially beneficial in improving opportunities for productive employment of the people of the regions of which the areas are parts.

OMISSION OF BRITISH COLUMBIA AND P.E.I. FROM SPECIAL DESIGNATED AREAS

Question No. 1,779—**Mr. Burton:**

Were the Provinces of British Columbia and Prince Edward Island omitted from the announcement by the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion in Parliament on March 11, 1970, concerning special areas designated by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion and, if so, for what reasons?

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Yes. In the case of British Columbia, needs for economic expansion and social adjustment were not so exceptional that, within the resources available for 1970-72, priority could be given to special measures. In the case of Prince Edward Island, there is already a comprehensive development plan under the FRED legislation.

NEWFOUNDLAND—CBC COVERAGE OF PROCEEDINGS REGARDING COME-BY-CHANCE OIL REFINERY

Question No. 1,790—**Mr. Marshall:**

1. How much time was given by CBC to televise proceedings in the House of Assembly in the Province of Newfoundland on April 21-23 to question Mr. John Shaheen with regard to the Come-by-Chance oil refinery?

2. What national and regional programs were pre-empted due to such coverage?

3. What revenue was lost to CBC in advertising by national or regional subscribers?

4. What was the cost to CBC to produce the proceedings?

5. Who authorized the televising of these proceedings and on whose request?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: 1. Total television broadcast time of the April 21 and 22 hearings was 12 hours and 18 minutes.

2. Programs pre-empted on April 21 were: As the World Turns (Network); Canadian Outdoors (Network); The Edge of Night (Network); The Galloping Gourmet (Network); A Place of Our Own (Network); Belle Sebastian and the Horses (Network); Beverley Hillbillies (Network); All around the Circle (Regional); Hollywood and the Stars (CBNT—local); Love American Style (CBYT—local); Press Conference of the Apollo Astronauts (Network).

Programs pre-empted April 22 were: As the World Turns (Network); Take Thirty (Network); The Edge of Night (Network); The Galloping Gourmet (Network); Banana Splits (Network); H. R. Pufnstuf (Network); Debbie Reynolds Show (Network); David Frost Show (CBNT—local); Gunsmoke (CBYT—local); Montreal Expos Baseball Game (Network—This program was joined in progress at approximately 11:04 p.m.).

3. All local spot commercials and national selective sales spot commercials plus the one fully-sponsored regional program, All Around the Circle, were made good at later dates, therefore no local loss of revenue was incurred. National revenue lost amounted to $792.

4. Total cost to the CBC for producing the hearings was $5,336.

5. The televising of proceedings in the House of Assembly on April 21 and 22 was authorized by a vote of the members of the House of Assembly as the result of a request

from the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation through the Speaker of the House.

[*English*]

LEVIS, QUEBEC—CANDIDATES FOR POSITION OF POSTMASTER

Question No. 1,816—**Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse):**

What are the names of the candidates who took part in the last competition for the position of postmaster in Lévis?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Public Service Commission as follows: Section 25 of the Public Service Employment Regulations provides that the name of a person who is a candidate for a position, unless his name is on an eligible list for that position, shall not be disclosed, without the consent of the candidate, to any person who is not directly involved in the process of selection for appointment to the position. Six applications were received in the last competition for Postmaster at Lévis and two of the candidates were found to be qualified. Their names were placed on an eligible list in the following order: 1. Maurice Bourgeois; 2. Jean-Marie Poirier. There were no appeals, and Mr. Bourgeois was appointed to the position.

[*English*]

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AUTHORITY—AMOUNT OF DEBT AND INTEREST

Question No. 1,826—**Mr. Laprise:**

1. (a) What was the amount of debt of the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority at the time of its inauguration (b) what is the amount at present?

2. What was the amount owing in interest, each year, since the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway, and what amount was paid each year?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The St. Lawrence Seaway Authority advises as follows: 1. (a) At March 31, 1959, the debt of the St. Lawrence Seaway amounted to $285.6 million, consisting of capital loans of $270.0 million and deferred interest (during construction) of $15.6 million. (b) At December 31, 1969, debt amounted to $546.4 million, consisting of capital loans of $474.5 million, deferred interest during construction of the Welland By-Pass of $5.4 million and deferred operating interest of $66.5 million.

[Mr. Pelletier.]

2. Interest charges to operating and payments against these have been as follows:

	Interest Charged $	Paid $ (millions)	Balance Owing $
1959	8.1	—	8.1
1960	12.7	—	20.8
1961	14.2	1.3	33.7
1962	15.6	—	49.3
1963	16.8	—	66.1
1964	18.1	5.3	78.9
1965	15.8	49.6	45.1
1966	16.3	13.7	47.7
1967	16.6	10.9	53.4
1968	17.9	13.2	58.1
1969	19.1	10.7	66.5

Of interest charged to operations during 1959-1969, a total of $11.6 million was in respect of borrowings for the improvement of the Welland Canal. This entire amount was paid out of parliamentary appropriations voted to cover the Welland Canal operating deficit for the period.

INCENTIVE GRANT TO SWIFT CANADIAN CO. LTD.

Question No. 1,834—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion under the Regional Development Incentives Act authorized or provided an incentive grant to Swift Canadian Co. Ltd., Etobicoke, Ontario and, if so, what is the amount of the grant?

2. Who are the directors and executive officers of Swift Canadian Co. Ltd., and what is the address of each?

3. To what extent is the company non-resident or foreign-owned or controlled?

4. What is the name and country of the known non-resident ownership in this company?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion and by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics as follows: 1. This information was contained in the monthly report, tabled in Parliament on the operation of the Regional Development Act.

2. The officers and directors of Swift Canadian Co. Ltd., as at October 26, 1968 were: P. L. Ayers, 1137 Royal York Road, N.. Islington, Ontario; W. P. Christian, 287 Markland Dr., Etobicoke, Ontario; E. D. Fletchall, 919 Country Club Dr., LaGrange, Illinois 60525, U.S.A.; J. E. Harris, 1113 Algonquin Drive, Port Credit, Ontario; M. E. Morgan, 930 Eyremount Dr., West Vancouver, B.C.; C. F. Patterson, R.R. No. 2, Norval, Ontario;

R. W. Reneker, 10158 S. Leavitt St., Chicago, Illinois 60643, U.S.A.; L. V. Spalding, 11 Orrell Ave., Islington, Ontario; P. M. Steinbrink, 9757 S. Bell Ave., Chicago, Illinois 60653, U.S.A.; J. C. Walmsley, 31 Appledale Road, Islington, Ontario; W. A. Mill, 403 Valleyfield Dr., Mississauga, Ontario.

3. Non-residents own 100 per cent of the voting shares of the company.

4. Swift and Company of Chicago own 119,989 of the total 120,000 shares outstanding.

VETERANS IN CANADA RECEIVING PENSIONS AND ALLOWANCES

Question No. 1,847—**Mr. Caouette:**

How many veterans are there in Canada who served in the army of our allied countries during (a) World War I (b) World War II (c) the Korean War and, of this number, how many receive (i) a federal pension (ii) a veteran's allowance (iii) a pension for disability attributable to service (iv) medical and hospital care?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Veterans Affairs and National Health and Welfare as follows: (a), (b), (c) Information not available. (i) All records of the Income Security Branch, of the Department of National Health and Welfare, are kept in such a way as to make it impossible to produce this information. (ii) World War I, 5,257; World War II, 985; Korean War, Information not available; Dual Service (WW I and WW II), 31. (iii) World War I, 423; World War II, 1,034; Korean War, none. (iv) Information not available.

NUMBER OF CANADIAN VETERANS IN WORLD WAR I, WORLD WAR II, AND KOREAN WAR

Question No. 1,848—**Mr. Caouette:**

1. Among World War I veterans, how many (a) were living in Canada prior to enrolment (b) served in the Canadian Army?

2. Among World War II veterans, how many (a) were living in Canada prior to enrolment (b) served in the Canadian Army?

3. Among Korean War veterans, how many (a) were living in Canada prior to enrolment (b) served in the Canadian Army?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Veterans Affairs and National Defence as follows: 1. (a) Information not available. (b) 619,636 (including 59,544 fatal casualties).

2. (a) Information is available only with respect to the Canadian Army. Out of a total enrolment of 1,086,343 in all three services, the records indicate that 723,143 army veterans were previously living in Canada. (b) 730,159 (including 22,917 fatal casualties).

3. (a) and (b) The Department of National Defence does not hold records which would provide this information.

COST OF COAST GUARD ICEBREAKERS ACCOMPANYING "MANHATTAN"

Question No. 1,854—**Mr. Burton:**

1. What was the total cost to the Canadian Government involved in having the icebreaker *Sir John A. Macdonald* accompany the supertanker *Manhattan* on its Arctic voyage in 1969?

2. What is the estimated total cost to the Canadian Government involved in having the icebreaker *Louis S. St. Laurent* accompany the supertanker *Manhattan* on its voyage in Arctic waters in 1970?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. Costs that are clearly identifiable as related to the *Manhattan* operation amounted to approximately $23,700. These comprise consultants' fees, salaries, travelling expenses, rental of equipment and expenses concerned with press representation.

The CCGS *John A. Macdonald* would have been employed in Arctic waters for approximately the same time even if she had not accompanied the *Manhattan* and there is no realistic way of determining what extra costs were incurred in the *Manhattan* operation. If any, they were offset by a certain amount of fuel supplied at no cost by the *Manhattan*.

An increased program of aerial observation of ice conditions was carried out over that normally undertaken. The *Manhattan* benefitted considerably from this but it was also of very great value in increasing our own knowledge of Arctic ice conditions and this was largely due to the loan of specialized electronic sensing devices not possessed by the Department at no cost by the Humble Oil Company. Here too there is no way of finding a realistic apportionment of cost.

2. A spring voyage by the CCGS *Louis S. St. Laurent* into northern waters to test the capabilities of this new vessel had been scheduled before the request for Canadian icebreaker support to the *Manhattan* was received. The two are therefore being combined. What additional cost, if any, will be incurred through the *Louis S. St. Laurent* accompanying the *Manhattan* cannot be estimated until it is known how long the voyage lasts.

Questions

VANCOUVER INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Question No. 1,859—**Mr. Goode:**

What is the capacity of the Vancouver International Airport sewer system in gallons per minute and how much of this capacity is being used?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The maximum capacity of the forcemain from the airport to the treatment plant is 1,400 gallons per minute. The agreement with the Iona treatment plant limits the discharge to 1,000 gallons per minute with a maximum daily total of 350,000 gallons per day. The airport is presently discharging approximately 240,000 gallons per day to the treatment plant and it is expected that with plans to connect the old terminal area to the system and growth of the present terminal area, the discharge will soon reach the allowed rate of 350,000 gallons per day.

AVERAGE CONSUMER INTEREST RATE 1960 TO 1970

Question No. 1,862—**Mr. Robinson:**

What was the average consumer interest rate for each year 1960 to 1970 inclusive?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): There is a great variety of interest rates charged to consumers depending upon the nature of the transaction. It would not be possible to calculate an average consumer interest rate. Consequently, the question cannot be answered in its present form.

REDUCTION OF INTEREST CHARGE ON CREDIT BUYING

Question No. 1,891—**Mr. Robinson:**

Will the federal government consider ways and means of reducing the interest charge on credit buying?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): The Bank of Canada on May 31 reduced its Bank Rate from 7½ per cent to 7 per cent. This was the second reduction in May. In addition, the government is reviewing its economic and financial policies in view of the recent changes in circumstances.

PERCENTAGE OF GNP SPENT BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Question No. 1,913—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. What is the percentage of the gross national product spent by the federal government for each year 1940 to 1960 inclusive?

[Mr. Loiselle.]

2. What is the estimated percentage of the gross national product proposed to be spent by the federal government for the year 1970?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): 1. On a national accounts basis, the percentage of the gross national product spent directly by the federal government for each year 1940 to 1969 was:

Year	Per Cent	Year	Per Cent	Year	Per Cent
1940	14	1950	12	1960	16
1941	18	1951	13	1961	16
1942	35	1952	17	1962	16
1943	38	1953	17	1963	15
1944	43	1954	17	1964	14
1945	35	1955	16	1965	13
1946	23	1956	15	1966	14
1947	14	1957	15	1967	14
1948	12	1958	16	1968	14
1949	12	1959	16	1969	14

2. On the same basis, it is estimated that these proposed expenditures by the federal government in 1970 would account for 14 per cent of the gross national product.

FINANCING OF CROWN CORPORATIONS

Question No. 1,940—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. Has the Department of Finance created a new position with regard to the financing of Crown corporations and, if so, what will be the duties of the incumbent?

2. What are the requirements for this position?

3. Is there a specific policy on the financing of Crown corporations?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): 1. No.

2. Not applicable.

3. Yes. The policy is that Crown Corporations obtain their financing from the Government of Canada, usually by way of loans but equity capital is supplied when required. Sums so provided are to finance the capital expenditures of Crown Corporations included in their capital budgets approved by the Governor in Council on the recommendation of the appropriate Minister, the President of the Treasury Board and the Minister of Finance as required by the Financial Administration Act. From time to time, some Crown Corporations have borrowed in their own name, for example, the CNR has issued bonds guaranteed by the Government of Canada, CMHC has sold mortgages insured under the National Housing Act. However, these issues were exceptions to the general policy of financing Crown Corporations by loans or subscriptions to equity capital from

the Consolidated Revenue Fund. The sums raised by these direct sales of securities to the public were also applied to financing capital expenditures approved in the manner just described.

PRIME MINISTER'S FAR EASTERN TRIP

Question No. 1,972—**Mr. Mazankowski:**

1. How many people accompanied the Prime Minister on his recent trip to the Far East?

2. What are their names and respective positions, including members of the Press Corps?

3. What were their duties while abroad?

4. Were additional personnel employed abroad, for the purpose of speech-writing, etc., and, if so, what are their names, and what were they paid?

5. Were any charges made to any person to recover air travel expenses and, if so, to whom and in what amount?

Mr. J. E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): 1, 2 and 3. See answer to question No. 1,858 answered this date.

4. No.

5. Air transportation charges of $1,300 for the round trip, and pro-rated for portions thereof, were recovered from members of the press party.

USE OF DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT IN PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE

Question No. 1,976—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Privy Council Office have data processing equipment (automatic) and, if so, for how long?

2. What was the initial cost of the equipment?

3. What yearly costs are anticipated for data processing in the Department?

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

2 and 3. Not applicable.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR—RESEARCH PROJECTS

Question No. 607—**Mr. Comeau:**

1. In 1968-69 and 1969-70, what were the estimated sums spent on research in the Department of Labour and what was the purpose of each research project?

2. How much money was actually expended according to Dominion Bureau of Statistics figures?

Return tabled.

Orders for Returns

GRANTS TO STUDENTS FROM UNDERDEVELOPED COUNTRIES AT CANADIAN UNIVERSITIES

Question No. 1,533—**Mr. MacLean:**

1. How many scholarships or other grants have been made to students from underdeveloped countries at Canadian universities for each year since the inception of such scholarships and/or grants?

2. What is the minimum and maximum of assistance given to individual students?

3. How many students who have received benefits have already graduated from Canadian universities?

4. (a) Have any of these students applied for landed immigrant status in Canada (b) how many of such applications have been granted?

5. When students from underdeveloped countries apply for these grants, are they required to undertake to return to their own countries on the completion of their education?

Return tabled.

CONSULTANTS ENGAGED, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Question No. 1,800—**Mr. Robinson:**

How many consultants have been engaged by the Department of Agriculture during each year 1950 to 1970 inclusive (a) what was the cost of the consultants (b) how were the consultants utilized (c) for what reasons were the consultants necessary?

Return tabled.

PEOPLE WITH PRIME MINISTER ON FAR EASTERN TRIP

Question No. 1,858—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. How many people accompanied the Prime Minister on his trip to the Far East?

2. Who are these people and what was the purpose of each person accompanying the Prime Minister?

3. What are the qualifications of each of the public servants who accompanied the Prime Minister?

4. Of those accompanying the Prime Minister who are not government employees, how many were representatives of newspapers, radio, television and other news media?

5. Will the representatives of the news media have their expenses paid by their employers and (a) if so, what will be the cost to each (b) if not, will the cost be paid by the government?

6. Were the representatives of the news media who accompanied the Prime Minister chosen by (a) the Press Gallery (b) by the media (c) by the government?

7. Were any of the people accompanying the Prime Minister either not government employees or representatives of the news media?

Return tabled.

Motions for Papers

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I direct the attention of the President of the Privy Council to the fact that the first eight questions on the Order Paper were all filed in October and here we are in the second week of June and they have not been answered. It seems to me inexcusable that these questions should remain on the Order Paper from the beginning of the session until almost the end of the session. If the government does not wish to answer these questions it should say so. Members cannot conduct the business of the House if they must wait months for answers to questions and then find that the House is about to close without these answers being given. May I ask whether these and many other questions which have been on the Order Paper for several months will be cleaned up before we recess at the end of the month?

Mr. Forest: Mr. Speaker, we are pressing for answers to all the remaining questions on the Order Paper. May I point out that up to date more than 85 per cent of the record number of all questions on the Order Paper have been answered.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Skoberg: Mr. Speaker, to be specific, question No. 131 was asked on October 23. I believe an answer could be provided without much difficulty. Again, question No. 133, which has been on the Order Paper since October 23, is merely an inquiry concerning whether an Arctic transportation task force has been established. Surely this does not involve too much research. Then there is question No. 244 of October 23 concerning outside consultant studies for various departments. Surely we should be able to expect answers before the end of June to some of these questions.

Mr. Forest: Mr. Speaker, I shall make inquiries, but we expect to file answers before the end of the session.

[*Translation*]

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, notice of motion No. 465 is acceptable to the government, subject to the usual reservations concerning confidential papers and to the authorization of the government authorities concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining Notices of Motions be allowed to stand.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Subject to the reservations and conditions expressed by the Parliamentary Secretary, is it the pleasure of the House that Notice of Motion No. 465 be deemed to have been adopted.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

CLOSURE OF POST OFFICES, SERATH AND GREGHERD, SASK.

Motion No. 465—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all corespondence, reports, memoranda and other documents relating to the closure of post offices at Serath and Gregherd, Saskatchewan and the proposed establishment of an alternative rural route mail service.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining Notices of Motions stand?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker will the Parliamentary Secretary give the same assurance and carry it through with regard to the remaining Notices of Motions for the Production of Papers?

Mr. Forest: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. member we are making representations to the proper departments. May I point out that we have dealt with about 80 per cent of the Notices of Motions for the Production of Papers already.

Mr. Skoberg: Mr. Speaker, some two weeks ago I asked about Notice of Motion No. 32 which has been on the Order Paper since October 23 and was given some indication it would be dealt with by the Minister of Transport. The same situation exists in respect of many other Notices of Motions which date back to October and November. Surely these motions can be brought forward and dealt with.

Mr. Burton: Mr. Speaker, on December 19 I asked the government for copies of all correspondence between the government of Canada and the government of Nova Scotia regarding financial assistance for the Deuterium of Canada Limited heavy water plant at Glace Bay, Nova Scotia. It seems to me the government should have been able to give

some indication prior to now concerning whether or not this correspondence will be made available.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining Notices of Motions stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

HOUSING

DROP IN STARTS AND GOVERNMENT POLICY OF RESTRAINT—MEASURES TO PROMOTE CONSTRUCTION

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Finance whether the serious drop in housing starts in the month of May to an annual rate of less than 130,000 units is a drop which is taking place according to plan as part of the government policy of restraint and whether it is consistent with the guidelines policy the government has adopted?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I should like to see housing starts expand greatly.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, is it the policy of the government that the expansion of housing starts to a reasonable level would have an inflationary or anti-inflationary effect?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, I find that question concerning whether it would have an inflationary or anti-inflationary effect very difficult to answer. I do not think it would have an inflationary effect.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the serious decline in housing starts that has taken place not only causes great hardship to individuals but would seem quite obviously to be inflationary in the sense that it pushes up the cost of living and therefore an increase in the wages that persons expect, is the minister prepared to announce in the House, in light of these very alarming figures, measures that he proposes to take to have housing starts return to something like a satisfactory, sensible and normal figure?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I may be able to assist a little on this. I have a report from the minister responsible for housing. I do wish to indicate the government's concern about these low figures and to repeat—

An hon. Member: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: Perhaps you do not want an explanation.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: You sound like Rawhide.

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is much the same as that of the Leader of the Opposition. I would ask the Prime Minister to set forth the position of the government concerning ways and means to improve housing starts in Canada in view of the serious decline in the first five months of this year.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It would seem to me that the question asked by the hon. member for Broadview is very wide in scope. He might wish to rephrase it. He is inviting a minister of the Crown to make a general statement. I do not think this should be done at this time.

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Speaker, would the Prime Minister make a statement before Parliament adjourns with regard to measures the government intends to take to solve the serious decline in housing starts in view of the 50.1 per cent drop in urban starts in the first five months of this year?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I will pass this suggestion on to the minister.

Mr. Stanfield: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Prime Minister if he would stop playing games with a subject of great importance not only to this House but the country—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: —and indicate to the House whether the government proposes to take any measures to meet this very serious situation and, very briefly, what these measures might be?

Mr. Trudeau: Well, Mr. Speaker, sometimes it is difficult to know if members of the opposition really want all the facts or if they are interested in playing politics with the situation.

Mr. Baldwin: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, under Standing Order 39 members of the House are entitled to ask questions. Ministers do not have to answer but if they do the answers should not be frivolous, glib, evasive and non-responsive.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I believe the hon. member for Hamilton West has a supplementary.

ESTABLISHMENT OF BUILDING SOCIETIES

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Finance. In view of the fact that the Minister without Portfolio in charge of housing, since his return from his European fact-finding tour, is now convinced of the usefulness and practicality of building societies, and in light of the fact that interest rates have increased to 10.3 per cent for home ownership, would the minister confer with his colleagues in order to review and re-assess the government's decision regarding building societies?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, there is nothing to stop the formation of building societies in Canada.

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a supplementary question to the Prime Minister. Can he tell the House when his mental age will catch up with his chronological age?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

LABOUR RELATIONS

SETTLEMENT OF WEST COAST TOWBOAT STRIKE—WAGE INCREASE AND SIX PER CENT GUIDELINE

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Labour a question regarding the towboat strike which has been going on for some weeks in the province of British Columbia. I understand that an agreement has been worked out for submission to the membership of the Canadian Merchant Service Guild with the help of the conciliation officers of the federal Department of Labour. Can the minister tell the House what are the terms of the settlement which is being submitted to the towboat workers, both with respect to the wage settlement and the manning and safety provisions?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I am rather pleased to announce that the very disruptive towboat strike on the west coast was settled about five o'clock this morning, Vancouver time. I think that the hon. gentleman will appreciate the fact that I cannot be specific as to the details of the settlement because these things are normally put before the membership when they are asked to ratify the proposed settlement, something which will occur on Friday.

I would like to say to the House that the main issue in dispute for some considerable time has been the safety factor, as pointed out by the hon. gentleman. This has been settled as the result of the improved manning regulation which the Minister of Transport tabled today, plus certain conditions which are included in the collective agreement.

So far as the wage factor is concerned, it is a three-year contract. It has been settled precisely on the lines recommended unanimously by the conciliation board. I think the settlements are 10 per cent, 10 per cent and 6 per cent.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, in view of the wage settlement which has been agreed upon by both parties and which is now being submitted to the membership, may I ask the Minister if this means that the Department of Labour has come to recognize that the 6 per cent wage guideline restraint is unrealistic unless it is accompanied by restraints on other forms of income?

Mr. Mackasey: Well, Mr. Speaker, as Minister of Labour I recognize the fact that there is a cost-push type of inflation, and I do not think anyone in the government should have ever left the impression, in fact I do not think anyone has left the impression, that the only cause of the cost-push inflation has been wages. I think that profits, dividends, rents, executive salaries, professional fees and wages have all contributed to the cost-push inflation, and I am hoping that labour will not be isolated as the only cause because this would be erroneous and unfair.

SETTLEMENT OF WEST COAST TOWBOAT STRIKE—USE OF SAME CONCILIATION OFFICERS IN POSTAL DISPUTE

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, in view of the excellent work which the conciliation officers of the federal Department of Labour did in the west coast towboat dispute, may I ask the minister if he would be prepared to make these conciliation officers available to the government in the postal dispute in the hope of bringing about an early settlement?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, much as it is tempting for the

Department of Labour to take the credit for this settlement, I think the head of the conciliation branch, Mr. Kelly, would be the first to say that the terms of settlement were arrived at independently of the Department of Labour. I think hon. members should realize that we were there only to assist the two parties to arrive at a settlement, and they arrived at a settlement, including wages, independently of the Department of Labour. I would like to take this opportunity, rather than on motions, to pay particular tribute to the B.C. Federation of Labour which proved to be a very positive force in arriving at the settlement.

EFFECT ON WAGE DEMANDS OF INCREASED RENTS

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Labour whether it is the view and the experience of his department that the shortage of housing with the resultant increase in rents is a factor in the wage demands put forward?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister of Finance made it quite clear in his statement on Monday that he regards unfair rents, high rents, as a cause of inflation, and I understand Dr. Young did obtain from the provinces—I must remind the House that rents come under provincial jurisdiction—recognition of this. There is nothing to prevent the Premier of Ontario, for example, from imposing rent controls. This is one tangible way in which the provinces can show that they pay more than lip service to the fight against inflation.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct one further supplementary to the Minister of Labour, a man who is sincerely interested in this whole issue. Would he use the influence that I am sure he has with the Prime Minister to persuade the Prime Minister to abandon his reticence and the rather arrogant way that he is treating the House and tell the House whether the government has a program to deal with this matter?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

[*Translation*]

INDUSTRY

GOLD MINES—ASSISTANCE FOLLOWING FREEING OF DOLLAR EXCHANGE RATE

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance.

Inquiries of the Ministry

After the adoption of the floating exchange rate for the Canadian dollar, Canadian gold mines are losing revenues and a good many marginal mines which attract American funds to Canada and which provide employment for Canadians will undoubtedly have to close down. Does the minister have any measures in mind to help the gold mining industry and improve this situation?

[*English*]

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, a week or so ago, along with my colleague the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion I met with citizens of the gold mining areas concerning gold mining assistance, and I understand that this morning the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources met with gold producers to discuss this particular problem.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—SUGGESTED MEETING OF PRIME MINISTER AND LABOUR LEADERS

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that Ontario and Quebec made it very clear that they do not intend to enforce the 6 per cent wage increase guideline, and in view of the very strong and recent reiteration by the leaders of organized labour that they do not intend to pay any attention to the government's 6 per cent guideline, a position which, judged by the announcement which was just made by the Minister of Labour—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member should not make a statement; he should ask his question.

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, sometimes I find it necessary to put the Prime Minister in the picture. In view of these facts, does the Prime Minister not consider that the time has now arrived for him to call together the leaders of organized labour to try to persuade them that they should give their co-operation in order to make anti-inflation policies workable in this country?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I attempted such a meeting some months ago, with the success which is now judged by the hon. member, but perhaps he could invite the leaders of organized labour himself and convince them.

Mr. Stanfield: Well, we will try. Somebody had better do something.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, now that I have the Prime Minister's okay to call a meeting that he will attend at his house in Rockcliffe, I will be very glad to issue the invitations today. I take it that he will be there and will do his very best to persuade the labour leaders.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

An hon. Member: No female company.

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

POLICY RESPECTING GRANTS—CONTROL OF COMPANIES—ASSISTANCE TO SWIFTS

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. Is it government policy, in reference to regional development, to advance money to Canadian companies in preference to American controlled companies?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Woolliams: I wonder if I might ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister justify his position, in light of that of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, by explaining to the House and the country why he is advancing to Swift's in Lethbridge several hundred thousand dollars to go into operation against Canadian owned and controlled companies? Why is he advancing money to United States companies that are not here already?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, in our regulations concerning industrial loans or incentives, we do not take into account the origin of the company but only the place where materials for the construction of industries are bought. There is no discrimination against businesses with regard to their origin.

[*English*]

Mr. Woolliams: May I ask a further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. With reference to the advancing of this money, is there any arrangement that the group that will be working in this plant will come from a certain section of Canada?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): I believe the policy comes from the statement on materials to be used for the construction of factories. Such restrictions exist but there are no others.

[*English*]

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, maybe the minister did not understand my question, which was very simple and to the point. Is there any arrangement, because of the advancing of this money against the interest of Canadian companies, that the labour that will work in this new plant, which is not there now, will come from a certain section of the country?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, I would need further details about the location or the area in Canada. If the hon. member would tell me to what area he is referring, I could give him a more specific answer.

[*Later:*]

[*English*]

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question arises from one asked by the hon. member for Calgary North. Is it a principle of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion to assist industry in certain areas of Canada in order to create greater employment in the area that the industry is going into?

[*Later:*]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, it is surely one of the objectives of the department to create a greater number of jobs where plants are set up.

[*English*]

QUEBEC—GRANT TO INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the minister whether, prior to making a grant to International Business Machines Corporation for a project in Quebec, he consulted with the Minister of Communications in view of the interest expressed by the Minister of Communications in developing a Canadian controlled—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question is not in order. The hon. member knows he cannot ask whether the minister has consulted with another minister before a decision has been taken.

DRUGS

APPEARANCE OF CANADIAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION BEFORE FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL COMMITTEE ON PRICES

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Has the minister received a request from the Canadian Pharmaceutical Association to appear before the federal-provincial committee on drug prices and, if so, what reply has he given to that request?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the meeting being held in Ottawa today is a federal-provincial meeting of officials at both levels of government. It certainly is not the practice to have people from the private sector present at such meetings.

Mr. Dinsdale: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the high cost of drugs, would the minister arrange to meet with representatives of the association who are anxious to offer advice on how the cost of drugs can be lowered?

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, I indicated to the association that following the conference there undoubtedly would be consultation.

LABOUR RELATIONS

SETTLEMENT OF WEST COAST TOWBOAT STRIKE—RELEASE FROM JAIL OF UNION MEMBER

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, may I address a question to the Minister of Labour relating to or arising out of the response he gave to the first question asked about the towboat situation in British Columbia. Could the minister tell us whether part of the settlement involves any form of truce in the legal conflicts which have surrounded this dispute? If so, could he state whether this might lead to the release from jail of a member of the union who is at the moment, I understand, in jail?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): No, Mr. Speaker, I think such a conditional settlement would be an interference with the due process of the law. I am not a lawyer but I would presume that in the case of this particular official the matter would no doubt be reviewed by his lawyer and possibly there are appeal procedures. Certainly the settlement was not conditional on the release of any union member under sentence for contempt of court. One of the beneficial effects of the proposed settlement is I understand all secondary picketing will be removed immediately in British Columbia and this should do a lot to remove one source of irritation.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Justice arising out of a question asked on Monday in his absence concerning, whether he sees any role that he might be able to play in bringing about the release of this union member, particularly now—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This question is not acceptable.

TAXATION

WHITE PAPER ON REFORM—DATE OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROPOSALS

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): I have a question for the Minister of Finance which concerns the timing of the implementation of the white paper proposals on taxation. In light of the recommendations of the western conference of Liberals which are to go to the national conference of the Liberal Party in November, is it right to anticipate that the government will be able to implement those recommendations by January 1, according to the timetable?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I answered that question yesterday.

POLLUTION

OIL SPILL NEAR UNGAVA BAY

Mr. Paul St. Pierre (Coast Chilcotin): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. What action is his department taking in relation to the 350,000 gallon oil spill near Ungava Bay in Quebec?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, we are sending people there immediately, as are the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources and the Quebec government. I understand that a large tank farm has been swept into an inlet near Ungava Bay and there is real concern about the living resources in the water there due to that unfortunate spill.

OIL PIPELINE SPILLAGE NEAR FORT MCMURRAY

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder

whether the minister might be able to report on progress being made on pollution in the Athabasca River and Lake system as well?

Mr. Speaker: I suggest that is not a supplementary but the question having been asked, perhaps the minister might like to reply.

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): I understand that officials from several departments are co-operating on this problem as well, Mr. Speaker.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

TORONTO—FACILITIES FOR PAYMENT OF BENEFITS

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): I have a question for the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker. In view of a possible impending postal crisis and in view of complaints that workers are being herded like cattle at the Moss Park Armouries in Toronto to receive their unemployment insurance benefits, will the minister give consideration to the use of the facilities at the Canada Manpower Centres in the Toronto area for the issuing of these benefits?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his customary courtesy in giving me notice earlier in the week that he intended to raise this question. The problem, of course, is that because of the rotating strikes we have endeavoured to continue our service to people who normally receive unemployment insurance payments by mail. The choice of the armouries, which may have been an unhappy one as far as conditions are concerned, was predicated upon location and size because of the admittedly large number of unemployed people in the Toronto area. I have taken into consideration the suggestion made by the hon. member that we use other government facilities, namely the Canada Manpower Centres. We have come to the conclusion that they are not large enough. However, as a result of the hon. member's suggestion we are searching in the general area for accommodations that are more suitable and through which the unemployed can receive their unemployment insurance with the dignity to which they are entitled.

HAMILTON—ALLEGED USE OF POSTAL CRISIS AS REASON FOR DELAY IN PROCESSING CLAIMS

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister in receipt of a telegram from the President of Local 2868, United Steelworkers, in Hamilton to the effect that untold hardship is being experienced by hundreds of employees of International Harvester in Hamilton as a result of the Unemployment Insurance Commission using the postal crisis to delay unemployment insurance claims due to intermittent mass lay-offs? Would the minister look at the Hamilton area in order to ascertain whether it is possible to find some means to get rid of these delays?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I will look into the matter, without accepting the interpretation of the hon. gentleman as to what the telegram contains.

BRITISH COLUMBIA—ACTION TO CLEAR UP BACKLOG OF CLAIMS

Mr. Paul St. Pierre (Coast Chilcotin): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister advise what action, if any, his department is taking to clear up the very serious backlog of unemployment insurance cases in British Columbia which has arisen from the strike?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest to hon. members that we should not at this time attempt to deal with all the provinces and communities of Canada. That would perhaps lead to some difficulty because there are only 40 minutes at our disposal. Perhaps hon. members who have supplementaries along that line would get in touch directly with the minister so that we might make some progress during the question period. I know this is an important matter, but perhaps we should go on to other subjects.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I admit that Your Honour's point is well taken but surely, since this matter affects thousands of people, particularly in the metropolitan areas, it should be raised in the House of Commons. The minister has indicated—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has asked a question which I realize is important and I believe he received an answer. The hon. member for Hamilton West did the same. We are now reaching British Columbia, and if we worked our way back to Newfoundland we would need more than the 40 minutes at our disposal. In fact, now we have much less time than that.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, if a person is waiting for his cheque this matter becomes very important to him.

Mr. Hees: That is absolutely correct.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

LEVEL OF MERCURY IN HUMANS—USE OF BLOOD INSTEAD OF URINE TESTS

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. I apologize for not giving him notice but I was unable to reach him by telephone. Since it has now been estimated that 1 milligram of mercury is toxic to the human brain, and since very grave doubts have recently been expressed on the reliability of urine tests to determine the level of mercury in humans who eat a steady diet of fish, will the minister consider resorting to blood tests which are much more accurate?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, I think this question should be directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. We are working closely with that department, of course. I believe it is dealing with the effects of mercury on human beings. We are confined to fish.

Mr. Rynard: A supplementary question, Mr. speaker. I direct my previous question to the minister's attention and ask whether, since this matter comes within the responsibilities of his department, he will get in touch with that minister and bring an answer back to the House?

Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might say something further. The level of mercury in fish in Canada is a very small fraction of the level which was found, for example, in Japan where there was an effect on human beings. In other words, the levels in Canada are very safe levels indeed.

NATIONAL REVENUE

SEIZURE OF LETTERS BY CUSTOMS OFFICERS AT MONTREAL AIRPORT

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Revenue. I tried to give him notice of it. Has the minister investigated the incident at Montreal airport where it appears that his officials have seized or detained 140 letters written by American servicemen captured in North Viet Nam to their relatives, and other material in the possession of visitors to Canada?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister of National Revenue): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

Mr. Brewin: Can the minister give assurance that the provisions of the Customs Tariff Act relating to treasonable or seditious literature will not be employed as a means of censorship of material which expresses a critical view of the continuation of the war in Viet Nam?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member's supplementary is in the form of an argument or submission. The hon. member will have to assume that it has been noted.

[*Translation*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

PERU—ASSISTANCE TO EARTHQUAKE VICTIMS

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): I wish to address a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

In view of the recent earthquakes in Peru where over 50,000 people lost their lives, can the minister tell the House whether this unfortunate country has asked for Canadian help and whether the government has dispatched relief?

[*English*]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Yes, Mr. Speaker, the government has received requests and has responded, I think, in a very adequate and generous way. We are also considering further measures to help the people of that country who have suffered such a great disaster.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Fundy-Royal.

Mr. Fairweather: Mr. Speaker, my question has just been answered.

FINANCE

SPREAD BETWEEN PRICES CHARGED AND PAID BY BANKS FOR UNITED STATES DOLLARS

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Is he aware of the exceptionally wide spread

between the price that the chartered banks of Canada are paying for United States dollars and the price they are charging when selling United States dollars? If so, what does he propose to do about the situation?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the particular incidents to which the hon. member alludes. I will look into the matter.

SHARED-COST PROGRAMS—CONSULTATIONS WITH PROVINCES BY PRESIDENT OF TREASURY BOARD

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Finance. In view of the concern expressed at the recent dominion-provincial conference of finance ministers about shared-cost programs, and in view of the answer of the minister on February 18 in the House that the President of the Treasury Board would be consulting the provinces on these matters, can the minister inform the House whether the President of the Treasury Board did consult the provinces; if so, could the minister at his earliest convenience make a statement on the result?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, he has consulted. He again consulted the Ministers of Finance in Winnipeg and a communiqué was issued. I would be pleased to table it.

NATIONAL PARKS

BONNE BAY, NFLD.—EFFECT OF OIL EXPLORATION RIGHTS ON ACQUIREMENT OF LAND

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with the right part of Canada now. I direct a question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Can he indicate whether in his negotiations with the province of Newfoundland to establish a national park in that province there has been any indication of action on the part of the provincial government to withdraw oil exploration rights held by John C. Doyle, which rights are holding up the handing over of the land necessary to establish the park?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware if Mr. Doyle or other people have the right to search for oil in this national park. Government policy is very clear in the matter: no oil exploration is to take place within the limits of national parks.

[Mr. Hales.]

[*English*]

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister not take the word of the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe as to the reason for the hold-up? Will the minister use his good offices to try to remove the rights held by John C. Doyle so that our regional development program may get under way as quickly as possible?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has made a submission to the minister. He has to assume it will be taken into account.

CRIMINAL CODE

ABORTION—REMOVAL OF PROVISIONS FROM LAW

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Justice. In view of the recent tragic and sordid deaths of two young girls, one in Hamilton and one in Montreal, as a result of illegal abortions at the hands of unqualified persons, will the minister reconsider his decision and introduce legislation to take abortion out of the Criminal Code, thus freeing qualified doctors to act in consultation with pregnant women?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I do not take second place to the hon. member in my sympathy for the tragic situations that may arise under the present law, but the position of the government has been stated by the Prime Minister and myself and that is it for the moment.

Mr. Nielsen: Is the minister not aware of the position of the western Liberals?

AIRPORTS

UPLANDS—COMPLAINTS REGARDING NOISE FROM EXPECTED INCREASE IN JET FLIGHTS

Mr. D. Gordon Blair (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. I have given him notice of it. Is the minister aware of the complaints and apprehensions by residents in my constituency about increased noise and disturbance arising from the enlarged jet aircraft traffic at Uplands Airport which is contemplated by his announcement of Friday last respecting changes in the regulations. If so, what steps is the minister taking to meet these complaints? Could he say, in particular, whether his

department will change the rules governing this airport to prohibit commercial jet flying between midnight and 7 a.m., as is now the case at Dorval and Malton?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, this comes as a complete surprise to me.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Jamieson: I will make the answer very short by saying that we have not received any complaints. Three of the four runways at Ottawa airport do not extend over residential areas. The fourth will be restricted. We will take a look at the other three. If this situation is going to cause disturbance to my hon. colleague's constituents, we will try our very best to keep it to an absolute minimum.

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister divert a little of that noise and jet activity to the international airport at Gander?

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Speaker, as long as the hon. member represents that constituency I do not think they will need to worry about noise.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lundrigan: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister not aware that the residents of Gander-Twillingate, after 21 years, would welcome that kind of noise in Newfoundland?

AIR CANADA

ADDITIONAL FLIGHTS FOR EDMONTON

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. I wish to ask the Minister of Transport a serious question—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Paproski: —arising out of his answer yesterday to my supplementary question. I asked the minister the following question:

—would he also see to it that Air Canada comes up with a few extra flights for Edmonton?

The minister replied:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, one each for myself and the hon. member.

I realize that the minister is having trouble with his diet control and may need a private aircraft for his duties, but as a private member who must travel by commercial aircraft and who has had his diet controlled—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Paproski: —I am concerned because Edmonton has had a few flights deleted from its schedule. Will the minister please check into the question of service and see what he can do?

FISHERIES

REQUEST FOR REFERENCE OF SUBJECT OF OFFSHORE LOBSTER FISHERY TO STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Louis-Roland Comeau (South Western Nova): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. Will the minister consider a special reference to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry of the matter of the offshore lobster fishery for the purpose of hearing the representations of the fishermen? I understand this matter could be dealt with in a day.

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): I would be very glad to hear from any of the fisheries interests affected. I doubt whether a special reference to the committee would be appropriate at this time.

AIRPORTS

VANCOUVER—RENTAL CAR SERVICE STRIKE

Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. Bearing in mind the long strike of Rent-a-Car employees at Vancouver International Airport, can the minister indicate what contact he has with this dispute which affects the international airport and tell us what is being done to get those involved in the dispute back to the bargaining table?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member appreciates that this strike is strictly and exclusively under provincial control. The party being struck against happens to be a U-Drive company which is a lessee of ours at Vancouver International Airport. In so far as the strike itself is concerned, we have no jurisdiction whatever. I did authorize limited picketing in the neighbourhood of the accommodation that is leased at the airport. That is the only involvement we have had. I can say that I am advised informally that one of the major U-Drive companies has now agreed to settle with its employees. Hopefully, this will lead to the rest doing the same.

Inquiries of the Ministry

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—ELUCIDATION OF SALARY AND WAGE GUIDELINE POLICY

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs whether he will, with a view to making a statement within the next day or so, confer with the Prices and Incomes Commission which reports to Parliament through him so that the minister can elucidate, on behalf of the Prices and Incomes Commission, the current guideline policy with regard to salaries and wages and what this policy consists of.

In view of the apparent effort of the government to maintain a 6 per cent guideline in respect of settlements, will the minister elucidate what the policy in fact is, and how the Prices and Incomes Commission proposes to influence the provinces to bring about settlements within a 6 per cent level when the federal government has just approved a settlement of 10 per cent?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest that the minister should not reply to the question now. He might indicate whether he intends to make a statement to the House in due course.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have read the statement the Minister of Finance made in the House last Monday and the statements by the Prices and Incomes Commission. At the moment I do not see the need for a further statement. I will be happy to table the statements issued by the Prices and Incomes Commission. I am sure the Leader of the Opposition has already read them. I see no need for a further statement today.

MANITOBA CENTENNIAL

REDUCTION IN TRAVEL GRANT FOR BOY SCOUT JAMBOREE

Mr. Craig Stewart (Marquette): My question to the Secretary of State arises out of the second Arctic and Northern Scout Jamboree being held in Churchill this July to commemorate the centennial of Manitoba and the Northwest Territories, with over 500 Boy Scouts from southern Canada in attendance. When this jamboree was held in Yellowknife two years ago, the Secretary of State supplied a travel subsidy for scouts attending. Could the minister advise the House why his department has drastically reduced the travel grant for this year's jamboree, preventing many scouts attending?

[Mr. Jamieson.]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I appreciate the importance of the question asked by the hon. member. I suggest it is the kind of question that can be considered for debate at the time of adjournment.

Mr. Stewart (Marquette): Ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

POLLUTION

SERPENT RIVER—LEVEL OF CONTAMINANTS IN FISH

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. In view of a press report this morning regarding uranium mines pollution in the Serpent River, can the minister say if tests of fish from that river basin have shown levels of contaminants harmful to people?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there are tests indicating harm to people. However, I have not yet had time to check with my officials on this matter.

MONITORING OF WATERS RECEIVING EFFLUENT DISCHARGES FROM PLANTS USING MERCURY

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. Is the Fisheries Department monitoring all those waters in Canada which receive effluent discharges from industrial plants using mercury processes in their operations? If so, how many such monitoring operations are currently under way?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member's question could well be placed on the Order Paper. I realize it is important. It could perhaps be considered at the time of adjournment.

Mr. Harding: Ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

SHIPPING

REPLACEMENT FOR MV "PATRICK MORRIS"

Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. Has the minister been successful in obtaining a replacement for the CN ferry *Patrick Morris* which sank some time ago?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I have received a further report from the team trying to find a vessel in Europe. They have boiled the search

down to one vessel. This vessel will require some modifications. Inquiries are now being made to ascertain whether the owners of the vessel are prepared to make those modifications. If they will, I think we will make an arrangement. We should know before the end of the week.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

FARM PRODUCTS MARKETING AGENCIES BILL

ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL MARKETING COUNCIL AND AGENCIES

The House resumed from Tuesday, May 19, consideration of the motion of Mr. Olson that Bill C-197, to establish the National Farm Products Marketing Council and to authorize the establishment of national marketing agencies for farm products, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Horner (p.6719).

Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent-Essex): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendment to this bill proposed by the hon. member for Crowfoot, (Mr. Horner). If the amendment is accepted by the House, it will restore to this bill some semblance of control by our producer groups, primary producers and agriculture in general.

Bill C-197, which is called the omnibus bill on agriculture, is of tremendous importance to the entire agricultural industry. It will affect nearly every segment of agriculture, if the provisions of the bill in their present form are implemented. I am concerned that the minister and members of the government have indicated in this House and to various major commodity groups that the opposition is conducting a filibuster with regard to this bill; that we are preventing the bill going to committee where the amendments can be considered, and that it is our intent to talk out the bill so that it will not become legislation. This is unfortunate indeed. These things have been said only for personal political gain on the part of an individual member, or because of a gross lack of knowledge of parliamentary procedure.

• (3:20 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, I am not only disturbed but angered that such tactics should be employed in connection with a matter which affects the livelihood of thousands of families engaged in the agricultural business. These are nothing but cheap, contemptible parliamentary tactics.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Danforth: Let me deal with this accusation of filibustering which hon. members opposite have made. This bill was introduced in the House on March 17. Today is June 10. The government has absolute authority when it comes to bringing business before the House. It can do so whenever it chooses. Responsibility for doing so rests with the government alone. During this time, the minister says, the measure was brought before the House on seven different occasions, on none of which could the government get the bill through second reading stage.

Let me deal with this allegation. On the first occasion the bill was introduced, no debate was permissible. On the second occasion, it was introduced about half an hour before the end of the sitting, so we discussed it for only half an hour. Subsequently, over a period of weeks the government allowed the bill to be discussed in fits and starts. At no time was the opposition allowed to discuss it for more than 3¼ hours. If my arithmetic is correct, in the period of almost three months during which the measure was brought before the House from time to time, opposition members have been allowed to contribute approximately 12 hours, in total, to the debate, compared with the days and days spent on the omnibus Criminal Code bill dealing with abortion and other matters in which the opposition contributed 17 hours over a nine-week period.

The government talks about a filibuster. On one occasion members of this government filibustered for 26 solid days on the estimates. Now they talk about 12 hours! During those 12 hours we were dealing with a measure which affects 10,000 farm organizations and commodity groups, and 120 marketing agencies. For 12 hours we were dealing with a bill which contains 30 clauses. This works out to something like three minutes a clause —and I would point out that the time I have mentioned was taken up by all three opposition parties. Members opposite call this a filibuster. It is the grossest misrepresentation they have ever tried to put across to these commodity groups.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Danforth: The government told them it intended to press forward with this legislation as quickly as possible, but that the opposition

were holding it up. They were doing their best, they said, but the opposition would not allow the bill to go to committee. Well, look at the record. This is the first day upon which the measure has been allowed to come before the House since May 19, almost four weeks ago. We have asked for it both privately and publicly, but the government has refused to bring it forward. Now they bring it in—

An hon. Member: On a short day.

Mr. Danforth: They bring it in on the shortest day of the week and we can only debate it for about 2½ hours. There is something else. When they were telling the farm groups that the opposition were holding up this measure, members of the government were well aware that if the bill had been referred to committee on the day it was introduced, it would still not have been possible to act upon it since the committee already had a full program before it. The government had already placed the estimates of two major departments before the committee in addition to the estimates of the Department of Agriculture. They knew full well that consideration of these matters would take up all the time available to the committee in this part of the session.

If the bill goes to the committee this afternoon, the committee will still not be able to work on it; its members are seized with another piece of legislation. We who sit on the Standing Committee on Agriculture, aware of the fact that one group alone has proposed 83 amendments to a bill containing 114 clauses, fully realize that it would be impossible for the measure before us to be dealt with immediately—and so would anyone else who was acquainted with parliamentary procedure. Yet the government has the cheek to say, across the nation, "Put the bill in committee and you will have ample opportunity to fix up this measure to suit yourselves." That is utter nonsense. This is why I call the government's action cheap and contemptible. I do so because there are no other adjectives which can describe it.

Members of the government have told the producers—and they have put it in writing—that if the opposition would let this bill go to committee, all their amendments would be favourably considered at the committee stage. They said this knowing full well that since treasury expenditures are involved, amendments which could be entertained in committee are extremely limited in nature. But they did not tell the industry this. They did not tell the industry that on second reading the principle is determined, not at the committee stage. Mr. Speaker, we have had painful experience of the type of bills which come out of committees, particularly committees of this Parliament.

We in the opposition are not trying to tell the agricultural industry the type of legislation it should have, but we are trying to give the industry the opportunity to express itself, to exert some influence with regard to the legislation with which it is to be saddled by the government. We are trying to give agriculture a break. How can we help these people if this kind of misinformation goes out across the nation? Leaders of the commodity groups, who do not have the time to spend on studying parliamentary procedure, of investigating the fine print and the reasons behind the positions taken here, must accept the information given to them at its face value. The information circulated amounts to misrepresentation. I have little patience with Members of Parliament who stoop to shenanigans of this type in exchange for a little political gain.

Mr. Olson: Then you must be mad at all your colleagues.

Mr. Danforth: There has been misrepresentation as to the amendment proposed by my hon. friend. The information given out was that the amendment meant there had to be a referendum among all producers from coast to coast before a marketing board could be set up under this bill. That is utter nonsense. The amendment deals with two principles only. The first is that primary producers should have representation on the boards of directors or on the councils and agencies to be appointed by the government under the terms of this legislation.

• (3:30 p.m.)

Secondly—and this is equally important—the amendment does not state as a principle that we must have a referendum throughout the nation before the bill can be effected. Yet this is the information disseminated by the government. I say it is misinformation, half truths, untruths. This amendment would mean—and every primary producer in the country supports this desire—that agencies would not be brought into being by this government by the stroke of a pen, by Order in Council, on the advice of a civil service bureaucrat appointed by the government. This is not what the producers want. They want a say in whether or not they have a marketing agency.

Under the terms of this amendment, which I would commend to all members of the House, no primary producer group could be brought under the control of a government agency unless a referendum were held among the producers of the commodity concerned and a majority of them indicated support. This is a fair procedure; it is democratic; it allows the primary producer, whose livelihood depends upon this measure, to make the decision. I submit there is nothing wrong with this approach.

Already at the provincial level we have marketing agencies which were set up in this very fashion. Under the terms of this amendment commodity groups would not be expected to hold another referendum. They have already made their wishes known, and this is good enough for the members of the opposition. They have indicated that they want an agency, and therefore they should have an agency. Our antipathy to this legislation results from the fact that from the beginning to the end of the measure it is the government agencies, the government appointees, that will make all the major decisions with or without consultation with and consent of the primary producers. We contend this principle is unjust.

These are the two principles behind the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Crowfoot. I suggest these principles are reasonable and can be easily implemented. Further, they do justice to the primary producers who are asking for help in controlling their product. The amendment would not mean that the producers are told what to do; it would put a noose around the neck of government-appointed decision-makers.

The producers of this nation find it difficult enough to compete in the marketplace, to fight for domestic markets, to fight input costs, to fight rising labour costs and to fight to produce a better product both for the Canadian people and for international markets, without this type of legislation. They have enough battles as it is, without battling government bureaucracy, a government whose help they are asking for in order to combat the marketing trends they are experiencing today. The agricultural producers of this nation are asking the federal government to be their allies, not their enemies. They want to work with government and to have government work with them. They do not want to be directed and told what they can and cannot do. Primary producers in the agribusiness feel they are subjected to enough regimentation as it is. They are looking for a way to protect themselves and improve their lot; they do not want to surrender their right to make decisions. This is our primary objection to the bill. The government today gave an undertaking that it will not throw technical roadblocks in the way of amendments proposed at the committee stage.

Mr. Baldwin: It took a lot to drag that out of them, too.

Mr. Danforth: Mr. Speaker, we have been asking for this commitment for weeks. We have asked for it privately and publicly. It is on *Hansard*. Today the Government House Leader gave this commitment, and I think he gave it seriously.

I know that had the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) been asked to give the same commitment today, he would have given it. We have now had an indication by the government that it will accept amendments at committee stage of the bill and will hear any and all interested parties. If in past weeks the government had been correct in informing agribusiness across the country that the opposition were preventing the bill going to committee, that if the bill were in committee and would be well and amendments would be given serious consideration and the government would present the type of legislation the opposition wanted, is it not strange that the government should say today, "We give an undertaking that we will allow amendments and that we will allow witnesses to appear"?

Mr. Whelan: We do it in other committees, too.

Mr. Baldwin: We have seen what you do in your committees.

Mr. Ricard: You do not accept the reports of committees.

Mr. Danforth: I am satisfied that the government is serious about the undertaking it gave Parliament today. I am also satisfied that interested commodity groups will be allowed to make representations. However, I am interested indeed in knowing how the various commodity groups across the nation will be invited to make representations. The task force report indicated—and I am sure this is correct—that there are nearly 10,000 commodity groups, agencies and committees as well as 120 marketing schemes directly affected by Bill C-197.

All members of this House who are engaged in agriculture have been aware for some time that this measure has not been

promoted by 100 farm groups, by 50 farm groups or by 1,000 commodity groups. It has been actively promoted by two or three commodity groups and one major farm organization. I do not blame them for it; they face difficulties and we realize that. They have every right to promote such legislation and to seek government support for it. However, the Minister of Agriculture, on the basis of this sort of support for the bill, should not stand in the House and say that this measure is what agriculture has been seeking for years. Let him not tell us that agribusiness has been pressing for this sort of legislation. This, like many other statements we have heard, simply is not true.

• (3:40 p.m.)

This bill controls all agribusiness such as chemical fertilizer sales, food processing, storage and whatever one buys and sells. All these things come under the terms of the bill. The entire agribusiness of this nation is involved. We are speaking perhaps of a $40 billion business when we take into account all the labour, all the capital investment and all the segments of the industry that are involved in this measure. We are speaking of a tremendous part of Canada's economy. We in Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition will not allow, if we can prevent it, agriculture to be put in such a confined, legal cage.

An hon. Member: Straitjacket.

Mr. Danforth: Yes, a straitjacket where government directive can control the entire industry. Mr. Speaker, we have seen what government directives can do. Many men seeking employment in the cities, and many families facing hardship such as they have never faced before, find themselves in this position because of directives of this government.

Before I resume my seat I would repeat that it is not the intention of the official opposition in this House to tell the agricultural industry of this nation what it may or may not do. It is our intention to prevent the government doing that. We feel that agricultural businesses combined are in a position, since the livelihood of all those employed in agriculture is involved, to make major decisions concerning the industry and should be left free and unhampered to do so. In this amendment, all we are seeking to do is making certain that those engaged in the production, distribution, sale and storage of agricultural products have an opportunity to decide whether they want a marketing agency and whether they will allow their businesses to come under the farm council which would be set up under this bill. The decision should be theirs. We shall not throw roadblocks in the way of any commodity group having such an agency, provided that is its wish.

Before concluding I should like to point out that under the provisions of this measure, any production monopoly, be it in respect of broilers, eggs or anything else, would be in a nice, comfortable pew because the government by regulation could prevent any other industry starting up in competition and could prevent any young person starting in the business. This measure will be effected on a nation-wide basis. Under the bill the government could control quotas and production. The reason this measure cannot, and never will, give the producers what they want is—as the minister himself said—that we cannot control imports.

When the minister speaks on this bill I should like him to say yes to the following simple questions: First, under the terms of this bill will the government guarantee that the primary producers will receive more for their products? Second, under the terms of this bill will the government guarantee that the input costs of production will not increase? Third, under the terms of this bill will the government agree that imports will not be allowed to take a part of the domestic market which is allocated under a quota system? Fourth, under the terms of this bill will the consumers of Canada, who are tremendously important and are very interested in this measure, obtain the same quality at no greater price? If the minister can answer yes to all these questions, this bill is very different from that which appears to be.

Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, my contribution to the debate on Bill C-197 to establish a National Farm Products Marketing Council will be very brief. Despite the rather attractive wording of the amendment brought forward by the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner), the members of the New Democratic Party will oppose it. I believe, however, we can speak in favour of the general principles of the bill. The form in which the bill will appear when it emerges from the committee is another question. I believe that to be in favour of this amendment would be to be in favour of greater duplication. I have a telegram from the prov-

ince of British Columbia which reads in parts as follows:

> We do hold plebiscites in this province for marketing boards and therefore see no need for a further plebiscite to see whether or not they are prepared to join a national marketing agency since the provincial authority allows them to contract or deal directly with a national agency.

That is one point of view from my province. Every member of our party who desired to speak on this bill before the amendment was moved has done so. Therefore, I need say only a few words. The important thing is that representatives of the farm organizations and commodity groups be given an opportunity to appear before the Agricultural Committee in order to make their representations. It has been emphasized by other members of our party that we should make certain that the various producer groups and farm organizations have adequate representation on the National Farm Products Marketing Council which is to be instituted. They do not want to be merely part of an advisory body. They want to be part of the decision-making process which affects their livelihood and businesses.

I was particularly interested in the questions asked by the previous speaker at the end of his speech. I think they could be applied equally to any marketing board. I believe these questions have been answered many times, perhaps years ago, because we have seen many marketing boards develop for the benefit not only of consumers but the marketing or commodity groups they represent. I am unhappy that this important bill which was introduced on March 17 and last debated on May 19 was not brought back to the House until June 10. Along with the hon. member for Kent-Essex (Mr. Danforth), I think we can be a little suspicious of the priority the government places on the bill and the urgency of this matter. I will follow my own advice at this point and sit down, in the hope that the bill will be referred to committee.

• (3:50 p.m.)

Mr. Mac T. McCutcheon (Lambton-Kent): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Whelan) wishes to make some comments, I wish he would get to his feet.

Mr. Whelan: I have heard enough from other peoples' feet; I do not want to do the same.

Mr. McCutcheon: That is where the hon. member makes the best sounds.

Mr. Jamieson: What makes you think he isn't standing up now?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. McCutcheon: If the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) wants to get into the act, let him do so. Mr. Speaker, I expect to speak for only five minutes; I propose to inflict myself upon the House for only that time. I agree with the principle of establishing a marketing board, but I have reservations about the way this one is proposed. Clause 3 of the bill provides:

> There shall be a council to be known as the National Farm Products Marketing Council—

The bill goes on to say that it is to be appointed by the Governor in Council and will hold office during pleasure. It also says that the members of an agency shall be appointed by the Governor in Council to hold office at pleasure. This is the provision to which I object most strongly. I object to this paternalistic, Big Brother approach—that so far as the farmers of Canada are concerned Big Brother knows best what is good for them. Big Brother knows who is in, through licensing. Big Brother also will know who is not in, through licensing. Big Brother will know what is in, through licensing, and Big Brother will also know what is out. I suggest there will be more people with briefcases looking after the affairs of our farmers than there will be primary producers.

I do not know why the government could not have agreed many, many days ago to having primary producers on the National Farm Products Marketing Council or on the agencies. Had this been done, it would have avoided all this so-called holdup.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McCutcheon: There is no reference whatever to primary producers in this context of the bill. I have known the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) for a long time and I hold him in high regard. I thought that so long as he held that portfolio there would be representation from primary producers. Why is the government afraid to include this provision as an amendment to the bill? I think the Minister of Agriculture would not object to it, because I have known him so long and I remember what he said on December 12, 1962—

Mr. Bell: I remember that, too.

Mr. McCutcheon: —in the House of Commons when speaking during a supply debate

in which a similar matter was raised. He said at that time:

For this reason I think any such scheme should be worked out amongst the farmers themselves.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McCutcheon: How times change! I guess your view depends upon where you sit. I support the amendment which has been brought in by the hon. member for Crowfoot because it will prevent all the things the Minister of Agriculture was terribly concerned about a number of years ago. I remember something else the minister said. I do not have the quotation here, but he will remember that when there was a slight problem of patronage in the Post Office he became quite eloquent in his condemnation of it. I am not suggesting for one minute that there would be patronage in the appointment of these marketing board people, but there is the possibility that it might happen. Therefore, I think the amendment of the hon. member for Crowfoot is most appropriate. It reads in part:

"this House will not proceed upon a measure to authorize the establishment of national marketing agencies for farm products where the establishment of such agencies is in the discretion of the government and the appointment of members to such agencies is in the gift and at the pleasure of the government—

Wow! Another matter which concerns me is that decisions will be made for farmers by people with no practical experience, period. They will probably have Ph.Ds. They will be economists, academics, and all the rest. The type of recommendation they will come up with is that which is found on page 8 of "Canadian Agriculture in the Seventies". This is a dandy heading. I hope that some day somebody will be able to explain to me what it means. I will just read this heading:

—increasing planning and contractual arrangements resulting in backward, forward, horizontal integration.

These are the birds—I use that word advisedly—who will be making decisions for practical farmers, unless the minister gives us assurance that there will be practical people on the boards. I have heard it said that if we had a group of economists laid end to end from B.C. to Newfoundland, we still would not come up with an opinion. I think there is some truth in that.

The preceding speaker said this bill could be amended so far as virtually everything in it was concerned, if only it got to the committee. We know that is not the case, because the government is not bound to make any changes so far as principle is concerned. I know that I speak for many farm organizations when I say we are pleased the minister has given us the assurance that the modifications and amendments which we desire will be included in the bill.

I have here a letter from an organization of Alberta farmers who were sucked in with the misinformation, or whatever it was, that was given out. I know they will now be happy because the mistake has been smoked-out, and witnesses can be called before the committee and, hopefully, the bill can be repaired to such an extent that it will be acceptable. Again I say to the Minister of Agriculture, "Please see to it that there are practical people on these boards so that we do not hear a lot of double-talk; so that, hopefully, this legislation will do a job for the agricultural community and for the consumers".

• (4:00 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, it is my duty as well as my privilege to speak on Bill C-197, entitled "An Act to establish the National Farm Products Marketing Council and to authorize the establishment of national marketing agencies for farm products".

First of all, although I agree with the ideas expressed by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Côté), who represents the Richelieu constituency, I do not appreciate the need for such a bill. In fact, this is what he had to say in the House, on June 4 last, as recorded at page 7761 of *Hansard:*

Then, as my hon. friend pointed out, the cows will be well looked after. They seem to be doing quite well indeed, because of the government's policy.

So the Parliamentary Secretary to the minister believes that "the cows are well looked after" by the government and that the Canadian agriculture is in good health. This is probably why, as he says himself so well, he felt prompted to sell his cows a few days after the election. I understand him perfectly well because, no doubt, it pays more to have one in Parliament than to have 25 of them in the barn, the way things are going nowadays.

This is perhaps what my hon. friend from Richelieu was referring to when he stated that the cows were well looked after. I do not want to dwell any longer upon the subject and I shall deal then with Bill C-197.

The agricultural situation is far from bright, especially in Quebec, whatever the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture thinks about it. And I shall quote a few figures showing that the situation is serious.

At page 11, volume 1349 of the *news bulletin* published by the Department of Agriculture, the following appears:

Although the general consumer price index shows an increase of 36 per cent between 1948-1952 and 1964-1968, the retail price of food has increased by only 33 per cent. Prices to the farmers have increased only by 9 per cent during that same period.

And further, we can read that in 1948, the average hourly wage which was 92 cents, enabled people to buy 18 large Grade A eggs. In 1968, the average hourly wage which was $2.58, enabled them to buy 59 eggs of the same grade. It is always the same people, i.e. the farmers, who suffer the consequences of an ailing, retrograde economy, with or without planning by the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, etc.

I am convinced that many believe the government helps farmers considerably. Nevertheless, what can make up for the present lack in product marketing? I should now like to quote part of page 2 of the aforementioned bulletin:

Canadian farmers do not receive many subsidies. A comparison with the OECD shows that federal expenditures on behalf of Canadian agriculture (including not only subsidies but all services such as research and inspection) come to an average of about $286 per person actively engaged in agriculture against $1,287 in the United States. The level of Canadian support of agriculture is one of the lowest in the Western world.

We can see from this, that it is senseless to say that the farmers are oversubsidized. Their incomes are no more encouraging as they follow a downward curve. One can read at page 191 of the report presented by the *Canadian Agriculture Outlook Conference* held in Ottawa on November 24 and 25 last, and I quote:

—the total cash received from the operation of farms in 1969 is supposed to be about $4,290 million, i.e. $100 million less than in 1968.

At page 195 of that same report, it is stated that in 1969, the net profit of farmers amounted to about $425 million, i.e. about 10 per cent less than for 1968. Now, the expenditures have increased by about $117 million. When one has a look at these figures one understands easily that Canadian cows are not so well looked after as the member for Richelieu seems to believe.

To cope with this we have Bill C-197. I approve the establishment of a National Farm Products Marketing Council so long as farmers are able to move freely within that agency.

As I read the bill carefully I found that many clauses could be improved.

Clause 2(d) says that marketing

—includes selling and offering for sale and buying, pricing, assembling, packing, processing, transporting, storing and any other act necessary to prepare the product in a form—

I feel that the government is firmly taking over the whole farm products trade.

Further, under clause 2(e)(iii), we realize that a marketing plan may, and I quote:

—determine the quantity in which and the price, time and place at which the regulated product or any variety, class or grade thereof may be marketed in interprovincial or export trade.

Under those provisions, the government would therefore determine the price, time and place, etc., at which the farm products may be marketed. The farmer would thus become simply a government employee with no freedom whatsoever as to his production.

In addition, only the farmers licensed by the government or the persons appointed by it would be able to go into production, as is provided for in clause 2(e)(v), which reads, in part, as follows:

—a system for the licensing of persons engaged in the growing or production of the regulated product—

Thus, the farmer will no longer be free since everything will be left to the discretion of the authorities appointed by the government.

The government will even be able to ask the farmer for "levies or charges", as stipulated in paragraph (vi) of subclause (*e*) of clause 2, and I quote:

—the imposition and collection by the appropriate agency of levies or charges from persons engaged in the growing or production of the regulated product—

As to the regulated product, subclause (*g*) of clause 2 provides the following, and I quote:

—any farm product to the extent that it is grown or produced—

And further on, we read this:

—in any region of Canada designated in the proclamation that authorizes an agency to exercise its powers—

In my opinion, the government is taking over all farm products through the people appointed by it.

Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill

• (4:10 p.m.)

According to clause 3 of Bill C-197, the members of the National Farm Products Marketing Council are appointed by the governor in council, therefore by the cabinet.

Besides, clause 5 says that the members of the Council become public servants, and so are independent from the farmers to whom they will not have to report at all. Consequently farmers will have no control over the marketing of their products.

Clause 6 says that the object of the act is to maintain and promote an efficient and competitive agriculture industry, which means the complete disappearance of average size or small farms.

The Council is empowered to require persons engaged in production or marketing to register with the agency, to maintain books under the provisions of the three paragraphs of clause 7 (e).

In addition, an inspector of that Council may, under clause 34, enter any place when he reasonably believes that there is a regulated product intended to be marketed and may examine any books, records or other documents in such place.

Pursuant to clauses 36 and 37, every person who violates any provision of this act or fails to comply with a requirement of the Council is guilty of, and I quote:

(a) an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years, or

(b) an offence punishable on summary conviction.

Mr. Speaker, the bill in its present form will surely be amended in committee, and I propose to attend all its sittings, because I strongly object to its passage. If a vote is taken, I will vote against it, because it must be amended at all costs, otherwise it is a strait-jacket put on the farmers. In my opinion, we should make this bill more democratic.

Instead of the government appointing all those who will implement this act, it would be advisable to divide that Council into three sectors, as my colleague, the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier), mentioned in the House on April 27 last.

I suggest that there be first, a federal sector; second, a provincial sector, and third, a sector made up by the producers themselves. Each sector would appoint its own representatives and thus have some discretion insofar as the implementation of this bill is concerned. If the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) finds it impossible to do that, I urge

[Mr. Beaudoin.]

him to delegate all his powers to the provinces, as I suggested it to him on June 4 last.

Primary producers groups want to appoint themselves their representatives, or have them appointed by their professional association, in order to ensure the control and the marketing of their products. They have their own set-up and they want their decisions to be carried out through the normal channels, that is, through their association. Every Canadian province has one or several farmers associations. That is why they want to have their own too, being more familiar than anyone with their individual or collective needs. They know better than anyone the cost of every consumer product they want to market. Now, in my opinion, they are better judges than anyone to advise the organization which is to govern them, under bill C-197, regarding the fixing of fair prices.

I feel that when an economic sector as important as agriculture is in a bad way, we should diagnose the trouble so as to remedy it as soon as possible.

I believe that up to now, the federal government has proved its inability to solve adequately the agricultural problem, whatever may think my friend from Richelieu, and I therefore ask the honourable minister once again to extend the scope of Bill C-197 with regard to the representation on the Council, or else to delegate his authority.

As far as I am concerned, the present situation could not be worse. The net subsidies to industrial milk and cream producers in Quebec have been as follows. The hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier) had addressed the following question to the Minister of Agriculture:

What were the amounts granted to Quebec industrial milk producers for the years 1967, 1968 and 1969?

The answer was as follows:

1. Net subsidies to manufacturing milk and cream shippers in Quebec were as follows:

1967-68	$41.2 million
1968-69	$44.4 million
1969-70 (incomplete)	$36.7 million

The second part of the question read as follows:

2. What amounts were witheld, for marketing surpluses or penalizing for overproduction manufacturing milk producers in Quebec, in the years 1967, 1968 and 1969?

Here is the answer:

2. The following amounts were witheld from the subsidies to pay for the cost of exporting surpluses:

1967-68	$4.5 million
1968-69	$7.2 million
1969-70 (incomplete)	$13.6 million

There is an increase there. So, we give with one hand and take back with the other, while giving less money from year to year. For instance, in 1968, $36.7 million were paid Quebec producers and in 1970, only $23.1 million, which represents a $13.6 million decrease over a short period, while we tolerate the government in power.

Employees in certain regional offices feel that the farmers would be well advised to sacrifice some personal freedom to protect their interests. However, I do not agree with that. If one must give up one's liberty to live decently in as rich a country as Canada, our government must be sadly lacking.

Therefore, I shall vote against this bill if it is not amended properly with a view to respecting the freedom of the farmers. We are fed up with a regime in which one must be tied like a dog to survive. It is high time someone cut the rope used to tie up the farmers.

Mr. Florian Côté (Richelieu): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture on a point of order.

Mr. Côté (Richelieu): Mr. Speaker, it may be that I did not understand clearly but the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Beaudoin) said about clause 2 that a marketing plan *may* ensure marketing, regulate sales.

As for me, I read:

(e) "marketing plan" *means*...

I do not know whether my interpretation is wrong or if I misunderstood what was read but if the hon. member really read that, the nature of the bill is completely altered. Could the hon. member repeat what he has in his notes? That would elucidate the matter for me, because it is very important.

Mr. Beaudoin: Mr. Speaker, does this have to do with clause 1?

Mr. Côté (Richelieu): Mr. Speaker, it is about clause 2(e).

Mr. Beaudoin: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to tell the parliamentary secretary that I said "may", but I think I should have read "means".

Mr. Côté (Richelieu): Indeed, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. I think it proper to remind hon. members that on second reading it is forbidden to consider a bill clause by clause and to refer to it as the hon. member for Richmond did in the course of his speech. Concerning this, I should like to quote part of citation 381 in Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, 4th edition:

On the motion for the second reading, it is out of order to discuss the clauses of the bill.

The appropriate stage for the discussion of a bill clause by clause is the committee stage and not second reading.

The hon. member for Joliette.

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I am happy—

Mr. Beaudoin: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. The hon. member for Richmond on a point of order.

Mr. Beaudoin: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

I thank you for having called me to order. However, I should like to say that I do not want to criticize application forms. Nevertheless it is a rewarding thing to trace something back to its origin, so as to know how to begin a discussion in committee.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Mr. La Salle: Mr. Speaker, may I be allowed to take a few minutes of the time of the House to express a number of opinions on this undoubtedly questionable and questioned bill, and also on the amendment introduced by a member of our group.

Bill C-197, as all members are already aware, is a very important bill. There is no need for me to say that in principle, we are in favour of the establishment of a marketing agency for farm products. We are certainly in favour of changes likely to bring about improvements by increasing the income of all Canadian farmers. On the other hand, it seems to me that the type of representation provided for within this agency whose members will be appointed by the government is not clear enough.

Several members have emphasized the importance of having the producers represented. I agree with them that this is not only desirable but necessary in the case of an agency entrusted with such heavy responsibilities.

This bill, however, does not say who is going to be appointed. How can we be sure

that the members of this agency will be qualified and will really represent every farming group in Canada?

As members of the House, I think it is our duty to require the minister and Parliament to amend this bill in order to ensure the full representation of the various farming associations.

Mr. Speaker, I do not question the good faith of the minister introducing the bill, but is it enough to rely on the good faith of the minister when he might very well happen some day to change his mind?

As for us, we want to be assured that a number of members of this agency, which will have great responsibilities as indicated by the clauses of the bill, will be chosen among the farmers.

I think that the farmers are entitled to that representation so as to ensure that the necessary talents can advise the agency. When the government will realize the significance of that representation, we may expect certain changes to be made during consideration of the bill in committee, so as to ensure the producers of an adequate representation.

It will be pointed out to me that the bill under consideration does not prevent such appointments. I realize the significance—as I said earlier—of the marketing of farm products and I would not want, at some time, to be accused of merely delaying the passage of this legislation.

I believe that it is our duty to require that representation if necessary. By simply relying on this bill, which lacks precision and guarantees, I think that we would be remiss in our duty.

We require these particulars in the best interests of the agricultural community.

My remarks are not intended to delay the passage of this measure. On the contrary, we recognize its merits and we agree with its basic principle.

In view of the importance of this bill, we must admit that the government is taking over complete jurisdiction over agriculture. Recognizing also the importance of agriculture in Canada as well as the difficulties it is facing, it is also obvious that such legislation has to be passed in order to improve the lot of the farmers.

This bill which contains provisions on the official recognition of the farmer, the selection of lands appropriate for certain types of crops and the control of the general production, constitutes the outline of a management

[Mr. La Salle.]

policy. I am not saying that it is not necessary today for the government to help in matters of production of these products. As several associations have requested it for a long time, we are asking for the establishment of a Commission or agency that will determine the kind of production most profitable to agriculture and to producers.

However, I wonder why the government would turn down the suggestion that the House give assurances that producers will be represented on the Council or the agency. Why should it refuse? I see no reason for the government continuing to refuse giving us the assurance of such a representation which I consider is necessary in order to maintain better control, at the same time depriving itself of the required information. I repeat that I do not believe these arguments are worthy of discussion in the House.

I prefer to credit hon. members with good faith and believe that the failure to recognize the value of farmer representatives within the council is perhaps an omission. Such participation would be a real enrichment.

The problems are many concerning milk, wheat, vegetables and imports in general, and at times they create great difficulties for our Canadian producers. The council will, I believe, have all the powers required for limitation of imports in certain cases. Thus, production of milk, wheat, or vegetables will become more regular and better directed to the advantage of the Canadian producers.

We all want agriculture to be prosperous. Because of the interest I have for the producers of my riding and for the Canadian producers in general and with the co-operation of all hon. members, I hope that the representatives of the various farm associations of Canada will be allowed to sit on this Council. The government will understand that these suggestions from the opposition are not against the principle of this bill and do not aim at questioning the goodwill of the minister responsible for this bill. On the contrary, we wanted to participate in the drawing up of the bill so that producers may be given the place they are entitled to since they are directly involved.

I imagine that an impartial government would not hesitate to recognize the value of such representation which cannot but help farming and which can also give our producers a sufficient income if it is well thought out.

I shall close my remarks by wishing that all hon. members will understand how important

this bill is and to what extent such representation is not only desirable, but also necessary.

[*English*]

Mr. William Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand): Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the minister on bringing Bill C-197 back into the House to be dealt with, rather than making statements through the press and other news media of this country. I have reason for being nice to the minister; I am hoping he will visit Norfolk County this fall to assist in the opening of an agricultural exhibition. We look forward to the minister accepting the invitation extended by the agricultural society of that area.

I rise in this debate in order to prove the consistency of my remarks. Very early in this session, in the Speech from the Throne and in a preliminary announcement the minister declared his intention of introducing legislation which would permit national marketing boards to operate in Canada. I wrote a newspaper article in which I said I welcomed wholeheartedly this announcement and looked forward to the introduction of the legislation.

I was completely dismayed when I found that the bill which was presented did not contain some very vital sections. I wrote in the article that it was absolutely essential for primary producers to retain a measure of control over any national agency which might be set up. The government could have obtained the acceptance of all opposition parties had it written into the bill a clause spelling out beyond any doubt that primary producers would be appointed or elected to the national marketing council and to the national marketing agencies.

• (4:30 p.m.)

In the second place, the government could have obtained ready acquiescence to their proposals had they simply carried out a referendum or plebiscite among the primary producers to discover whether they were favourable to the establishment of a marketing agency. If they did not find it workable, or if they believed it was not working to their advantage, they should have the privilege of voting it out again. This is the principle under which marketing boards operate in Ontario. In that province a 66⅔ majority of producers must vote in favour of a scheme. They also have the privilege of voting out an agency if they find it is not working in their best interests—and this has been done on more than one occasion in Ontario. Surely we are not asking too much when we propose that the government write this type of safeguard or safety valve into the legislation we are now considering.

The minister's assurance that primary producers will be on the board is simply not good enough. As has been pointed out by my hon. friends, the minister has the best intentions, no doubt, and as long as he retains his present portfolio he will no doubt see that this is done. We want an undertaking to be in black and white. Our producers are not satisfied by a simple assurance from the minister or an indication that it may be done at the pleasure of the government or of the Governor in Council.

We are also suspicious of a promise that amendments will be made at the committee stage. We have had some eye-opening experiences on committees dealing with other pieces of legislation, when perfectly acceptable and reasonable amendments, drawn up with legal advice and worded so as not to contradict the principles of the measure concerned, were voted down by a majority of the members. This situation was not explained to the producers across the country. The government said, "All we have to do is get the bill into committee and all your recommendations and proposals will be listened to and accepted." This is just not the case.

The opposition welcomes the assurance by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) and the minister that the government will guarantee the acceptance of reasonable amendments to this legislation. Only in light of this assurance are we ready to accept a time limit on this debate, are we willing to see this discussion reach a conclusion and have the bill sent to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

The primary producers in my own area whom I have contacted or who have contacted me concerning Bill C-197 have expressed mixed reactions. The broiler growers are among the few groups across Canada who are in a position to take advantage of this legislation, and even they were not familiar with the bureaucratic and autocratic way in which the national marketing council was to be set up. Then again, everyone became suspicious when there were not sufficient copies of the bill to send to all those who wrote enquiring exactly what it contained. The Ontario Flue-cured Tobacco Growers Marketing Board adopted a ho-hum attitude toward the legislation. They would not oppose it but they are not, perhaps, in a position to take advantage

of the services of a national marketing agency at the present time. Tobacco, as hon. members know, is grown only in limited areas of Canada. In Ontario we operate under a somewhat rigidly controlled system operated by a board which was set up by a 66⅔ majority of producers. However, in other parts of this country the tobacco industry is only in the development stage, and growers would not wish to have controls imposed upon them such as those in Ontario find acceptable. Another factor which causes some people to view Bill C-197 with a measure of suspicion is the experience of dairy producers operating under the Dairy Commission. In many cases the experience has been good, but some producers have found their production curtailed to a quantity below the level necessary for efficient operation.

I stated earlier that I did not intend to prolong this debate unduly. I say in conclusion that I accept wholeheartedly the principle of this bill, but I want the details spelled out in black and white so that they cannot be changed at the whim of a minister. The participation of producers in policy-making is essential. Unless the government accepts this point of view in committee, it will encounter further opposition when the bill comes back to the House for third reading. We want to make it abundantly clear that when this legislation is finally written into the statute books, production is controlled by the primary producers and decisions are made by the producers themselves in their own best interests.

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I think it is in order to say once again that this bill is one of the two most important pieces of legislation affecting agriculture which have been presented to Parliament this session. The other bill, of course, was the one to change the grading of grain and deal with other aspects of the grain trade in both eastern and western Canada.

Reference has been made to the amount of time which has been taken to debate this piece of legislation. In my opinion the bill deserves a great deal of debate. After all, it will affect the methods of production and marketing employed in respect of a great many farm products. Also, of course, it will affect the livelihood of many thousands of farmers. So as far as we in this party are concerned, we are not worried about the amount of time which has been taken to discuss the bill. When it gets to the committee we intend to propose changes, the first objective being to ensure that farmers participate in the decision-making process; that they do not simply act on the direction of government administrators no matter how capable they may be.

• (4:40 p.m.)

We have received representations from farm groups who wish to use this legislation. The turkey producers marketing board of Saskatchewan have been in touch with me and indicated they want this bill passed in a workable form because they want to use this type of legislation co-operatively with producers in other provinces. We have also received representations from other farm organizations. It is significant that in letters written to other members of this party as well as myself major farm organizations have mentioned repeatedly that the bill should provide for producer participation in decision-making. They suggest that the commissioners appointed under the bill be nominated, wherever possible, by farm organizations and producer groups.

One thing about this bill that has surprised me is that no specific provision was included in the original draft for the participation of producers in matters dealing with the operation of the bill, the kind of products it will control and the markets to which produce will be directed. We are moving into an era when this sort of legislation is becoming increasingly important, an era when patterns of production and marketing will progressively be controlled not by individual farmers but by organizations, in some cases not by government but by the industry itself.

I recall that a few years ago some of the big chain stores in Regina decided to buy their eggs from Manitoba instead of from the egg producers close to Regina. As a result, the Regina egg producers who had been supplying these chain stores found they had no retail outlets. Since eggs must be delivered to market quickly and must be fresh, this meant that some egg producers literally were put out of business on, if I remember rightly, two or three weeks' or one month's notice. As the saying goes, they were all dressed up but had nowhere to go.

This is the kind of marketing situation that we have to live with today, and it is the basic reason we want this bill to go to committee. There I hope the government will be prepared to take a hard look at some of the provisions in the bill to ensure that the producers are fully protected. It is not a question simply of

protecting the producers by this type of legislation; participation of producers is also involved. If the operations of agencies such as the Canadian Dairy Commission, the Canadian Wheat Board and the Board of Grain Commissioners are out of the reach of the farmer, and the farmer does not take part in the decision-making process, in the absence of two-way communication sooner or later he will regard them as one of his worst enemies even though he may now regard them as his friend.

This situation can only be avoided if individual producers have a working knowledge of the operations of such agencies and how they are trying to assist him. Through this understanding the farmer will be able to take the good with the bad. The nature of marketing activities is such that at times things get a bit rough. Unless there is two-way communication the farmers will run into trouble with the marketing agencies, whatever their stripe, be they government commissions or producers' agencies. Once there is a breakdown in communication and understanding between producer and marketing agency, you are in real trouble.

Those are the thoughts that I wish to express this afternoon. As the bill moves into committee I hope we will be able to work toward meeting our objectives. As I say, I should like those organizations who have written to members of the House saying they are either in favour or against the measure to appear before the committee, state what they like or do not like about the bill and give their reasons. In this way the members of the committee will be able to make a reasoned, value judgment of how we should change the legislation.

Mr. F. J. Bigg (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, I rise in my place to support the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner). It is a pleasure to follow the previous speaker because he has great experience in farming matters. Before becoming the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar he was president of the Saskatchewan Farm Union and, as I say, he speaks with great authority of farm matters. He has taken a very fair attitude in the debate which has taken a few days to bring it to this stage.

Had the minister wanted to rush this legislation through, it would have been quite simple for him to assure the House which specific amendments would be acceptable or even encouraged in committee. The subject of marketing boards is not new. The Saskatchewan Farm Union, the former farm union of Alberta, the Canadian Federation of Agriculture and now Unifarm, a combination of these two, are unanimous in saying that uniformity and common sense should be brought to the orderly marketing of farm products.

No farm union—I repeat, no farm union—has ever recommended handing over responsibility for decision-making, consultation and the composition of such boards to a group other than itself. I do not know why any government or minister would suggest in legislation, in this House or in committee that such a program could be foisted on the Canadian people. I am not satisfied with a sort of blanket assurance that everything in committee will be well. We have found from sad experience that the proper time to change the principle of a bill is on second reading when its principle is under discussion. Once the bill is sent to committee, often the government feels that it has a free hand to do what it likes.

I have before me a letter from the president of Unifarm, which represents 30,000 farmers in Alberta, the great bulk of family farmers in that province. In paragraph 4 the letter states:

• (4:50 p.m.)

> Our main concerns are in regard to representation on both the proposed marketing council and the marketing agencies which could be established under it.

The following appears in the previous paragraph:

> We understand that desirable changes could be introduced at that stage.

As the former speaker said, and I agree, it is our duty to see that more than pious promises are given. We want to see commitments in black and white. After all, the minister's promises are binding only on himself. We do not know what the vagaries of the summer may bring. We know that Bill C-196 is still before the committee and that Bill C-197 cannot be passed in the few days remaining in this session.

Mr. Olson: I hope it can.

Mr. Bigg: A pious hope cannot put it through. The committee is seized with Bill C-196. I understand that the marketing agencies have proposed 87 amendments.

Mr. Olson: All members need do is get on with it.

Mr. Bigg: That is quite apart from amendments presented in the House. I cannot deny what the former speaker has said. He has been intimately connected with farm organizations and the problems in respect of grain. He knows that Bill C-196 in its present form is unworkable and it will be some time before it leaves the committee.

Mr. Olson: Not necessarily.

Mr. Bigg: The minister also is aware of this.

Mr. Olson: We will vote on the amendments as fast as we can.

Mr. Bigg: We will be happy to see the amendments that come forward, but it will take some time for all the farm organizations to be heard. We want to see orderly marketing established, fair prices instituted and the agricultural industry stabilized. We must be assured of these things. There must be consultation before the boards or agencies are established. There must be proper representation on those boards. There must be a sensible and reasonable appeal from the arbitrary decisions of such boards. The appointees must be independent, whether they are farmers or not, and not mere tools of the government.

There are these four main principles involved. I am sure the letter from the president of Unifarm would have been couched in different terms had he been assured by the minister that these things would be done. I hope that in a few months' time the minister will come back to this House and tell me I am wrong. However, at the moment I do not think the farmers of Canada have been given the assurance they require.

Mr. Rod Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that I do not agree with this amendment. As I understand it, under the BNA Act no provincial marketing agency can be forced to participate in this legislation unless it has the sanction of the provincial government concerned. This is a question we should discuss in the committee, along with other questions. I understand that provincial bodies have the right to vote on whether they will join the marketing agency or whether they will have an agency. If that hurdle were passed, I assume the power to operate under this bill could be delegated. If this is the case, I do not see any need for this amendment. I have very hastily checked this point in the BNA Act. I even spoke to a person who wrote a book about it. If he knows what he is talking about, the situation is as I have explained it.

When this bill reaches the committee I should like to have some of these points clarified. I am somewhat concerned about how control by the respective boards of the council will apply in all cases. We are all aware that no legislation is better than the government which applies it. I believe that in respect of these boards there should be some control by the producers themselves. I should like to see an amendment to the bill which would ensure that this is the case. Further, I believe producers should have an opportunity to appear before the committee. I realize that the government would like early action to be taken on this bill. I can understand that, but I do not think it would be right to rush such a bill through the House when there are points to be brought forward by the people involved in this matter. I can think of no better example than the hearings just completed in respect of Bill C-196.

For the major part of my adult life I have been involved in the grain business as a farmer, as an interested politician and as a wheat pool delegate. I still learn much about legislation from these hearings. It would seem to me that some of the abstract lawyers who sit in Ottawa and draft bills relating to industry are not always aware of the effect of some of their clauses. For this reason I believe committee hearings are useful. They provide an opportunity for those involved in the industry to present their points of view.

In this connection I should like to refer to the Canadian Wheat Board. This agency seems to be a little unrelated to the marketing situation of the day. It would seem to be, in a sort of vacuum, apart from the situation which exists. The Canadian Wheat Board appears to be separated from the grain producers. I feel that producer representation would be useful on the boards contemplated in the bill in order to ensure that the operations of the boards are related to those who produce the product and to the market in general. I should like to make sure that the agencies to be set up under the National Farm Marketing Products Council will have a close relationship to the people who are to be served.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Call in the members.

The House divided on the amendment (Mr. Horner) which was negatived on the following division:

• (5:00 p.m.)

YEAS

Messrs:

Alexander
Alkenbrack
Baldwin
Beaudoin
Bell
Bigg
Carter
Coates
Comeau
Danforth
Dinsdale
Dionne
Downey
Fairweather
Flemming
Gauthier
Godin
Grills
Hales
Harkness
Hees
Horner
Howe
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Lambert (Bellechasse)
Lambert (Edmonton West)
Laprise
La Salle
Lundrigan
MacEwan
MacLean
MacRae
McCutcheon
McQuaid
Marshall
Matte
Mazankowski
Moore
Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys)
Muir (Lisgar)
Nielsen
Noble
Nowlan
Paproski
Ritchie
Rodrigue
Rondeau
Rynard
Schumacher
Southam
Stanfield
Stewart (Marquette)
Thomas (Moncton)
Thompson (Red Deer)
Woolliams—55.

NAYS

Messrs:

Anderson
Badanai
Barnett
Basford
Béchard
Beer
Benjamin
Benson
Blair
Blouin
Borrie
Brewin
Brown
Burton
Caccia
Cafik
Chrétien
Clermont
Cobbe
Côté (Richelieu)
Côté (Longueuil)
Crossman
Cullen
Cyr
Davis
Deachman
De Bané
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)

Division

Drury
Dubé
Forest
Forget
Foster
Francis
Gendron
Gervais
Gibson
Gilbert
Gillespie
Gleave
Goode
Goyer
Gray
Groos
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Haidasz
Harding
Hogarth
Honey
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)
Howard (Skeena)
Hymmen
Isabelle
Jamieson
Kaplan
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Lachance
Laing (Vancouver South)
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Lind
Loiselle
MacEachen
MacGuigan
MacInnis (Mrs.)
Mackasey
McIlraith
McNulty
Mahoney
Marceau
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Murphy
Nystrom
O'Connell
Olson
Orange
Otto
Pelletier
Penner
Portelance
Prud'homme
Richard
Roberts
Robinson
Rochon
Rose
Rowland
Saltsman
Serré
Sharp
Skoberg
Smerchanski
Stafford
Stanbury
Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay)
St. Pierre
Sulatycky
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley)
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Wahn
Walker
Whelan—109.

• (5:30 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost. The question is on the main motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: On division.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

[*Translation*]

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

JUSTICE AND LEGAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Paul-M. Gervais (Sherbrooke): Mr. Speaker, if the House agrees, I would like to revert to routine proceedings in order to pre-

sent the report of the committee on Bill C-192.

Mr. Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Gervais: Mr. Speaker, in the name of the chairman of the committee, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the fifteenth report of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

[*Editor's Note: For text of above report see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

AERONAUTICS ACT REGULATIONS BILL

PROVISIONS RESPECTING REGULATIONS MADE PURSUANT TO SECTION 4

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-218, respecting regulations made pursuant to section 4 of the Aeronautics Act, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Moved that Bill C-218, respecting regulations made pursuant to section 4 of the Aeronautics Act, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Jamieson moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, so far this bill has had a pleasant, even passage. However, one or two things still remain to be said about it. I have a responsibility to take a few minutes of the time of the House to refer to the bill, and possibly to move an amendment.

At first blush the bill looks very simple. There is an amazing story behind this bill. As an amendment to the Aeronautics Act seeks to repair an omission of 16 years and tries to validate in a retroactive manner air regulations which have been passed from time to time since 1954. This is because of an error which has crept in where ministers, probably on the advice of their officials, have enacted these regulations by means of Order in Council. In section 4 of the Aeronautics Act it is stated that subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, the minister may make regulations. Over this 16-year period a large number of regulations have been enacted by Order in Council, improperly and illegally. I am not here to challenge the necessity and virtue of the regulations; I am here to point out the dangers in adopting this procedure.

We are continually giving the government, at its request and demand, power to act by Order in Council, regulation, decree and ordinance. At the present time there is very little legislative power left in this House. We have seen this situation occur in the electronics media, in broadcasting, and in transportation. The government has supreme power in these two areas: it is omnipotent; it cannot be regulated or controlled. These actions have been the basis of motions in this House which have not had any real effect. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) is attempting to take such action, on behalf of the government, with respect to agriculture. It is happening in respect of financial institutions, through the Corporations Act and the investments act.

We are heading into a very dangerous area where all-power will reside in the government. The situation would be bad enough with a good government, but when we have an incompetent, stupid, sawdust-Caesar government making use of this power it is time some of us stood up and called attention to the fact.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baldwin: This bill was brought about because in the recent past someone noticed the irregularity and challenged the validity of a regulation. When the matter came to court, a judge decided that the regulation in question was invalid because it had not been dealt with in the proper way. I wish the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) were here. In the face of most complete and meticulous requests by members of this side of the House, that minister saw fit to institute the breathalyzer provisions by amendment to the Criminal Code, without asking the proper precautions. I cannot go any further than that because the matter is now before the courts. These are two examples within recent weeks of the government's acting in a tyrannical and autocratic manner.

This government is out of step. Grave dangers face the people of this country because of the exercise of power such as this. In an attempt to validate all the regulations improperly enacted over the last 16 years, this

bill would purport to make them legal and effective retroactively. I understand this action is essential and must be done, because the regulations are there. I assume they are essential regulations and that grave consequences and ill effects will follow if they are not validated. The minister was questioned today about the regulations by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair). I was inclined to tell the hon. member that he did not have to worry, because at this time none of the regulations are valid. However, I thought of my responsibility to the country and decided not to do that. By this apparently simple bill the House is now being asked to make good the defects and deficiencies of past governments and to validate these regulations. I know of nothing that can better illustrate the dangers and evils of giving unrestricted rights to any government in the way of acting by Order in Council and by regulation.

• (5:40 p.m.)

Canada is one of the few Commonwealth countries where no authority resides in the House, where there is no means of examining, scrutinizing and vetting regulations. Machinery for doing so exists in England. I had the opportunity a year and a half ago to be present in Westminster and I was invited by the chairman of the scrutiny committee there, which was dealing with regulations, to be present. It was a revealing and fascinating experience. This committee, which examines regulations such as those now in question, is advised by Sir Robert Speed who is legal counsel to Mr. Speaker. He receives a list of the large numbers of Orders in Council and regulations and these, according to certain rules, must go before the committee. He examines them with regard to their legality and validity—whether or not they have any undue or unexpected effect not contemplated by the legislation. He then makes a report to the committee and the committee meets from time to time in camera to conduct a detailed examination.

On a great many occasions, as I could tell from my examination of the proceedings of the committee, government departments were told: This regulation is not in order. This regulation is retroactive in its effect. This regulation imposes a greater burden than was contemplated by the legislation. You must change them.

We have no such safeguard in this country. Together with other hon. members, I have been attempting for the last year to repair this serious omission. Finally, last session, we persuaded the government to set up a committee known as the Special Committee on Statutory Instruments. It was a good committee, an all-party committee which toiled very hard examining this issue with the help of expert counsel. It heard a number of witnesses and, in the result, on September 22, 1969, the day before the session began, it brought in a most comprehensive report, one which was greated with loud hosannas by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) and others opposite. They said it was the dawn of a new day as far as statutory instruments, regulations and Orders in Council were concerned.

What has happened? The report is gathering dust in some pigeonhole, and this is not because we on this side have not attempted from time to time to push the government into implementing at least part of the proposals. Here we are, a few days away from the termination of this part of the session, and not one thing has been done about it. This is shameful and disgraceful behaviour on the part of the government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: Turn the rascals out.

Mr. Baldwin: I hear my leader say, "Turn the rascals out". That is the song now being sung in all parts of western Canada whenever a member of the government appears there. The song is, "We'll be glad when you're gone, you rascals you."

I shall read a few extracts from this report to indicate what we had in mind. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson), appears to be a reasonable man. I hope he will be prepared to bring pressure to bear on the rather immovable bodies of some of his colleagues. They may be prejudiced so far as I am concerned. I hope he will be the irresistible force.

Mr. Jamieson: I am the immovable body.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baldwin: I would pit the minister against the President of the Privy Council any day. I will read one or two sentences from the preface of the report and from the end.

> The report is based on the assumption that public knowledge of governmental activities is the basis of all control of delegated legislation. For parliamentary democracy is a system of government which requires that the executive be responsible to the legislature and that both be ac-

countable to the people, and there can be neither responsibility nor accountability where there is no knowledge of what has been done.

That should be written up on a placard and hung in the Prime Minister's office where he can see it every morning.

Your committee's contention is, therefore, that there should be, as a general rule, public knowledge of the processes of delegated legislation before, during and after the making of regulations, and that any derogation by government from this rule requires justification.

Your committee adopts this position for five reasons. First, the people cannot control their government without knowledge of its actions, nor can Parliament fulfil its role of responsibility with respect to legislation without being fully informed on the operation of those legislative powers which it has delegated to others. Second, the existence of secrecy is likely to lead to popular suspicion of wrongdoing by government—

How right that popular suspicion is, Mr. Speaker, with respect to this government.

—whether or not there is any genuine reason for suspicion. Third, we are living today in a period in which the validity of authority can no longer be taken for granted but must be constantly demonstrated. Governmental systems which do not take this new attitude seriously are apt to find public confidence in them diminishing rapidly. Obviously a continuing demonstration of the justice of the system necessitates an opening of the processes and products of delegated legislation to the light of publicity. Fourth, your committee has been able to find no reason, either theoretical or practical, except the force of tradition, why there should not be publicity in the making of regulations. Canadian governments appear to have remarkably little to hide—

If I had seen that sentence, I would have objected to it.

—and therefore nothing to lose, from openness except their psychological investment in existing practices. Indeed, publicity can have the positive value for administrators of helping them to improve weaknesses in their system. Fifth, since regulations have the force of laws, they should be made by processes which as far as possible approximate the openness of the general legislative process.

I reinforce those words because there is today in many parts of democratic society a feeling that governments must be strong, must be able to act without interference from the legislative branch. This is a myth which was exploded between 1939 and 1945. It is a myth which we in this House would do well to disregard. There can be no efficiency in a government which has freedom to act and regulate in the absence of the wholesome scrutiny which comes from the legislative branch. This is one of the reasons we find ourselves in the situation which causes us so much difficulty today. This is one of the reasons Bill C-218 is before the House.

[Mr. Baldwin.]

I shall not discuss all the other recommendations made by the committee, but there can be no excuse for the government failing to implement at least some of the recommendations. One of them involves the selection and appointment of a House Committee on Regulations, together with terms of reference which were set out carefully and particularly. Nobody in this House can have any doubt about the usefulness of these recommendations. Nobody has challenged them. Yet here we are, late in the session, and nothing has been done. It is possible that implementation of some of the other regulations might take time, but I simply fail to understand why no action has been taken to establish this committee. I have discussed this question with some of my friends in the New Democratic Party and the Créditiste Party.

• (5:50 p.m.)

If the President of the Privy Council had come forward with a motion couched along these lines, incorporating the terms of reference to establish a committee on the basis proposed by the third report of the Special Committee on Statutory Instruments, it would have received unanimous approval and been agreed to without debate. I can only suspect that the government and some of the bureaucrats who buoy them up stand fearful of what would happen if this committee were established.

It is for this reason that I intend to move, seconded by the hon. member for Annapolis Valley (Mr. Nowlan), the following amendment:

That all the words after "that" be deleted and the following substituted:

"This House will not proceed upon a measure to validate retroactively Orders in Council of doubtful legality, without obtaining the safeguards and controls which will be brought about by the implementation of the third report of the Special Committee on Statutory Instruments tabled in this House on Wednesday, October 22, 1969."

Before I conclude, let me say that this amendment has been pretty well couched in terms that follow the amendment on which we just voted. Yesterday I had the opportunity of hearing Mr. Speaker commend Your Honour's interpretation of the rules in regard to the amendment which I was unfortunate enough to have ruled unacceptable. Since Your Honour was in the chair when the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) brought in the amendment to Bill C-197 on which we just voted, and since I followed it faithfully except to adapt it as required, I am sure that Your Honour, in light of the great commenda-

tion Mr. Speaker made respecting your capacity for understanding the rules, will find it difficult to suggest that this amendment is not in order.

Finally, we have heard a lot recently about the great measure of independence of hon. members opposite. We have heard of great winds blowing from Toronto and from western Canada. Over and over again we have heard the news story that the Liberal party, especially its western branch, will assert its independence; that there must be new changes to the rules of this House to permit members on the government side to express themselves freely and without hindrance. What better chance could they have to do that than this amendment? Certainly I hope the members from western Canada who served with me on the committee will take this opportunity. This is not a non-confidence motion; hon. members cannot hide behind that argument. If hon. members feel there is a case to be made for a greater measure of scrutiny and examination of government regulations and Orders in Council, here is an opportunity for them to back up, by their votes and actions, the talk that we have been hearing.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, before Your Honour decides whether or not this amendment is in order I am sure you will want to take into account other factors. Firstly, we are at the report stage of the bill.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Third reading.

Mr. Olson: On third reading, that is right; we passed the report stage a few minutes ago. What this amendment calls for is the rejection of the provisions of Bill C-218. I think it is a well-known practice and precedent in this House that a motion, the purpose of which could be achieved by negating the bill, is not in order. This, of course, is the situation here. The motion reads:

> This House will not proceed upon a measure to validate—

And so on. The operative words are, "This House will not proceed". The words following differ in different cases. Sometimes the wording is "be not proceeded with for six months", and there are other variations in wording that my hon. friend from Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) is clever and adept at using. We have to be concerned with the fact that the amendment calls upon this House not to proceed with Bill C-218. As I pointed out at the outset, if a negative vote on third reading would achieve the same thing as a positive vote on this amendment, the amendment is out of order. I suggest that that is the situation before the House.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, may I call to Your Honour the wording of the amendment that we have just voted upon, moved by the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner). It commenced:

> —"this House will not proceed upon a measure to authorize the establishment of national marketing agencies"—

It then delineated certain principles which indicated why we felt that this should be the case. In other words, we were establishing, not our opposition to the principle of passing the bill but we were setting up a reason without the acceptance of which we would be reluctant to support the bill. It therefore came squarely within the interpretation of a reasoned amendment. In fact, Your Honour did not even ask for argument on the amendment moved by the hon. member for Crowfoot because it was a valid amendment.

My amendment has simply been shaped and adapted to conform to the particular provisions of this bill, but its principle is precisely the same. Without needing to say anything further, I suggest that this amendment is a reasoned amendment of the type which by tradition and practice for many years has been accepted by the House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) rising on a point of order?

Mr. Howard (Skeena): No, Mr. Speaker. I do not think there is a point of order; I just want to speak to the amendment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I must say that the hon. member is more convinced of that than I am. Perhaps he would like to enlighten the Chair. I must say I have reservations about the amendment. I would specifically draw the attention of hon. members to the provision to be found at page 572 of May's seventeenth edition, which I would read at this point:

> As the debate on the third reading should be confined to the contents of the bill, reasoned amendments which raise matters not included in the provisions of the bill are not permissible.

It seems to me that the amendment not only attaches a condition, which probably by itself would be reason enough not to put it, but it goes beyond the contents of the bill. I am inclined not to put it, despite the very

generous and persuasive comments of the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin). However, I am prepared to hear procedural argument. If there is none, I am prepared to rule definitively now.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, I would make this proposition. It is now six o'clock. It is not an unreasonable amendment at all. I would be perfectly prepared to withdraw it if I could get a commitment or undertaking. The Minister of Agriculture and the President of the Privy Council have been becoming a little more generous in giving undertakings. If I could receive an undertaking from the government that within a limited time it will implement the provisions of the third report of the Committee on Statutory Instruments, although I would have to consult my colleagues I would be inclined to give serious consideration to withdrawing the amendment. If that is not done, I would have to insist on Your Honour making a ruling, because I would then have no more faith in the intentions of this government regarding the report of this committee.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, this is another of those instances where the hon. member for Peace River wants to attach conditions that are clearly out of order and which have nothing to do with—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Six o'clock.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. In view of the hour I will reserve judgment in case there are some last-minute appeals to sections of May or Beauchesne that I have not consulted. It being six o'clock, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m.

At six o'clock the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, June 11, 1970

The House met at 2 p.m.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received which is as follows:

Government House, Ottawa
11 June, 1970

Sir:

I have the honour to inform you that the Hon. D. C. Abbott, P.C., Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, acting as Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber today, June 11th, at 5.45 p.m. for the purpose of giving Royal Assent to certain Bills.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,
Louis-Frémont Trudeau,
Brigadier General,
Assistant Secretary to the Governor General.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

TRIBUTE TO MEMBERS FOR CALGARY CENTRE AND OTTAWA EAST ON TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF SERVICE

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege affecting all members of the House. Politics is often described as a gamble—that is, it is not unlike playing the stock market. Some players lose their shirts in short order. Others manage to make respectably moderate gains. Still others transform their initial investment in the political process into solid and long-term returns. A gamble or not, this process is a vital and necessary element in the constitution of the democratic process in which we are all participants.

[*Translation*]

To achieve such success requires tenacity and patience; humour and understanding. Above all it requires the ability to convince a block of voters that, on balance, one understands their problems and has more to offer them than all the other fellows.

Today I am sure all hon. members would wish to join in congratulating two of our colleagues who have been receiving votes of confidence from their constituents since they were first elected on June 11, 1945. I refer to the hon. member for Calgary Centre and the hon. member for Ottawa East.

• (2:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

Twenty-five years is a large and precious segment of any man's lifetime, Mr. Speaker. Our country is all the richer for having as citizens the kind of men who would offer these years to the Canadian Parliament. Without this sort of responsibility and dedication, this institution would not endure; without their good nature and geniality we would find it a less attractive place.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the question of privilege raised by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and to join him in extending congratulations to the hon. member for Ottawa East (Mr. Richard) and the hon. member for Calgary Centre (Mr. Harkness) on achieving 25 years of service to this House. I do not think that hon. members think of it in terms of service. My own observation is that most people who come to this House are very anxious to stay. In addition to these 25 years being a period of service for these hon. gentlemen, I am sure that they have been fascinating and enjoyable years which have given a great deal of pleasure to their colleagues in the House.

It is natural that I should know the hon. member for Calgary Centre a little better than the hon. member for Ottawa East, who I find to be a very friendly and gracious colleague. I have known the member for Calgary Centre for quite some time. He has had a very distinguished career. He is a very affable man, a man of very deep conviction and principle. I recall, when I was in another position, trying to persuade the member for Calgary Centre, who also at that time held another position, that he ought to do something he did not think he should do. I was not able to make much progress.

I extend felicitations to both of these gentlemen. I wish them many years of continued

public service and good health. I express my compliments to them on the contribution they have made to Parliament and to the lives of those associated with them.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I wish to associate ourselves with the sentiments expressed by the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) and extend our congratulations to the hon. member for Calgary Centre (Mr. Harkness) and the hon. member for Ottawa East (Mr. Richard) on having completed a quarter of a century of service to this House and to the people of the constituencies they represent.

Politicians have three main problems: First, how to get elected to the House of Commons; second, how to stay there and, third, how to get out gracefully. When the late Senator Chubby Power was a member of this chamber he said that there are only two ways for a member to get out of this House: One is to be defeated and the other is to die, but the trouble with these alternatives is that the first is so humiliating and the second is so final. The two members we are honouring today have succeeded in avoiding both, and I hope they will not have to worry about the latter for a long time.

The members of my party wish me to say how happy our association has been with these two members over the years. We wish them well. We trust that they will continue in good health and that they will have the privilege of serving the people of their constituencies and the people of Canada for many years to come.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in extending our warmest congratulations to the members for Ottawa East and Calgary Centre (Messrs. Richard and Harkness).

Between 1945 and 1949, I got to know both very well as I was then sitting on this side of the House. If we had to part company in 1949, it was not my fault but that of the "bad" Liberals who defeated me.

In any case, the members for Ottawa East and Calgary Centre, whom I got to know between 1945 and 1949, have both rendered tremendous services to their constituents.

Personally and on behalf of my colleagues, I wish them long life and success in their undertakings. I hope they will continue to serve the Canadian people for many years to come.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*English*]

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank the Prime Minister, the Leader of the Opposition, the leader of the New Democratic Party and the leader of the Créditiste party for their kind expressions of good will toward the hon. member for Ottawa East and myself. I should like to thank you, Mr. Speaker, and, indeed, all our colleagues in the House for the mark of esteem which they have shown by their applause.

I appreciate this very much. I must agree with the Prime Minister that 25 years is a very large slice of one's working life to spend in Parliament. At the same time, I do not know of any way in which I could have spent those 25 years in a more interesting manner than I have here in the House of Commons.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Harkness: It is a privilege to have known so many hundreds of members who have sat in the House in that period, to have been able to exchange ideas with them, and to obtain from them a much broader idea of the different elements which make up this country—its problems, its diversity, and, at the same time all the unifying forces that exist within it. This is a privilege one can only enjoy by spending a long period in the House of Commons. I must say, though, that occasions of this sort demonstrate fairly dramatically the fact that all of us here are engaged in a very hazardous occupation. I do not know of any other way of life in which the survival rate after 25 years is less than 2 per cent.

I must at this point express my thanks to the voters of Calgary who have sent me here in the last nine elections, and say to all my colleagues that the only way in which to make a career out of politics is to make sure that your voters continue to support you.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (2:20 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. J.-T. Richard (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, I am deeply moved by the nice things that were said by my leader (Mr. Trudeau), the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield), the leader of the New Democratic party (Mr. Douglas) and my friend, the leader of the Ralliement Créditiste (Mr. Caouette). I wish to thank them all for their good wishes.

I must say that I am happy to have spent 25 years in the House; as we say "it was a home away from home". Besides the fact that some confided in me, I have been trusted and respected by my colleagues from all parties in the House. My leaders had confidence in me and I consider that I have a special status: among the four more senior members of the House, I have the privilege of having always remained a commoner. Perhaps I wanted to make sure that I would be re-elected.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Richard: However, I have always thought that there was enough to do in the interest of those who are dear to me, the ordinary people with whom I have lived from my childhood, in very simple conditions, as I continue to do still.

I am quite pleased that I was never meant to have a lot of money or to reach a high station in life, because I still feel quite close to my electors who respect me and this is what I want more than anything else.

If you allow me, I would like to point out the presence in the Speaker's gallery of my mother—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Richard: —who is accompanied by my wife and my son.

[*English*]

I would have so many things to say, Mr. Speaker, if we were in a committee, or if I had the privilege of speaking for 40 minutes, but I think it would be very enlightening to some hon. members to know just what Parliament has been like, during these 25 years. The reformists are not just the recent arrivals in the House; The 1945 "little Chicago boys" who used to sit over in that corner of the House were much more a group of reformists. We sat there the whole time from three to six and then from eight to eleven at night.

I must thank all of the party leaders who have been in this House since 1945. I have enjoyed the confidence not only of my leaders who were Prime Ministers—four of them—but I should also mention that the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) has been a very good friend of mine. On the very first day I sat in this House he came over to greet me and to speak to me.

I could ramble on but I must close. Before I do let me say this carnation I am wearing was also a symbol of the little Chicago boys in 1945. The then Prime Minister, Mr. King, was in hot water at that time for many months, and I remember in those days we played the game because he thought that we were members of the Fabian society.

From a more serious point of view, may I say I hope I will be able to serve the people of my riding for some time yet. I also hope I will live to see a Canada that is very closely united and whose people are bilingual. By that I mean that I hope the solution to a united Canada, which I have looked for for so many years, will be found in the fact that slowly, progressively, without force or any other means of that type but through knowledge of each other and the expression of good will, we will have a nation where the majority of the people speak not only their native language, whether that be French or English, but both languages.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

LABOUR, MANPOWER AND IMMIGRATION

Second report of Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration—Mr. Émard.

[*Editor's Note: For text of above report see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

CONSTITUTION OF CANADA

CONCURRENCE IN SECOND REPORT OF SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE

Mr. Mark MacGuigan (Windsor-Walkerville) moved that the second report of the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and of the House of Commons on the Constitution of Canada, presented to the House on May 20, 1970, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Student Summer Employment

MANPOWER

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INCREASED SUMMER EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR STUDENTS

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, last week the government took action concerning the financial relationships between the federal and provincial governments in view of current economic conditions. This action will provide a new stimulus to the economy.

Today, again in view of these economic conditions, the government has taken new decisions to increase employment opportunities for students across the country this summer, either within the federal public service and through special programs.

You will recall that some time ago I stated in the House that the objective of the government of Canada was to employ 11,365 students this summer at an estimated cost of $13 million for salaries. I now wish to announce a decision of government to employ an additional 5,836 students within the government service this summer at an estimated additional cost of $5.5 million for salaries. This represents a total of 17,200 jobs for students this summer in the public service at a possible salary cost of $18.5 million.

My department will also within a fortnight open 33 additional special offices to serve students. These, as well as the 40 offices already operating, will be manned by students. In this way, we hope to provide the best possible services to the student population of Canada.

In addition, funds will be made available to permit the Department of National Defence to launch four new job-creating projects. These are: ground maintenance at bases across Canada, range clearance at Base Gagetown and Valcartier, opportunity to serve in the militia, and increased cadet training. Additionally, the Canadian Red Cross Youth has been approached to assume responsibility for leadership courses to be given to students while National Defence will provide accommodation and board to students in some of its establishments across the country. Some 10,500 should be gainfully employed through the first four projects. Some 300 students could enrol in the leadership courses. The total cost of these five projects involving the Department of National Defence is estimated at $7.9 million.

Funds for the ongoing program of student travel within Canada and abroad under the leadership of voluntary agencies and in co-operation with the Department of the Secretary of State have been increased. It is expected that some 1,800 additional applications will be received from students. The Department of the Secretary of State will launch also a program to teach French or English to some 1,000 students during the summer months. While no salary is paid to students, the cost of the program is estimated at $600,000 to cover teachers' salaries, accommodation and board for students for a six-week period.

• (2:30 p.m.)

Finally, with the assistance of the Department of National Defence an effort will be made to establish drop-in centres in major cities to provide beds for students travelling throughout the country.

We have also approached the Canadian Red Cross Youth to allow us to participate in their educational projects by assisting them with funds to extend these projects to all provinces. These projects are designed to assist the underprivileged. Some 100 students could be employed as leaders while some 5,000 secondary school students might serve as volunteers.

In co-operation with the National Council of YMCAs it has been proposed that we assume through a grant the employment of students to act as supervisors in a number of day camps which, I believe, are important to many children in Canada.

In brief, the federal government intends to provide through its total program 36,000 openings for students this summer at an estimated cost of $27.9 million. Parliament will be asked to provide funds through supplementary estimates.

A table providing a summary of our programs is attached to this statement, and, with consent, might be included in *Hansard* as part of my statement.

I have outlined our new programs for student employment. We shall bend all our efforts to ensure their implementation to the fullest possible extent.

As I have said before, we appreciate the leadership given by the Canadian Chamber of Commerce to its members in providing additional student openings this summer. It is my hope that these additional efforts by the federal government will encourage other employers to increase summer employment for students.

[Editor's Note: The summary of programs referred to above follows:]

SUMMER STUDENT EMPLOYMENT 1970
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT PROGRAM
(estimates of openings and costs)

Programs	Number of students	Number of Man-months	Salaries and Other Costs $
1. Student Employment in the Federal Public Service			
(a) already approved	11,365	34,095	13,000,000
(b) additional	5,836	17,508	5,500,000
	17,201	51,603	18,500,000
2. Department of National Defence			
(a) Ground Maintenance at Bases across Canada	4,000	8,000	2,250,000
(b) Range Clearance (Base Gagetown)	1,000	2,000	775,000
(c) Militia Training	5,000	8,750	4,500,000
(d) Cadet Training	500	875	275,000
(e) Leadership Training (in conjunction with Canadian Red Cross Youth)	300	225	100,000
	10,800	19,850	7,900,000
3. Department of the Secretary of State			
(a) Additions to Travel Programs Voluntary Agencies	1,800	900	150,000
(b) Language Training	1,000	1,500	600,000
(c) Drop-in Centres			200,000
	2,800	2,400	950,000
4. Canadian Red Cross Youth Educational Projects	5,100	15,300	325,000
5. National Council of YMCA's Day Camps	200	500	220,000
	36,101	89,653	27,895,000

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the minister for taking into consideration even at this late date the student employment problem in Canada. I am rather proud to have the opportunity and privilege of answering the minister's statement because the young member of our party, the hon. member for Vegreville, who usually speaks on matters regarding youth, happens to be absent from the House today. I feel privileged because, like many other hon. members who attended university in the 1930's, I had to work my way through college, and thus we are aware of the difficulties in trying to obtain employment.

I should like to say a few things regarding the merit of the program. First, any thought given by this government to student employment is good. I hope that the assistance given will be based on need rather than special privilege or any other factor because those in need are the ones who require the jobs. When we look at the total program we see that in one way or another 36,000 students will be guaranteed employment. But I think that this fact must be seen in its proper perspective. I do not have the exact figures but I have seen references in newspapers to the fact that there are as many as 600,000 students in Canada. I believe it would be more accurate to say that there are about 450,000 students in institutions of higher learning, universities and vocational training schools. So we have to look at this program from the point of view of what it will really do.

The program is good as far as it goes. The only criticism I have is that it comes too late. University students have been out of college already for one month. One only has to drive down the Trans-Canada highway from Winnipeg to Banff, which I did recently, to see large numbers of students thumbing rides to go to places where they hope they can find employment, just like the average man in the 1930's rode the rods trying to find a job.

So I say that although this program will be helpful to 36,000 students, it will not help those who are still unemployed. I repeat that there are 450,000 students in Canada, many of whom are looking for work. If they do not find work this summer they will not be able to return to university in the fall. In addition, we must remember that, as has been brought out, unemployment in Canada is 6.6 per cent of the work force in this country. If we add to this figure the number of unemployed university students and other students from our high schools and colleges, there must be pretty close to 800,000 unemployed in this country, and that to me is a serious situation.

Mr. McGrath: Close to a million.

Mr. Woolliams: Yes, we will not be very far from that figure. I say with great respect that this is no time to gloat. Our greatest resource in Canada is our human resource. If we neglect our youth, we will have neglected the finest resource we have.

Only a month ago I asked the minister, when this problem first arose as university students were leaving college, whether he would present a program similar to the one he presented today but also go even farther and bonus business and industry to stimulate and motivate them to take on students so that all students, irrespective of class, would have employment and be able to return to the universities they have been attending.

Finally, we must realize that the 36,000 students are only equivalent in number to the student population of two universities in western Canada. When one considers the number of universities across this country and the number of young men now hunting desperately for employment, not only graduates and undergraduates but high school students and students in vocational training schools, I say to the minister on behalf of the ones who will obtain jobs: thank you very much but the program is too late and is too inadequate.

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, may I say at the outset that I am very happy that the minister has recognized the problem of student employment this year. I congratulate him for recognizing the need to spend additional government money on employing an extra 5,800 students in the government services this year. I am also happy that the minister has opened an extra 33 special offices to serve students seeking jobs this summer and that he is staffing the offices with students. I wish we could have done these things about a month and a half ago when they could have helped quite a few students who have been unemployed since classes stopped in the middle of April.

I do not think we should now put away our books and forget about the student summer employment problem, because it will not go away. The minister's program will be helpful but more jobs are going to be needed.

I have just completed a survey of the major universities in Canada. I have been telephoning placement officers on their campuses and have learned that they have major problems this year. I should like to take one or two minutes to point out three or four of them. First, I think the student employment problem is linked directly to the whole unemployment picture in Canada and to the economic slowdown we are now experiencing. I find that almost every major university is having more difficulty this year than they had last year in obtaining adequate employment for students this summer.

Second, I find that even though a student has a job it may not be one that pays him adequate money to enable him to return to university in the fall of 1970. Other students only have part-time jobs and cannot expect to work for any more than two or three months this summer.

The third point I want to make is that I found through my survey that particular difficulty is encountered by women students in finding adequate jobs in the cities and towns of this country.

I should like to underline two additional points. One is that there are special regional problems in student employment as there are in many other facets of Canadian life and society. I believe we will need extra help and more emergency or special programs in places such as Saskatchewan, which is suffering from an economic slowdown, and in the Maritimes and rural Quebec. I think this is very important.

I also believe that in dealing with the whole problem of student employment we should

make some basic change by trying to create jobs that are more student-oriented. I refer to work-study jobs, so that students will not be competing with the members of the regular work force. We will have to start such programs in the future. Having regard to the student employment picture, we will also have to start thinking of fundamental changes in our educational system so that every young person, regardless of his financial or economic background, will be able to attend university whether or not he finds a summer job.

I thank the minister once again for at least recognizing the problem in part. Let us make this the beginning rather than the end in trying to find jobs for students this summer and in trying to find a new solution to the whole problem of making it possible for everyone to attend a school of higher learning.

• (2:40 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, we are surely pleased to hear the minister say that the Public Service will hire this year 17,200 students instead of 10,365. Better late than never.

As the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) mentioned a moment ago, the students have been looking for jobs for more than a month and the government has finally decided to open 33 special offices for students in addition to the 40 already existing, in order to enable them to find employment. I hope that among these 33 offices at least one will be established in northwestern Quebec, an area which I represent in this House.

Mr. Speaker, the government is making a big fuss about the student situation, and rightly so. I have recently had the opportunity of visiting the four Western provinces: British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba. University students have had to pay their tuition fees in wheat or rye because they could not afford paying cash. Those students in the West, I repeat, are entitled to earn an honest living in their country, and it has not been possible to allow them to do so. Actually, what are 35,000 or 40,000 jobs at a time when 400,000 to 600,000 of our students are seeking work. That is therefore not an adequate response to the present problem.

I also said in the West that, should a war break out today, the Minister of Labour and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen) would not just say: We have found 33,000 jobs, but: At last we have found jobs for all our young people of 18 and over, and we are going to draft them into the Army, feed them, house them and clothe them. Then any amount could be spent.

I think the government is taking a band-aid approach to the problem. It will not be possible, of course, to find employment for every student. Those who will not be able to earn a livelihood and those who will not earn enough to resume their classes for the fall term will engage into another path and then they will be blamed for rebelling against a society.

Mr. Speaker, instead of putting the blame on the young who sometimes revolt against society, why not blame society itself for preventing the young from integrating into it and having their say about the administration and the development of their country.

[*English*]

TELESAT CANADA

TABLING OF FIRST ANNUAL REPORT FOR YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1969

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 41, section 2, I wish to table the first report of Telesat Canada for the year ended December 31, 1969, in accordance with section 37 of the Telesat Canada Act.

MOTIONS TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

MANPOWER

LACK OF SUMMER EMPLOYMENT FOR STUDENTS

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, notice was given to you in reference to this motion prior to any knowledge on my part of the statement made on motions today by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration.

I ask leave to move the adjournment of the House under Standing Order 26 for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely, the dearth of summer employment for many thousands of young Canadians who will be unable to continue their education next fall because they cannot now work to pay their way through school and university, a problem compounded in many instances by the desperate plight of their families whose incomes have been drastically reduced through growing unemployment.

In the next ten days there will be more than 200,000 additional students from colleges and high schools also looking for summer employment. Although there are no definite figures we do know that 6.6 per cent of the Canadian labour force is unemployed and if the students that are unemployed were added to this figure it would bring unemployment in Canada up to 8 per cent. I would hope that this government has the heart to do even more than was suggested today.

Mr. Speaker: I am not sure whether I should infer from the hon. member's statement that he is making his motion or is withdrawing it.

Mr. Woolliams: No, I am making it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Calgary North had filed the notice required by Standing Order 26 and, of course, I have had an opportunity to give the matter some serious thought since then. Hon. members are well aware that the matter of summer employment for students has been brought to the attention of the House on a number of occasions in recent weeks. In particular, a motion similar to that now before us was proposed on May 14 by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands. The ruling of the Chair on that occasion read in part as follows:

> In so far as the reference to the problem of student employment during the summer months is concerned, it is hardly necessary for me to remind hon. members that a debate on this very subject took place on Friday last, when a supply motion was presented to the House by the hon. member for Edmonton Centre.

In view of the fact that there has already been a special debate in the House on this very subject, considering that it has been the subject of a number of interventions by hon. members since then, and taking into account the statement made on motions by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration which has been followed by the interesting and constructive comments of hon. members speaking on behalf of the parties in opposition, including the statement made by the hon. member for Calgary North, I would not think that I am at liberty at this time to put to the House the motion proposed by the hon. member.

HOUSING

DROP IN STARTS IN URBAN CENTRES

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave, seconded by the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin), to move the adjournment of the House under Standing Order 26 for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely, the announcement by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation of a drop of 50.1 per cent in housing starts in urban centres for the first five months of this year compared with a similar period last year, thereby creating a new and alarming crisis in Canada, and making it urgent that Parliament deal immediately with the situation that has now been created before the people of Canada suffer undue hardship from the housing shortage and excessively high rents and mortgage interest rates.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Broadview has also given the Chair the notice required under the terms of Standing Order 26. Hon. members will recognize that the report on which the hon. member for Broadview has based his motion is analogous to the periodic announcements made by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and other government agencies dealing, for example, with the cost of living, with employment or unemployment with import or export statistics. There are many precedents indicating that in the circumstances it is not competent upon the Chair to accept such motions.

In the circumstances I regret very much that I have to advise the hon. member that I cannot agree the House should be adjourned for the purpose he has suggested under the terms of Standing Order 26.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

URBAN AFFAIRS

PROPOSED FORUM FOR FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL-MUNICIPAL CONSULTATION—ESTABLISHMENT OF FEDERAL DEPARTMENT

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether the Minister without Portfolio from Port Arthur was announcing government policy when in Halifax he recommended a forum for federal-provincial-municipal consultation on urban matters, with the municipalities having a legitimate and recognized place at the table with the provinces, with the federal government laying on that table all federal policies and actions that affect the cities for discussion and co-ordination with provincial and munici-

pal needs, and more in the same vein? I hope the minister was speaking for the government when he made that recommendation.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for supporting the government's position on this general approach, Mr. Speaker, but I would not want to bind the government to the exact words quoted by the Leader of the Opposition. Certainly the government has always hoped it could find some way of discussing its actions in the cities with the people upon whom that action bears first and foremost. We are very glad that the position taken by the minister in Halifax has met with some degree of support from at least some municipal authorities.

Mr. Stanfield: May I ask the Prime Minister whether the minister was announcing the position of the government and government policy when he said he would seek the views of the provinces on whether they would be agreeable to the establishment under a formal framework of an urban council where the political representatives of all three levels of government could meet and discuss urban policies regularly?

Mr. Trudeau: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The idea of an urban council was discussed by the minister with his cabinet colleagues, and this idea was approved. It is a matter for implementation and for agreement, which the minister is presently seeking.

Mr. Stanfield: Is it the intention of the government to establish a department of urban affairs in order to administer the federal end of this program that the minister announced?

Mr. Trudeau: Well, Mr. Speaker, we are not obsessed with the name of any such agency. We think that the minister is now dealing with the problem in a very adequate way. He has no department yet, but of course he has some supporting agencies such as CMHC. We will be looking in the near future to see if there is any need for further structural changes.

STRUCTURE OF PROPOSED FORUM FOR FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL-MUNICIPAL CONSULTATION—DROP IN HOUSING STARTS

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): I have a supplementary question for the minister in charge of housing, Mr. Speaker. In setting up this new urban council on housing, does the minister intend to set it up under a framework different from that suggested by former Prime Minister Pearson, who in December, 1967, said that such a council would be merely a consultative body dealing with housing assessment and housing studies? Is it the intention to have a different framework for the purpose of initiating policies, dealing with financial problems, and so forth?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I think the words already spoken on this subject during the question period give some indication of some of the ideas I have, but they are one man's view of the world. It would be incumbent upon us to start the consultation by consulting about that very point, that is, about the structure that would best serve the purpose that we all seem to be agreed on. In that light it would be part of my approach to the provincial minister concerned to see what their views would be.

Mr. Gilbert: May I direct another supplementary question to the minister in charge of housing, Mr. Speaker. In view of the serious drop in housing starts in the first five months of this year, amounting to a 50.1 per cent decrease in urban centres, is it the intention of the minister to make a statement on motions setting forth the government's policy and initiatives aimed at solving the housing crisis we now face?

Mr. Andras: Mr. Speaker, I will give consideration to a statement. I am concerned myself about the low number of starts in May. I think it would be wise if we could analyse the May figures in particular, which, among other reasons, were down as a result of some unfortunate construction strikes. One or two of the provinces, for good and legitimate reasons, have not yet been able to commit public housing funds allocated to them. This, however, is a temporary situation and will be improved upon. This does not negate the seriousness of the low number of starts in May. I am consulting with my colleagues and if there is to be any different approach to this matter I will be glad to mention it in the House.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Prime Minister. In view of the government's obvious change in policy with regard to direct participation of the representatives of urban municipalities, is the wel-

come mat now outside the Privy Council Office for the hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Hellyer)?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

REQUEST FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank the Minister without Portfolio in charge of housing for taking the advice of the opposition which has long been seeking the co-operation in this field of the federal, provincial and municipal governments. Now that we are moving in that direction, may I ask whether the Prime Minister would consider setting up a standing committee on urban affairs to which many representations could be directed?

Mr. Baldwin: Come on! Answer the question!

Mr. McCleave: Does the Prime Minister now know what is going on?

Mr. Alexander: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I know the Prime Minister was exceptionally busy when I asked my question. Perhaps I might ask my question again. In view of the direction that government policy has now taken, is the Prime Minister prepared to recommend the setting up of a standing committee on urban affairs?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his representation.

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the Prime Minister assure the House that the independence and initiative the Minister without Portfolio displays in urban affairs will meet with more success than the independence and initiative he displayed when he was in charge of Indian affairs?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

CANADA ASSISTANCE PLAN

REFUSAL OF CASH BENEFITS BY BRITISH COLUMBIA MINISTER

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Is the minister aware of Mr. Gaglardi's new directive in British Columbia that people involved in a labour dispute can receive food vouchers but no cash welfare, and only when they can prove there is no food in the house? If he is aware of this, did he agree to it? If not, what action does he propose to take?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I am aware of various press releases alleging that the minister made this statement, but I have not yet seen such a statement in the form of directives to welfare administrators who are responsible. If it should occur that there are such directives, that of course would be contrary to the provisions of the Canada Assistance Plan and the agreements under it.

Mrs. MacInnis: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. If I can provide the minister with those written directives, will he take action?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

[Translation]

INDUSTRY

GOLD MINING—ASSISTANCE FOLLOWING FREEING OF DOLLAR EXCHANGE RATE

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources.

Yesterday, I asked the Minister of Finance a question in which I said:

> After the adoption of the floating exchange rate for the Canadian dollar, Canadian gold mines are losing revenues and a good many marginal mines which attract American funds to Canada and which provide employment for Canadians will undoubtedly have to close down.

The Minister of Finance told me that the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources was meeting with gold producers to discuss this particular problem. Is the latter in a position today to tell the House whether the government will continue or will increase the subsidies paid to gold mines to keep them in operation, in order to reassure the population of northwestern Quebec?

[English]

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, there is as yet no government decision on the question of the Emergency Gold Mining Assistance Act. The subsidies continue until the end of the year. I have had meetings both with community leaders from northern Ontario and northwestern Quebec and also, yesterday, with officials of the Canadian Mining Association. My own department is conducting a

very comprehensive survey that includes both the social and municipal implications of the removal of the subsidy. We hope that we shall have a government decision as to the future of the gold mines and the gold mining communities and the relevance of the Emergency Gold Mining Assistance Act in a very short time.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—SUGGESTED MEETING OF PRIME MINISTER AND LABOUR LEADERS

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

An hon. Member: He will not listen.

Mr. Hees: I gave him notice of the question. Following the Prime Minister's suggestion yesterday that I invite the country's top labour leaders to a private meeting with the Prime Minister to discuss some of the country's more serious economic problems and possible solutions to them, and in view of the personal assurances that have been given to me during the past 24 hours by those top labour leaders that they would welcome such a meeting and that they think it could be very constructive indeed, will the Prime Minister assure the House that he will now instruct his staff to work out a mutually convenient time for holding such meetings, so that they can be proceeded with as soon as possible?

An hon. Member: How about next weekend?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, there may be a little bit of misunderstanding on the question of how the hon. member's persuasive powers were to be used. When I answered his question yesterday I suggested that since in my public meetings with the labour leaders some months ago I had not been entirely successful, perhaps the hon. member could invite the labour leaders and that he could convince them. Obviously, he feels he is unable to convince them and he wants me to convince them.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: I am, of course, prepared to do so and I thank the hon. member for his constructive proposal. But I have a high regard for the persuasive powers of the Minister of Labour, who has told me that he has been in contact with the labour leaders for some time now and that he will arrange for such meetings if such meetings can usefully take place.

Mr. Hees: I have conveyed to the Prime Minister, as he very well knows, the fact that during the past 24 hours very senior labour leaders of this country have indicated that a private meeting with the Prime Minister would be very conducive to improvements in the economic atmosphere in Canada. Will the Prime Minister take this matter seriously in the interest of the country? I am speaking very seriously. Will he ask these labour leaders to attend a private meeting with him, away from press, radio and television? Possibly a meeting could be held in the home of the Prime Minister to discuss these important matters.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has asked his question.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I assure the hon. member that I do take the proposal seriously. I thank the hon. member for having given it consideration and for having discussed it with me yesterday after the question period. I can only repeat my answer of yesterday to him and indicate that steps are under way. The Minister of Labour has been having discussions with these leaders. If the minister cannot make any headway, and if the labour leaders find that their only access to me is through the hon. member, I will willingly let him set up the meeting.

INFLATION—EFFECT OF HIGHER WAGE INCREASE IN TOWBOAT INDUSTRY ON SIX PER CENT GUIDELINE

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): A supplementary question. Following the announcement made by the Minister of Labour yesterday, I ask the Prime Minister whether the government's guideline on wage and salary increases is still 6 per cent?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): If the Leader of the Opposition will recall, the government's position as stated by the Minister of Finance is that the Chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission proposed that guideline to the federal government and to the provinces. We indicated our intention of accepting it.

Mr. Stanfield: A further supplementary. Will the Prime Minister or one of his ministers make a statement on motions at an early date to explain this guideline? Since the gov-

ernment of Canada has apparently accepted it, how do they propose to persuade those concerned that the 6 per cent guideline should be followed when the Minister of Labour has been involved with negotiations at a substantially higher level?

Mr. Trudeau: I gladly ask the Minister of Labour to answer that question.

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for the Leader of the Opposition. I do not think he would want to mislead the House, even unintentionally. If he will read yesterday's *Hansard*, he will see that the settlement of the strike in the towboat industry was arrived at independently of the government and the Minister of Labour. I think the settlement is fair, in view of the fact that it represents the unanimous feelings of the conciliation board which was set up to settle the strike in the towboat industry and taking into consideration the existing salaries before the collective agreement was signed, as well as productivity and other factors. I made it very clear in my statement yesterday and I take this opportunity today to say, with a degree of satisfaction, that in the two years I have been Minister of Labour on not one occasion have I either persuaded or abnormally influenced either side to make settlements.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: I wonder whether we are not now entering the field of debate. I point out to hon. members that we are running short of time.

Mr. Stanfield: With respect, Mr. Speaker, this is a very important matter. I wish to direct one further question to the Minister of Labour. I do not think I misinterpreted what he said. I simply ask him how he expects postal and other employees to accept a guideline of 6 per cent in the circumstances announced by the minister yesterday?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I again suggest to the minister and the Leader of the Opposition that we are entering the field of debate and argument. Although I appreciate the matter is very important, I suggest we go on to another subject.

ENERGY

RELAXATION OF U.S. IMPORT CONTROLS ON CANADIAN OIL—RELATIONSHIP TO EXPORTS OF CANADIAN GAS

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I direct my question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Has the minister received any information from the government of the United States that the latter intends to relax controls on the import of Canadian oil into the American market? If he has any information, will he tell the House what the new quotas are likely to be and whether this relaxation is in any way related to an arrangement between the two governments regarding the export of Canadian natural gas?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): I am not officially aware of any such relaxation, Mr. Speaker, although I have read rumours in the press that there might be a relaxation. We have not had any official notification of any relaxation.

With regard to the latter half of the hon. member's question, there is certainly no agreement that any relaxation must be contingent upon a greater quantity of Canadian gas being made available. The decision on whether there is a surplus of Canadian gas is made by the National Energy Board. The government cannot make such an agreement. I have accentuated in several speeches that the wider the oil market, the more exploration will take place and the greater the likelihood of more gas being found.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): In view of the fact that American companies now have applications before the National Energy Board for the export of 9½ trillion cubic feet of Canadian gas to the United States, and in view of the fact the final decision will come to the cabinet in the form of recommendations by the National Energy Board, I ask the minister whether he will assure the House that the government will not approve any such export until such time as the matter has been placed before Parliament?

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, if I made such an undertaking I would be interfering with a statute of this House. There is a statute which set up the National Energy Board as the decision-making authority in this regard. When they sit on these hearings they do so in a judicial capacity. At no time do I interfere in their deliberations. Their recommendations will be made to and determined by cabinet in the normal course of business.

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

DELIVERY OF PENSION AND OTHER CHEQUES BY SPECIAL MESSENGERS

Mr. Mac T. McCutcheon (Lambton-Kent): I wish to direct a question to the Postmaster

General. Since the advent of the rotating postal strikes, has the government been delivering old age pension cheques, government annuity cheques and similar payments to areas such as Carleton Place and Smiths Falls? Can the minister say whether this personal service will be or has been extended to all areas of Canada? Also, will he inform the House whether the messengers are private bonded couriers or departmental employees?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General): With respect to the particular places mentioned by the hon. member, I will have to consult with my officials. As the hon. member knows, my colleagues in the Department of National Health and Welfare took care some time ago to mail early many of their cheques. I will have to seek further information on the particular places mentioned.

Mr. McCutcheon: A supplementary question. My question is basic and simple. Is the department sending people to places such as these to personally deliver mail?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has restated the question asked in the first instance. My understanding is that the minister will look into the matter.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

SAFETY OF CANADIANS IN AMMAN, JORDAN

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): My question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. It is about Canadian citizens and nationals of other countries now being held as hostages by Palestinian insurgents in Amman, Jordan. Can the minister bring us up to date on the current situation and tell us whether it is expected that Jordan will be in a position to guarantee the safety of our fellow citizens?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): The reports I read just before coming into the House are very serious. There is great trouble in Amman, and it continues. There were reports that some Canadian citizens are being held as hostages but we have been unable to confirm this; the reports are somewhat contradictory. Our embassy in Beirut, which also looks after our interests in Jordan, is checking on these reports and I may have further information on the subject later. As to the safety of Canadians in Jordan, measures to assist them as the situation might warrant have been arranged through the United States and British embassies in particular.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): May I ask the minister whether he can tell us the approximate number of Canadians in Jordan, and whether any have so far sought asylum or refuge in either the American or the British embassies?

Mr. Sharp: The records we have show there are seven Canadian residents in Jordan but of course there may be some Canadian tourists there who would not necessarily be registered. The reports I have received are that Canadians are not among those who are being held hostage. I would think that any Canadians who might want to get out would act in concert with the United States and British citizens who are there, and they would be informed as to how best to look after themselves. We have no information so far that any Canadians are being held.

DRUGS

INQUIRY AS TO PUBLICATION OF LE DAIN COMMISSION REPORT

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): I should like to address a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare about the 700-page Le Dain Commission report. Does the minister plan to make it public tomorrow and does he intend to hold a briefing session for members of the press, members of the opposition and maybe members of his own party?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): It is premature to consider seriously the mechanics which might be employed to make this report public since the matter is still before the cabinet and no decision has been taken on whether or not it should be made public.

An hon. Member: Shame!

Mr. Woolliams: Has the minister or any member of his department discussed the possibility or the probability of this document being tabled tomorrow so that people outside the department can see this document which he seems to regard as a security document?

Mr. Munro: No, Mr. Speaker. As I say, no decision has been made by the cabinet on whether or not it will be tabled, and I doubt very much whether a decision will be reached by tomorrow.

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): May I ask the minister whether he has been able to overcome the objections of the Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General to the publication of this report?

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*Translation*]

MANPOWER

SUMMER EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM FOR STUDENTS

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration.

Following his statement concerning the creation of 35,000 new summers jobs for students, can the minister indicate to the House whether this new policy will be permanent or only temporary?

[*English*]

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, it is a policy for this summer. I would not wish to predict what the appropriate policy might be for a future summer.

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): In view of the lack of reference in the minister's statement today to the special problems affecting students in certain regions of Canada, would he instruct his department to give special attention to the needs of university students living in areas where economic disparity exists?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member's question is in the form of a representation.

DRUGS

MEASURES TO DEAL WITH HIGH PRICES

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): My question is for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Does the hon. gentleman agree with the conclusion of the joint parliamentary committee on high drug prices that the chief cause of the difficulty is at the retail level? If so, when does he intend to use the anti-combines legislation or other measures to deal with this problem?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): I am not sure that the phrase used by the hon. member is a correct reflection of the recommendation of the Harley report which recommended that action be taken on several fronts. In line with the recommendation of the Harley committee we are, as the hon. member knows—he asked a question about this yesterday—holding meetings today with provincial officials to discuss certain aspects of the distribution of pharmaceutical products at the retail level. I am surprised that the hon. member does not know that action under the Combines Investigation Act was taken some months ago in British Columbia.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I notice that several members are rising to ask supplementaries, but again I would request the co-operation of hon. members in an effort to curtail the number of supplementary questions asked between now and the end of the question period.

Mr. Dinsdale: A very brief supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In light of the minister's answer, is it fair to conclude that he is now delegating his responsibility for the control of drug prices to the provincial governments?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

[*Later:*]

CROWN CORPORATION TO MANUFACTURE AND DISTRIBUTE—ADVERTISING AND PROMOTION EXPENSES

Mr. David Lewis (York South): May I ask the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs a question which is related to one addressed to him a few moments ago? In view of the minister's justified concern about the high prices of prescription drugs, and in view of certain statements he is reported to have made, will he inform the House whether he intends proposing to the cabinet the establishment of a Crown corporation for the manufacture and distribution of prescription drugs to the end that drug prices might be reduced?

Mr. Basford: I am also reported as having said that, for the moment at least, I have rejected that solution.

Mr. Lewis: I had hoped that overnight the minister had become wiser. I regret being disappointed. I should also like to ask the minister whether he would consider discussing with the Minister of Finance the possibility of amending the Income Tax Act so as to place limits on the allowable expenses which large pharmaceutical concerns and wholesalers may put into promotion, advertising and the like?

Mr. Basford: As has been made clear, we have a five-point program to reduce the cost of drugs and we are meeting with the provinces at the present time in an effort to get some improvement made at the retail level. I believe it would be premature to adopt other measures until we have had a chance to see how effective existing measures are.

BROADCASTING

SUGGESTED REFERENCE OF ACT TO COMMITTEE IN LIGHT OF TECHNOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENTS

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): May I direct a question to the Secretary of State? Because of the rapid advance of technology in the communications field, will the minister agree to a suggestion that the Broadcasting Act be considered by the relevant committee and that the committee be empowered to recommend changes? Will he report to the House on motions at an appropriate time as to the merits, if any, of this suggestion?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's suggestion is an interesting one, especially because it is based on technological changes, but before answering I would like to consider it more closely.

Mr. McCleave: Ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

THE CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

QUEBEC—POWER TO AMEND SECTION 128 OF BRITISH NORTH AMERICA ACT

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

As he surely knows that in Quebec a group of separatist members of Parliament are refusing to take the oath of allegiance to the Queen and, because of this, are not authorized to sit in the National Assembly, and in view of the provisions of section 128 of the British North America Act, would the Prime Minister tell the House whether the province of Quebec could amend this section without first consulting the federal government?

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member will certainly recognize that he wants the Prime Minister to express a legal opinion and that his question is obviously out of order.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a supplementary or rather an amended question. Can section 128 of the constitution be amended by the province only?

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid that this second question is too similar to the first one to be in order.

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

PERMISSION TO UNITED STATES TO STORE NUCLEAR WEAPONS AT ARGENTIA, NEWFOUNDLAND

Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question I should like to direct to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. May I ask the minister whether permission was sought by the United States government to store nuclear weapons at Argentina. If so, was permission given?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have had to answer questions of this kind on many occasions by saying that I can make no comment on the positioning of nuclear weapons in Canada, either to comment negatively or positively.

Mr. Carter: A supplementary question. I appreciate the need for the minister to remain silent but perhaps he might give me some hint as to the position. If an explosion took place in the area, should the people there start praying or start running?

[*Later:*]

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, my question is supplementary to that asked by the hon. member for St. John's West. Would the minister give the House an undertaking to investigate the report referred to by the hon. member for St. John's West and to make a full report to the House on motions before the termination of the session, indicating the basis for the report and whether or not there is a reasoned explanation of why Canada cannot inform its 22 million people about the establishment of nuclear weapons on Canadian soil?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I think the reason for not discussing these matters is fairly obvious; it is one of security.

REINSTATEMENT OF SUGAR REBATE TO CARIBBEAN COUNTRIES

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs and relates to a question I asked the Prime Minister, as reported on page 7894, of *Hansard* for June 9, with regard to reinstating the sugar rebate to Caribbean countries. I believe that at that time the Prime Minister thought we were

talking about other sweets. Would the Secretary of State for External Affairs be so kind as to answer that question?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the government is aware of the representations which have been made by the Caribbean governments. Indeed, I personally met with Mr. Lightbourne, Minister of Trade for Jamaica, and we are now studying ways of meeting those representations.

PUBLIC SERVICE

ESTABLISHMENT OF FRENCH-SPEAKING UNITS

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. Was the Secretary of State expressing government policy last night when he said, as reported in *Le Droit,* that there would be French-speaking units in the Public Service, as recommended by the third report of the B and B Commission, perhaps before the end of this session?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I see the Secretary of State indicating by his facial expression that that is not quite an accurate quotation of his position.

Mr. Nowlan: Then, could I ask a supplementary question of the Secretary of State. Was the Secretary of State correctly reported in *Le Droit* as saying that this question would be decided—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question cannot be asked in that way, as the hon. member knows. Perhaps he would ask the question directly.

Mr. Nowlan: This is not a canard. Canards come in English, but I do not know whether they come en français. May I ask the Prime Minister whether this matter is under active consideration by the cabinet, and will there be a declaration of government policy before the House rises, if it does rise, on June 26?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, the question as put seems to be hypothetical, but I am prepared to answer it. Yes, the matter has been considered by cabinet. I cannot recollect whether a statement has been made or whether it has been decided that a statement will be made, but I will check into the matter and let the hon. member know, if he will remind me subsequently.

[Mr. Paproski.]

Mr. Nowlan: I have a supplementary question for the Secretary of State.

Mr. Speaker: Order. May I bring to the attention of the hon. member that we are running short of time. Perhaps he has a short supplementary.

Mr. Nowlan: Did the Secretary of State say last night that he thought these units would be in the Public Service—

Mr. Speaker: Order. This is a question as I have indicated to the hon. member that, according to the rules, cannot be asked.

IMMIGRATION

REPRESENTATION OF APPLICANTS BEFORE APPEAL BOARD BY UNQUALIFIED PERSONS

Mr. Hyl Chappell (Peel South): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. In view of the fact that hundreds of would-be immigrants are being badly represented before the Immigration Appeal Board by people who pretend to be but are not solicitors and are not capable, will the minister, as requested by the Immigration Appeal Board, amend the regulations to stop this abuse of so many would-be newcomers to Canada?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the suggestion made by my hon. friend is under very active consideration at the moment. There are compelling arguments for and against the proposition, and until they can be fully assessed no change will be made.

EXERCISE BY APPEAL BOARD OF DISCRETION RESPECTING POLITICAL PERSECUTION AND COMPASSIONATE GROUNDS

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration in his capacity as the minister responsible for the Immigration Appeal Board. When checking with the Immigration Appeal Board, would the minister ensure that the board exercises fully the discretion given to it under the act by section 15(1)(b) regarding political persecution and compassionate grounds? I have in mind especially those of Greek origin who may be sent back to Greece at this particular time.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, as my

hon. friend knows, the board is an independent tribunal, but I am satisfied that they do consider, in the exercise of their discretion, the political position of an individual in a country for which he may be destined. On more than one occasion the board has allowed an individual to remain in Canada on the very grounds referred to by my friend in connection with Greece; the board has certainly considered that factor.

ESTABLISHMENT OF APPEAL BOARD PANEL IN TORONTO

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. In view of the tremendous backlog of applications for landed immigrant status in Toronto, and again the tremendous backlog of cases before the Immigration Appeal Board in Ottawa, would the minister seriously consider setting up another Immigration Appeal Board in Toronto?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, it is proposed in the fall to establish a panel to hear cases in Toronto, as is now the case in Montreal. This will certainly provide a more convenient service for the large number of interested persons appearing before the board, though it will not in itself fully remove the backlog or even partially remove the backlog of work facing the board.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

• (3:30 p.m.)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CANADA CORPORATIONS ACT

ADMINISTRATIVE AND CONSEQUENTIAL AMENDMENTS

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-4, to amend the Canada Corporations Act and other statutory provisions related to the subject matter of certain of those amendments, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Before we proceed with the motions listed for consideration at the report stage of Bill C-4, may I be allowed to suggest to hon. members that there might be procedural difficulties with respect to a few of the motions which appear on the notice paper. I have in mind particularly motions 2, 3 and 5. Any decision with respect to motion 2, would, of course, affect motion 1, which I understand is consequential. It seems to me that motion 2 is in the nature of a substantive proposal, and perhaps hon. members who have been able to understand the amendment proposed by the hon. member might like to guide the Chair in this respect. I am not making a ruling now but I would appreciate being enlightened by the hon. member for Waterloo (Mr. Saltsman) who has proposed this motion that has caused considerable difficulty to the Chair and to the Chair's advisers.

In regard to motions 3 and 5, the difficulty, as the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) will recognize, is procedural and stems from the fact that it might well be considered that there is therein provision for a possible charge against the Crown. The hon. member must have given this matter serious thought, and probably also has some advice for the Chair.

I have been studying the other amendments closely, and to the Chair all appear to be procedurally in order, though it may well be that some members of the House may have objections to other motions to which I have not alluded. For the moment, the Chair might hear from the hon. member for Waterloo.

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, the amendment we are seeking in respect of clause 38A deals with ownership. We are seeking to change the nature of the clause to make it more encompassing so that it will deal with the matter of foreign or non-resident ownership. The effect of this amendment would be to put into this section a clause which exists in the Bank Act, and in some other financial legislation, which would restrict foreign ownership in Canadian corporations generally to 25 per cent, unless any corporation is excluded by the minister. One of the clauses in the amendment would give the minister discretion to exclude any company from the provisions of the act if there should be a good and compelling reason for so doing. We think it is important that such a provision be included in the bill because, if it is not, the bill itself does not go very far and does not do too much in respect of dealing with the question of ownership. I think this is a fundamental point. The House has put this provision in other legislation in the past. Mr. Speaker, I hope you will accept the reason as offered and accept the amendment.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, on a point of

order in respect of amendment No. 2, may I say that I think from the words of the hon. member for Waterloo (Mr. Saltsman) two things probably are apparent. The first is that he is not satisfied with the original scope of the bill and, second, in putting this motion he is attempting to expand the original scope of the bill by what he has referred to as a fundamental change. It would seem to me, having made those two admissions, that he has acknowledged that the amendment as proposed in Motion No. 2 does go beyond the scope of the bill and therefore is out of order.

Mr. Speaker: I must tell the hon. member for Waterloo that I feel very unhappy about having to reach the conclusion that the amendment should not be put. I suspect it is the result of considerable work. It would appear to be a drafting masterpiece. In fact, after studying the hon. member's amendment, the impression I have is that it is in essence a legislative proposal which stands on its own two feet and might very well be the subject of a private bill sponsored by the hon. member. To my way of thinking, this amendment goes considerably beyond the purpose and purport of the bill before us. As the President of the Privy Council has indicated, the hon. member for Waterloo himself has indicated that he is trying to introduce a new aspect or a new proposal which, in effect, would change the basis of the bill itself. My impression is that in a way the hon. member has sought to amend more than the bill which is before us. He has sought to go behind this bill to amend the Corporations Act. In other words, he has sought to make a change which would not only affect the bill before us but also the act which the bill seeks to amend. In this respect, the amendment should not be accepted.

Again I say to the hon. member that it is with considerable hesitation that I reach this decision because I think it is very unfortunate that an amendment which is so well prepared and drafted should not have an opportunity to be debated. Perhaps the hon. member will give some thought to the possibility of introducing this proposed amendment by way of a private bill, at which time a debate could be held in the House. I apologize to the hon. member and say to him very sincerely that it is with regret I must rule that the amendment should not be put.

I shall now move on to Motion No. 3 and Motion No. 5 in the name of the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) about which I have expressed some reservations. I have indicated to the hon. member that I have some misgivings about these two amendments which otherwise appear to be in order. They have financial implications which would make them out of order. Perhaps the hon. member might like to indicate his views in this respect.

[Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale).]

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): I shall do so most willingly, Mr. Speaker, because it seems to me these same points were raised before the committee. Unfortunately for me, the government has introduced another bill, C-216 to which I draw Your Honour's attention, in which precisely what I am seeking to do is being done, and in similar terms. I should like to draw Your Honour's attention to the original form of Bill C-4 and the recommendation contained therein. Perhaps I might read the whole recommendation:

> His Excellency the Governor General has recommended to the House the present measure to amend the Canada Corporations Act and other statutory provisions related to the subject-matter of certain of those amendments, in connection with the administration of the Canada Corporations Act, more particularly in regard to provide for the payment of expenses to be incurred with respect to the investigation of the affairs of companies and to authorize the increase in the membership of the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission from three to four members to take account of the added duties arising from the investigation measures introduced by the amendments to the Canada Corporations Act, and to provide for other consequential and related amendments.

The minister has admitted that he also was breaking new ground not in any way referred to in the recommendation. As appears from page 52 of the bill, the judge, on the conviction of an individual, may in the same proceedings order the individual to pay to the Receiver General such expenses as may be specified in the order. We now have the Crown seeking to recover its expenses from an individual, which is a provision that has not existed before. So, the purport of my Motion No. 3 is merely an attempt to go down the other side of the street and say that on acquittal the judge, in the same type of proceeding, may make a recommendation. I do not say that he should order. I use the word "recommend" on the advice of the officers of the minister's department. The effect of the amendment is that the judge may recommend to Her Majesty in the right of Canada that such a person be paid costs as specified in the order. In other words, there is a discretionary power given to a judge or magistrate to recommend that Her Majesty pay certain costs in view of the fact that authorization is

provided for the payment of expenses to be incurred in respect of an investigation of the affairs of companies.

I would therefore say there is sufficient authority to give a judge the discretion to recommend that Her Majesty pay the cost of the expenses of an individual who has been acquitted. After all, the Crown asks for the right of reimbursement of its expenses from a person convicted. All I am trying to do is see that justice walks down both sides of the street rather than only the one side.

• (3:40 p.m.)

I would put it to Your Honour that, on the basis of what I said with regard to the recommendation and my amendment, there is sufficient authority for the motion. But if proof of that be needed, let us go to Bill C-216 where, in the second paragraph of the recommendation, it is said:

To provide also that the salaries, travelling allowances and annuities payable to members, former members and widows of former members shall be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, and that all other expenditures shall be paid out of moneys appropriated by parliament for the purpose;

The first paragraph has only to do with salaries, annuities, and things of that nature. Let us consider Bill C-216, by which the Crown seeks to amend the act. The amendment is to section 101 of the Income Tax Act, which reads as follows:

101 (1) The court may, in delivering judgment disposing of an appeal, order payment or repayment of tax, interest, penalties or, subject to subsection (2), costs by the taxpayer or the minister.

It is left to the discretion of the court to order the minister, in the case of certain tax appeals, to pay the costs. But then let us look at subsection (2), which is an amendment, which reads:

(2) Where, on an appeal by the minister, other than by way of cross-appeal, from a decision of the Tax Review Board, the amount of tax that is in controversy does not exceed $1,000, the court, in delivering judgment disposing of the appeal, shall order the minister to pay all reasonable and proper costs of the taxpayer in connection therewith.

Bearing in mind the recommendation that I read to Your Honour that all other expenditures shall be paid out of moneys appropriated by Parliament for the purpose, there is a provision whereby the judge in the Exchequer Court shall order the minister to pay. This is not a discretionary provision. It is absolutely clear that he will have to pay the costs of the taxpayer in connection with any claim that amounts to less than $1,000.

Let us take the parallel situation where the recommendation of Bill C-4, refers to authorizing a provision for the payment of expenses. These two are in the same category. It is the expenses of the Crown that we are asking be paid, and the expenses of the Crown shall include, in appropriate cases, the costs that may be awarded against it by a judge in dealing with a matter. This is my case. We cannot distinguish between the two types of recommendation. They are recommendations for the payment of expenses, and if the costs that may be recommended to Her Majesty to be paid to a taxpayer are not the expenses of an investigation, that is straining the credulity of members of the House and also is an abuse of the English language.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Perhaps my colleague, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford) would like to participate in this debate also. The hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) raised a nice point with respect to the two recommendations. I suggest that the recommendations are different in that the time honoured use of the phrase with regard to Bill C-216 "and that all other expenditures shall be paid out of moneys appropriated by Parliament for the purpose" indicates that the numerous occasions which occur in other bills where the Crown may be exposed to financial expenditures are covered by those words. Of course, such funds will have to be appropriated from time to time in appropriation acts.

What the hon. member is seeking to do with regard to the recommendation in Bill C-4 is to expand the meaning of the word "expenses" so that it would refer not only to expenses which the Crown may incur on its behalf in connection with the type of investigation referred to but also to provide for punitive costs that may be awarded against the Crown from time to time in the case of a certain proceeding. I suggest that the principle should apply here that if a further obligation is imposed on the Crown it should be stated with greater precision. With respect to Bill C-216 the precision will be provided from time to time by the appropriations acts. With regard to Bill C-4, however, there has been no inclusion of penal costs against the Crown in the definition of expenses in the original bill. I suggest, therefore, that it would expand the word beyond its normal meaning to suggest that costs awarded against the Crown could be regarded as expenses for the purpose of the financial recommendation.

As I said, perhaps my colleague who, I must admit, is much more familiar with the entire procedure, could, I hope, enlighten the Chair better than I can.

Mr. Basford: It is seldom that I argue points of order in the House, but I would like to contribute briefly because the same point Your Honour has raised was raised in the committee when various amendments were moved. I concur with my colleague, the House leader, that what the hon. member for Edmonton West is endeavouring to do is to expand and extend the use of the phrase "payment of expenses" in the recommendation far beyond whatever proper interpretation could be given it. The recommendation from the Governor General preceding the introduction of Bill C-4 contains words which allow the Crown the payment of expenses to be incurred with respect to the investigation of the affairs of companies. I submit that that wording in the recommendation has to be interpreted by reference to the provisions of Bill C-4 as they stood before the Governor General when the recommendation was made.

There is nothing in the original version of Bill C-4 that would allow the conclusion that the Governor General ever intended to recommend that the Crown should accept responsibility for paying the expenses and costs incurred by the person who is the object of an investigation pursuant to these provisions. This is what the amendment of the hon. member for Edmonton West is endeavouring to do. The original version of Bill C-4 provided by way of expenses solely for the appointment of an additional member of the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission, and the conduct by the Crown of certain investigative work. Surely, the only interpretation that can be put on those words is that those are expenses that were intended to be included within the recommendation.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): I have a further point, Mr. Speaker, in brief answer to the minister.

Mr. Speaker: There will have to be unanimous consent to allow the hon. member for Edmonton West to make his additional point. Of course, the hon. member may rise on a point of order.

• (3:50 p.m.)

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): The minister has indicated that I have rather expanded the nature of the phrase "payment of expenses", but it will be noted on examination of the bill that the right of recovery is limited to the case of a convicted individual and to no other case, whereas the payment of expenses is the responsibility of the Crown all the way up to, but falling short of, conviction. Therefore that category of expenses all the way through must be authorized and recommended by the bill. It is not limited only to matters of appointment of a commissioner. All I say is that these expenses are part of the investigation.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the hon. member for Edmonton West and the minister for taking part in this procedural debate. The advantage of the notice which the Chair receives by the appearance in our notice paper of the motion is that the Chair can appear to be very wise.

After lengthy discussion and consultation of precedents I have, of course, in this instance again given the matter very serious thought. I have listened to the very interesting and forceful argument put forward by the hon. member for Edmonton West, and he has shaken me to some extent in my original conviction that this amendment is a charge on the Crown.

The hon. member well knows how difficult it is to get away from the long established limitation which prohibits members from proposing for acceptance by the House charges which are not covered by the royal recommendation. It is perhaps the most difficult procedural obstacle to be surmounted. I have some doubts that the hon. member has been successful in this respect, although he has submitted very serious objections and potent arguments.

My understanding of Motion No. 3 is that it proposes in certain circumstances, when persons have been acquitted of charges, when certain prosecutions have been dismissed, abandoned or withdrawn, that such persons may be reimbursed by the Crown for their expenses. It seems to me, if the proposal were accepted and became operative, that it would create a financial charge. I find it difficult to escape this conclusion.

I should perhaps refer hon. members to May's seventeenth edition, page 551 which states as follows:

> Amendments or new clauses creating public charges cannot be proposed, if no money resolution or ways and means resolution has been passed, or if the amendment or clause is not covered by the terms of the resolution. This rule, which is of fundamental importance, is fully explained in Chapter XXV and on page 803.

This is a general statement of course and refers more to the resolution than the royal recommendation but it is the rule which applies to royal recommendations even when a bill is not preceded by a resolution. I have looked at the words in the royal recommendation and having studied it, my humble interpretation of it was that it should be deemed to include the costs incurred by individuals, which the hon. member's amendment would want to be paid.

Of course I have some difficulty in connection with the other argument put forth by the hon. member for Edmonton West when he suggests that his proposal is on all fours with the clause contained in Bill C-216 on the Order Paper, which is an act to establish the tax review board and particularly clause 22 subsection (3) wherein section 101 of the Income Tax Act is amended by making costs payable by the Crown where the amount of taxes in controversy does not exceed $1,000. The hon. member suggests that this has the same effect as his proposal to amend Bill C-4. I should like to suggest to the hon. member that there is a substantial difference in that the amendment to section 101 contained in clause 22 of Bill C-216 in reality recommends a reduction in the charge on the Crown because section 101 at present enables the court to order payment of costs by the Crown in all cases, that is, wherein the amount of taxes on controversy exceeds $1,000.

That is my interpretation. The hon. member does not appear to agree with this, but I have given the matter serious thought and study and it is my impression that this is the way the bill ought to be interpreted.

Through his amendment, the hon. member suggests that he would rectify what he considers an inequality or injustice by putting the individual taxpayer on the same basis as the Crown. This is a most laudable purpose but I would not think it is sufficient to overcome the procedural difficulty to which I have alluded. I would have to rule that Motion No. 3 standing in the hon. member's name cannot be put for the reasons I have stated.

I feel we would have the same difficulty in relation to Motion No. 5 but perhaps the hon. member feels there is a difference which is not apparent to me. Unless he felt there was a difference in Motion No. 5 and would like to argue some difference between the two, I suggest that the ruling I have just made on Motion No. 3 should apply to Motion No. 5.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, first of all I should like to raise a point of order because I would hesitate to have the Chair misdirect itself on an interpretation of law. Your Honour indicated the amendment to section 101 of the Income Tax Act was a reduction of the—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That is not a point of order. The hon. member is debating a ruling of the Chair and he knows very well that cannot be done. Perhaps he would like to advance an argument in connection with Motion No. 5.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): With in regard to Motion No. 5, I hope Your Honour will look at section 101 again because what I did was to follow the principle as enunciated in the bill whereby the Crown can recover its expenses by saying, at the termination of the investigation or at any stage, that the commission which is in charge of the proceedings may in its discretion direct the payment of the expenses of the Crown. In other words, I am suggesting that the Crown should have the right to recover some money. In the previous section the Crown has narrowly limited itself to the case of an eventual conviction. I agree that they should, in this instance, recover their expenses and I think it is an acceptable principle. But I go further and say why should the Crown not have the right to recover part way down the road? If the person involved says "that is fine I agree. I will not raise any further defence and I will restore the money" or whatever it is, then the Crown should have the right to recover. But under these cases, unless there is security for costs, which was an amendment the Minister and I worked out together, there is no means whereby the Crown can recover any of its expenses. That is the purport of my amendment.

True enough, I must travel down both sides of the street and if at any time in these proceedings the Crown should desist—this often happens because the individual before the commission may have given a satisfactory explanation and the Crown could be satisfied that it should not proceed any further—then I say the commission, in its discretion, should make an award of the expenses of the individual or the company concerned and that these be paid by the Crown. Let us have justice on both sides of the street, and this is what I have said.

I have indicated clearly that this shall be for the payment of the expenses of an investigation of the affairs of a company. There is no suggestion, I would submit, of any ques-

tion of costs—if anybody wanted to split hairs and distinguish between expenses and costs. These are expenses of an investigation of a company and I suggest to Your Honour that this is amply covered in the recommendation of the resolution. There is no expansion.

• (4:00 p.m.)

I will go back to my second argument because I suggest to Your Honour that it is apposite. In the terminology of the recommendation of Bill C-216 there is not a reduction in expenditures at the discretion of the court, but an expansion, because the amendment in the case of Bill C-216 makes the award of costs against the Crown mandatory in all cases. The original act only stated that the court "could do so" in all cases. In those cases involving $1,000 or less, it must award costs against the Crown. Therefore, with all due respect, that is an expansion of the liability of the Crown. Clearly, if there is an expansion of the liability of the Crown under Bill C-216, and if it is deemed that there is an expansion of potential liability of the Crown under Bill C-4, the wording in C-4 is wide enough and the amendment ought to be accepted.

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, I might add that I think Your Honour's ruling on Motion No. 3 applies to the motion we are now considering. In view of the lastest remarks of the hon. member for Edmonton West I simply add that the wording of the two recommendations, one relating to Bill C-4 and the other relating to the amendments to the Income Tax Act that the hon. member mentioned, is different. Different words are used.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): But they mean the same thing.

Mr. Basford: The wording in the recommendation relating to Bill C-4 refers to the payment of expenses to be incurred with respect to an investigation. The wording in the recommendation that the hon. member for Edmonton West referred to lists a number of expenditures and then goes on to say, "all other expenditures." I think, since the recommendations accompanying these two bills are different, the words in the recommendation accompanying Bill C-4, speaking of the payment of expenses and those in the recommendation accompanying Bill C-216, speaking of "all other expenditures", that these matters ought to be subject to different interpretations.

[Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West).]

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Edmonton West restated as forcibly the second time as he stated the first time his arguments in support of the procedural admissibility of Motion No. 5 in his name. I do not see how I can reverse my decision, reached after having given every possible consideration to the hon. member's views, to his past experience in the House, which I respect, to his training in the Chair and to his legal background. I have taken all these matters into consideration. I would say, rightly or wrongly, that this is the conclusion I have reached. I hope that the hon. member will not be unduly aggrieved and that no miscarriage of justice will result from this interpretation of the hon. member's motion. But I feel, generally speaking, that the opinion I have expressed in relation to Motion No. 5 should apply to Motion No. 3. I again regret very much that I cannot accept the hon. member's arguments and that I cannot put to the House Motion No. 5.

I shall now put the question on Motion No. 4, which stands in the name of the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert). He moves:

That Bill C-4, An Act to amend the Canada Corporations Act and other statutory provisions related to the subject matter of certain of those amendments, be amended by striking out in clause 12 the words "any shareholder" in line 6 on page 53 and substituting the words "any or all shareholders".

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre) Mr. Speaker, I rise on a minor point of order. I wonder, have we disposed of Motion No. 1? I realize that it is consequential on Motion No. 2. Since Motion No. 2 has been ruled out of order, perhaps Your Honour might make a ruling on Motion No. 1.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the hon. member for raising this point. I thought it had been made clear that Motion No. 1 was a consequential motion and could not be put if Motion No. 2 were not accepted. That is why it has not been called. It is deemed to have been ruled out of order because it is consequential upon Motion No. 2.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my amendment is actually to bring a little more precision to this point. This amendment was worked out with the minister and relates to the obtaining of security for costs. I felt that merely using the words "any shareholder" in line 6 on page 53 was perhaps limiting the matter too much, because the bill says that an application for an investigation by the minister shall be

made by five shareholders or more. I should like to be satisfied with the interpretation to be put on this part. I want combinations. It may be that the minister would find that one or more of the complaining shareholders is a citizen of substance residing in Canada, and from him no security for costs would be required. However, others might be residents of foreign countries or in other provinces and they may not be citizens of substance, so in their case there may be a necessity for obtaining security for costs. The purpose of this amendment is to dot the "i's" and cross the "t's". That is about all there is to it, because we want to make absolutely clear that the choice of the minister would be exercised and that there would not be a case of "any and/or shareholders". The amendment seeks to clear this matter up.

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, while I am not entirely sure the amendment is needed, because I think the wording of Bill C-4 probably covers the situation the hon. member refers to, I may say that if there is any doubt I will be quite happy to accept the amendment. That of course, is characteristic of this government. When we receive good ideas from across the floor we are happy to accept them in the spirit of co-operation.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Motion No. 4 (Mr. Lambert) agreed to.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Speaker, may I rise on a point of privilege that has nothing to do with the minister. It relates to the holding of the debate on the report stage of this bill this afternoon. As the minister knows, there were 19 sittings in committee with regard to this bill. We heard witnesses from 17 organizations as well as individuals, plus the minister, the deputy minister, his assistant, the deputy minister for corporate affairs and the director of corporations. They appeared before the committee on numerous occasions. What I wish to say to Your Honour now will not entail any kind of disparagement of hon. members in the House at the present time. This is a highly technical bill. The House is being asked in some instances to express itself on certain amendments. As debate continues, it will have to express itself on other amendments that are more contentious than the ones which have been put forward up to now. Why has this debate been scheduled for today when there is full knowledge that the finance committee in another place will hold three sittings today. That is a very grave matter. The members who were present at the committee hearings have studied this matter in great detail. I suggest that very few members of this House have read the proceedings of the committee. They are very extensive.

• (4:10 p.m.)

My point of privilege is that the scheduling of this debate is a discourtesy to this House and also to the witnesses who are appearing before the finance committee. The representatives of national organizations, major corporations, etc., in many cases have to travel a very long distance in order to appear before the committee. The committee today has to limit itself to less than a corporal's guard to receive and question these witnesses. This points out a very serious problem. Your Honour alluded to it yesterday.

There are nine committees holding 19 sittings today. On Tuesday last, ten committees held 25 sittings. One committee had three sittings on that day, yet the legislation called for discussion in this House was legislation dealt with by that committee. I am referring to the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development. On that day someone counted 26 members in this chamber. I say that is a discourtesy to this House.

I did not see any government members in attendance today at that committee at any time as committee members, although periodically one member present did come in to ask questions. The hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Ritchie), the hon. member for Waterloo (Mr. Saltsman) and the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Burton) attended that committee. There is not one member on the government side who was present at those committee discussions. That is an odd situation. It seems to be an ill-disguised attempt to get legislation through by default or by steamroller because members are required to be present in two places at the same time.

I am not complaining to the minister because he has no control over this. I am not complaining to the Chair. I wish to point out the difficulty that has arisen which is one that is sundering the efficacy of the committee system in studying legislation.

Mr. Basford: There are several things that surprise me, Mr. Speaker. I want to say that the business of the House is arranged through consultation with the government house leader and house leaders of other parties. It

was announced some time ago that Bill C-4 was to be the business of the House for today. I assume this was known by the house leaders and the hon. member. The fact that the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs was to meet today was known some days ago. We have been debating Bill C-4 for over an hour. I am curious as to why the point of privilege has just been raised.

Mr. Speaker: I doubt very much if we should pursue the matter. Generally speaking, I agree with the point raised by the hon. member for Edmonton West. As the hon. member mentioned, the Chair alluded to this situation yesterday in a statement made prior to routine proceedings. However, this is not a question on which the Chair can make a ruling. My only suggestion is that even in the face of a difficult situation we should attempt to pursue our discussion of the matter. The next motion, No. 6, stands in the name of the hon. member for Waterloo.

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo) moved:

That Bill C-4, to amend the Canada Corporations Act and other statutory provisions related to the subject matter of certain of those amendments, be amended in clause 14 by adding to section 118A the following subsection:

"(c) funds derived from the non-resident aspect of each item in subsection (a)

(d) funds applied to the non-resident aspect of each item in subsection (b) and,

(i) payments to non-residents for advertising licences

(ii) payment to charitable, cultural, and political causes."

He said: Mr. Speaker, clause 14, subsection 118A is a provision dealing with the application of funds. It deals with a number of important items, such as from where the funds are derived and where they are applied. It is our feeling that it is most important that stockholders and the public know about the use of corporation funds for political purposes.

One of the chief purposes of the motion before the House is that, if accepted, companies will have to reveal the contributions they make to political, charitable and cultural causes. Another important reason for moving this motion is that in the absence of any differentiation between American and Canadian corporations in this act, it is important to know to what extent there are transfer payments between the corporations in Canada and the parents in other countries regarding advertising, licences and other matters of that kind. The motion is commended

to the members of this House as a way of providing additional information to stockholders and companies on how corporations are conducting their affairs.

Mr. Basford: I wish to oppose this amendment, Mr. Speaker. It is not appropriate to include it in Bill C-4 at this time. As the hon. member for Waterloo (Mr. Saltsman) has pointed out, the amendment requires the disclosure of payments by non-residents for advertising and licences. The hon. member says that this would be useful information. However, I am not sure why he has selected this particular kind of payment.

The Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act, the other disclosure statute in the law of Canada, applies to all companies, whether or not they are incorporated under the Canada Corporations Act. The amendment requires the disclosure of payments by resident corporations to non-residents. The requirement for the disclosure of payments of that kind includes more than 15 different items, such as royalties, rent on real property, payments for or in respect of scientific research and several others. It is doubtful, in my view, that the information the amendment would require would in this context be very useful. If it were to be deemed useful information, I submit that the appropriate place to obtain it would be through amendments to the Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act. The disclosure of these kinds of payments from resident to non-resident companies would then be required from all companies in Canada, rather than just federal companies.

With regard to the second point of disclosure that is required, I wish to point out two things. I am not sure that the lumping together of all payments to charitable, cultural and political causes would provide meaningful information. I suspect that is a technical error in the amendment. I suspect that the hon. member for Waterloo would like them all shown separately. The wording is such that they could be all lumped together. This would not be very useful information.

Also, the matter of election expenses is before a committee of this House at the present time. If we are to have different laws pertaining to corporate donations to political parties, this should be dealt with in the legislation with respect to election expenses. It should be dealt with in matters pertaining to federal elections and federal political parties.

It would require information from all companies in Canada, not just the federally incorporated companies. In any event, if there are votes on these amendments I would request that they be deferred so that they can all be taken together.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): It must be remembered that this is an amendment to an amendment to the Act. In actual fact, it covers part of the disclosure provisions in the amendment put forward by the minister. It would add to the number of public companies on the register of the Crown, as well as to those private companies referred to in the second amendment, bringing them within the group of companies which must make certain disclosures.

The information which is sought here in the amendment before us would really be meaningless. As far as the private companies are concerned, their number is 375, and the total number of private companies operating under federal jurisdiction is, I believe, less than 9 per cent of the total in the country. All the companies operating under Ontario Charters—and I suggest they amount to nearly 50 per cent—and all those operating under the charters of the common-law provinces in the west, operate under the same kind of company law. So, what we would be doing is this: we would be picking out a very narrow sector of Canadian companies and asking them to make available certain information. But for what useful purpose? I can see none except, maybe, to satisfy the curiosity of a few Paul Prys, certain individuals who would have to pay a fee to look into company files.

What is the purpose? The rule should apply to all, and unless it does there is no useful purpose served by an amendment of this type. I cannot see my way clear to supporting it at all; I did not support the initial amendment, in the first place.

Mr. Steven Otto (York East): I believe the mover of this amendment is under the misapprehension that the more information which is given, the better. In some way this amendment is supposed to indicate to a corporation where to invest its money, how it is to expend its advertising funds and so on.

I should like to bring the section to the hon. member's attention. The act stipulates that certain matters should be disclosed to the shareholders; for example, the extent of funds derived from current operations, through the sale of non-current assets, identifiable assets and issues of securities. This is all intended to give the shareholder some knowledge in the event that there are inside trading arrangements of which he might not be aware. Later on, there is a reference to funds applied to the purchase of material assets. This is in case one of the directors, on the inside, might have been able to pawn-off on the company certain assets detrimental to the position of the shareholders. There is a further reference to disclosure of information with regard to purchases of redeemable stock. It might be that a company had issued redeemable stock which had fallen into ill-repute. Then, when the company was about to make it 100 per cent good, one of the "inside" directors might have acquired it so as to make a profit for himself.

If the hon. member would study this section, he would see that the purpose is to require disclosure of information to shareders which it is necessary for them to know before deciding whether or not to support the board of directors or the management of the company. It is not a section designed to make possible the provision of all kinds of information or one by means of which a government, whether federal or provincial, may dictate to a corporation the way in which it should run its business. It is intended merely to protect shareholders against eventualities which might prejudice them as shareholders.

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): I wish to say a few words in support of the amendment put forward by my hon. friend from Waterloo (Mr. Saltsman). Information as to both the source and the application of corporation funds is a most important aspect of the financial statement made by a corporation. This is of particular significance in view of the concern felt in Canada at the present time with respect to foreign ownership, a concern reflected in the fact that a study is presently under way in government circles to help determine future policy with respect to foreign ownership and development in Canada.

The principle that adequate information should be provided by corporations has already been acknowledged. Among the information which should be required from all these corporations is disclosure of figures relating both to the source and the application of their funds, and especially to the non-resident aspect of such funds. My hon. friend from Waterloo has dealt adequately with specific features such as advertising, and in the

circumstances I shall content myself with expressing the hope that there will be support in the House for this amendment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Some hon. Members: On division.

Motion No. 6 (Mr. Saltsman) negatived.

Mr. John Burton (Regina East) moved:

That Bill C-4, An Act to amend the Canada Corporations Act and other statutory provisions related to the subject matter of certain of those amendments, be amended by striking out in clause 20 paragraph (b) of subsection (3) on pages 62-63 and substituting the following:

"(b) A private company except as provided in paragraph (c) and (d);

(c) section (b) does not apply to a private company that is a personal corporation within the meaning of section 68 of the Income Tax Act in the whole of the year in respect of which a financial statement is required by this Act;

(d) the Minister having regard to the public interest may grant an exemption to a private company if revenue does not exceed ten million dollars in any period ending in or after the year in which this section comes into force, in respect of which a financial statement is required by this Act to be prepared, or whose total assets on the last day of any such period do not exceed five million dollars."

He said: Mr. Speaker, at the present time we are giving consideration to the review and overhaul of the Canada Corporations Act, an important statute. I feel we are bound to give close and serious attention to the various aspects of this legislation before it is given final passage. It must be recognized that within a modern Canadian economic complex the corporations are a principal instrument for economic activity. Through federal legislation and other legislation enacted by the provinces, the corporations are established as legal entities and thus given special powers and privileges within our society. Thus we, as legislators in this House, have the duty and obligation to ensure that there is an adequate control over the operations of the corporation in view of the rights and privileges granted to it.

• (4:30 p.m.)

In my view, the operations of corporations are no longer simply a matter of considering the interests of shareholders, the interests of debt holders, business transactions, transfers of shares and proxies, and investigations into problems that develop within corporations. I quite acknowledge that these matters are important and deserve adequate consideration; but I think it is not enough to restrict our consideration solely to these matters.

Corporations today exert a very profound influence upon the economy. We no longer live in a society where the actions of individuals or corporations do not influence the economy. We no longer live in that sort of laissez-faire world. The corporation today can have a particular influence on the economy. It can influence the course of affairs of a nation and it affects the public good and public interest. Thus, we have to exert extreme care in determining the powers and rights of these corporations and to ensure that adequate obligations are placed upon them. I think this is, in fact, now recognized since at the present time there are many people in society, including governments, who are working on the development of policies to reconcile corporate activity and power with the public good and public interest. A prerequisite to carrying on such studies and examination of the activities of corporations is adequate information and knowledge.

One of the first to point up this particular matter and to indicate that a very real problem exists in this regard was Professor Melville Watkins, who was commissioned by the federal Liberal government to make a study. His report was entitled "Foreign Ownership and the Structure of Canadian Industry". When Professor Watkins presented his report to the government he stated as follows:

It is a prerequisite to public discussion of government policy and the formulation and implementation of actual policy that more information be available on the activities of corporations, particularly large corporations, both Canadian-owned and foreign-owned. Information presently available is generally deficient, and in some respects grossly so, for meeting the three distinct purposes for which information is needed: public disclosure, economic analysis, and governmental surveillance of firms.

He goes on to make this recommendation in his report:

It is recommended that the following specific steps be taken with respect to company law, bankruptcy law, securities legislation, the Corporations and Labour Union Returns Act, and the guiding principles of "good corporate behaviour" to the larger foreign-owned subsidiaries:

(a) Amend the Canada Corporations Act so that federally-incorporated private companies (as well as federally-incorporated public companies), without respect to the nationality of ownership, must file returns with the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, and make returns for all com-

panies available to the general public; seek provincial co-operation to make this an effective means of obtaining public disclosure.

He then suggested other alternative steps that might be taken. It seems to me that in his study Professor Watkins took a major step forward in highlighting this particular problem and indicating the need for more adequate legislation. There have been many other instances and examples quoted both before this monumental report and since that time. I have had considerable personal experience in searching the records of companies in the province of Saskatchewan, as well as federally incorporated companies, in connection with which there has been a great deal of difficutly in obtaining adequate information. I would find that with a public company there was no problem at all about securing adequate information with respect to its shareholders, the directors of the company and the financial statement of the company. But such was not the case with companies carrying on similar operations which were incorporated as private companies. In those cases this information was not available to me.

I can assure the House that in searching these records I was not doing so in any individual capacity on behalf of any private or personal interest; rather it was in terms of looking at them in order to determine whether certain steps taken and activities carried on by those companies were in fact in the public interest. I quite realize that a certain judgment follows from that in regard to the use of the information that is obtained, and in regard to making judgments based on the information obtained. But certainly it was quite clear to me from my own personal experience that information was being denied the public, information the public had the right to have in terms of dealing adequately with modern economic and social problems.

Thus, it seems to me that the principle of the right to know is one of the features that should be incorporated in the Canada Corporations Act vis-à-vis the provision of financial information. I think a balance is required in terms of the structure of the law. On the one hand, corporations are given powers, rights and privileges; on the other hand, certain controls and requirements are placed upon them. The requirement should also be placed upon all large corporations that are established within the framework of this statute to provide adequate information with respect to their financial operations.

Bill C-4, which was introduced in the House of Commons last fall, provided with respect to this particular matter that any company which had gross revenues of over $3 million in any one year or which, on the other hand, had more than $3 million in assets would be required to submit the same financial information as was required of public companies incorporated under this act. Various representations were made when the bill went before the committee, for the most part by a variety of companies, though chiefly large companies that objected to being required to make this information public. As a result of consideration in the committee, an amended version of this clause was reported back to the House of Commons and is now before us. This amended version states that any private company which has more than $5 million in assets or more than $10 million in gross revenues should be required to submit financial information comparable to that required of a public company.

It seems to me that in setting that arbitrary figure—and I have to consider this an arbitrary figure—there are a number of problems created. First of all, who knows what the right figure is? What figure should be used, whether $3 million, $5 million, or $10 million, in terms of dealing with the economic significance of any given company?

• (4:40 p.m.)

In the second place, I think it is quite probable that a figure of economic significance will differ between various regions and companies. I do not believe one would find the figures for one company would be applicable to another company in assessing the economic significance and importance of a corporation. Third, I would point out that big oaks from little acorns grow and very often very small concerns are the start of large corporations, sometimes by design and sometimes simply because that is the way the corporate events take place. I have personal experience in trying to obtain information on small companies which had been established and for which no information was available. I knew very well that these small companies would be economically significant corporations in which questions of public interest would be involved, either now or in the very near future. Thus, I believe it should be suggested that provision of information concerning the financial operations of corporations should be applicable to all corporations under the Canada Corporations Act.

This, in fact, is the intent of my amendment. It does provide for an exemption and exception in respect of personal corporations.

There is also provision within my amendment for special cases where corporations may apply to the minister for an exemption from the provision. This gives the minister a discretionary authority. I think it should be noted that corporation laws provide for two basic types of companies, public companies and private companies. Under the terms of the bill as now reported back to us we have sort of a hybrid known as "constrained share companies". We do have these two types of companies, public and private, and I would point out, if it is important to obtain information concerning the financial operations of public companies, that only some 2350 companies will be involved according to recent information. On the other hand, there is a much larger number of companies incorporated as private companies on the basis of the information available to me. If it is important that we obtain this information from public companies, I believe it is also important that we obtain this information from private companies.

Two factors involved in differentiating between public and private companies very often concern the control of the ownership of shares within the company, the provision of financial information and information in respect of the shareholders. We are not concerned just with the control of ownership. A private company would still have the right to say who may own shares and to whom shares may be transferred. We are proposing a change which would place both public and private companies on the same footing with regard to the provision of financial information. I believe this is necessary within the framework of a modern, integrated and complex economy because we no longer live in a world of isolation. It would seem to me that the public interest should be paramount in any consideration of this legislation. As was pointed out by Professor Melville Watkins, the information is needed for determination of policy and analysis of events and developments within the economy.

It would seem to me that the right to know is a very important principle. This principle now applies to many aspects of government operations. Certainly, the right to know is applied on a much broader scale than is proposed in respect of the operations of corporations. I suggest that this principle of the right to know must apply to the private sector as well. Thus, I would hope the House would give serious consideration to the amendment proposed.

[Mr. Burton.]

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, briefly may I say that I thoroughly disagree with the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Burton). I also disagree with the minister in respect of his proposal concerning disclosure —disclosure for whom, for what purpose? At the time of the examination by the committee, the minister indicated that he did not know for what purpose the disclosure is to be made. There was also no precision in the comments of the hon. member for Regina East. He did not indicate for what purpose. When the comparison is made with public companies, may I say that little or no information can be drawn from the material filed by public companies. There is no common form used in respect of the filing of balance sheets. There is no common form in respect of profit and loss statements, with the exception of whatever conformity there may be as a result of the statements having been prepared by chartered accountants and the fact that they have some uniformity. Apart from that, however, there is absolutely nothing that says that balance sheets shall be on the same basis or that profit and loss statements shall be on the same basis or that the source of revenue and application of fund statements shall be on a uniform basis.

So, there is absolutely no simple reason for the collating of the information. These returns will now be placed on a company file forever to gather dust unless someone wishes to equip himself for the payment of a dollar per file to go through the files and collate information which is not uniform. Information which is not uniform is useless unless someone wishes to go to an individual company to do something privately for a chosen purpose. There are other ways in which to do this. There are a number of public companies registered in Ottawa. All one need do is buy one share in order to have the right of access to the statement, thus gaining rights with other shareholders. I am surprised the hon. member for Regina East mentioned that when he was concerned about private companies he could obtain no information whatever. Of course he can obtain up to date information from the corporations branch in respect of the shareholders, the directors and the quantum of their individual holdings. This is a requirement of Saskatchewan law as much as it is a requirement of Alberta law.

One cannot obtain any balance sheets of private companies at any level at the present time, but why would one want such balance sheets? The original and fundamental reason

for the provision of balance sheets and profit and loss statements is for the information and protection of persons who are interested in investing in public companies. This is the purpose. But there is no reason for this in respect of private companies because they are prohibited from seeking to distribute shares to the public. It is forbidden for a private company to do that. So, it is not seeking shareholders and will not adversely affect anybody else. If a person wishes to make an investment in a private company, he must make application and before his application can be considered all other shareholders have the right to buy those shares in whatever proportion they may desire. This is the purpose of a private company.

• (4:50 p.m.)

A private company is an expanded partnership with limited liability. Do we want disclosure, and for what meaningful purpose? Not one iota of meaningful purpose has been disclosed by the minister, either in the House on second reading or in committee, whereby he could point out that disclosure of the information would be of benefit to a class of companies. Is it on the basis of the balance sheet or of the source and application fund statement that it will be determined a company has been efficient behind a certain tariff wall, as someone suggested, or because it receives grants? What about looking at a company like Eaton's, which is a private company with many interests and many operations? Which of them are efficient and which are inefficient? Which ones benefit from this particular economic policy and which ones do not, as disclosed by the balance sheet, the source and application fund, or the profit and loss statements required to be filed by law?

What hon. members would like to do really is to go into the books and play God in the operations of the business. I will ask the minister and anyone supporting this type of amendment just who they would like to carry out the appropriate analyses on the basis of this information that is submitted in disparate form. It is not uniform. There is no power to go back to the company to ask them to elaborate on their statements, none whatsoever. So the minister is going to gather a basket of fruit of all kinds and someone will say "my, what a fine looking bunch of grapes or what a fine bunch of bananas or what a fine bunch of rotting fruit". What is the purpose of it?

We know that the proportion of companies that will be affected in Canada is minute, and when one company comes and says that they want to draw some economic conclusions and therefore want to make some surveys about the operations of private and public companies, I ask: what about all the private companies in the province of Ontario? Over 50 per cent of the companies of the country are under Ontario charter, but not one of them will be touched by these amendments. There is no indication whatsoever that the Ontario law will be changed. There is no indication that the law in Alberta, British Columbia, Saskatchewan or Manitoba—which is pretty well uniform with that of Ontario except that the Manitoba law has a little more flexibility in it in certain areas—will be changed. I find it incredible for anyone to advance serious arguments in favour of disclosure.

An hon. Member: Why not?

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): "Why not" is not an argument. It is like saying "because". Originally, the disclosure was for the protection of shareholders and potential shareholders, but as far as that goes the securities commissions exact a lot more and better information of the type which I suggested should be required but is not asked for here. The minister is trying, in a half-hearted and ham-handed way, to do some work that he cannot do because he cannot set up a national securities commission. That is the reason. What we should have established is a national securities commission in co-operation with the provinces. Co-operation from the provinces would be forthcoming, but for the insistence that the national securities commission should be headquartered at Ottawa, away from the stock exchange, and that it would be under federal aegis. This is a co-operative effort.

I have had a number of sources of information with regard to the "non-negotiations" that have been going on between the federal government and the provinces with regard to the establishment of a national securities commission. This is a sort of picayune effort to try to obtain what a meaningful securities commission, having the right to ask for statistics from public companies on a uniform basis, could obtain. That is what is needed for the protection of shareholders. With regard to disclosure for the purposes of carrying out an economic study of one sort or another, that is all very well if the government is able to separate the operations of a company on the basis of the information that is required, even the operations of a public company as it exists today. There is no possible way of

determining whether or not this type of operation is successful. Did the company benefit from certain economic activity? Only wild guesses could be made on the basis of a great deal of misinformation.

I am amazed at some of the academic economists who should be so naïve as to think that through this sort of operation they will be able to get some meaningful information. This is not so. Comparisons have been made with the United States, but in the United States information is obtained from the SEC, not from the companies' annual returns. The directors of companies are not even authorized to go through the files to collate information. So who is going to make the study, the minister? He has to pay $1 for every entry into the files. Under the Companies Act the minister is not exempt from paying the fee, neither is any member or any professor wanting to make a study. May I call it five o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Basford: I apologize to the House because there have been no previous consultations, but I wonder if the House would be agreeable, in view of the fact that we are trying to adjourn by June 26 and this bill has to reach the Senate if it is to be dealt with at all, to waiving the private members' hour, during which we are to deal with a notice of motion for the production of papers, and continuing debate on this bill for the next hour?

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): I do not disagree with the minister's request, but I should like to say that I hope the minister will be able to say that one day all those members who have given up private members hour will receive a day from the minister or from the government. Private members have their rights and, in order to assist the government, they have given up private members' hour. I should like it clearly understood that in due course we will get a day which will be devoted to private members on an allocated basis so that we can deal with some of our business.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): May I make a suggestion, Mr. Speaker? It is true that when we give up an hour on a Thursday or Friday, we lose it. Today happens to be a day for the debate of notices of motions for the production of papers, and one of my colleagues was planning to present one of his motions today. I have just consulted with him and my colleagues who are here. We offer a compromise of half an hour. In other words, let us stay on this bill until 5.30 and at 5.30 we could go to notices of motions for papers.

• (5:00 p.m.)

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): I was reaching the end of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, and I think I have made my point. I do not think the amendment adds anything to the terms of disclosure as requested by the minister in his bill. I thoroughly disagree with the requirements, and I have said so many times in committee and out of committee. I have a further amendment which would eliminate disclosure for private companies and that is why I have said as much as I have on this occasion, so that when we deal with my amendment I will not be repetitious.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Prior to recognizing the hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Kaplan), I might advise the House of the subjects to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment: The hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis)—Canada Assistance Plan—Refusal of benefits to members of B.C. building trade unions; the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave)—Broadcasting Policy—Suggested reference of act to committee in light of technological developments; the hon. member for Peel South (Mr. Chappell)—Immigration—representation of applicants before appeal board by unqualified persons.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CANADA CORPORATIONS ACT

ADMINISTRATIVE AND CONSEQUENTIAL AMENDMENTS

The House resumed the consideration of Bill C-4, to amend the Canada Corporations Act and other statutory provisions related to the subject matter of certain of those amendments, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, and motion No. 7 (Mr. Burton).

Mr. Robert P. Kaplan (Don Valley): Mr. Speaker, I should like to begin by attempting to respond to some of the questions asked by the previous speaker. He tossed into the air the consideration of what useful purpose would be served by disclosure, what meaningful purpose would there be. He argued that the minister had not offered one single, substantial reason why it would be in the interests of Canada to have this kind of disclosure.

I disagree with him. I think this disclosure would be extremely desirable and useful. I will agree with him to the extent that it is not obvious that this disclosure would be useful. It takes some thought to appreciate why it would. In the first place, we have the consideration of privacy. This is important and I think in other areas this government has indicated its respect for privacy in what it proposes to do with respect to computer technology and bugging devices. These considerations indicate that privacy is a value which this government respects. One might ask, why should privacy not apply to business. I think it should and I think there is a value in privacy there.

The hon. member mentioned that we ought not to pander to mere nosiness to accommodate people's interest. Even if someone would like to know how much profit is made by the T. Eaton Company, the A & P, Texaco or General Motors, this is nobody's business. The hon. member points out that these are private companies and they should be allowed to carry on privately, that no public interest would be served by knowing their profits and that we ought not to accommodate mere nosiness. He also pointed out that some businessmen can achieve a certain benefit in secrecy. That is undeniably true, because in many cases there are competitive advantages in keeping information to themselves. I have to agree that this is a point deserving of strong consideration and appreciation.

But even considering those factors, Mr. Speaker, I have come to the conclusion that public disclosure is a good practice within a certain limit. It is not just a case of shareholders having information; I agree entirely with the hon. member that the interests of shareholders are already accommodated by existing laws. The interest that has to be accommodated by increased disclosure is the public interest.

We sit in this House day after day, Mr. Speaker, and many of us concern ourselves with economic questions. It is remarkable that, although we propose public policy, although we make far-reaching decisions which must be considered fundamental to our free enterprise system and the preservation of our market economy, although we do the best we can, we make these decisions largely on the basis of guesswork. We do not know as much about our economy as other countries knows about theirs, and we do not know as much as we should in order to do a good job.

I was astonished to hear the hon. member refer to economic studies with a measure of contempt. I have a great deal of respect for that kind of research and I think we need more of it in Canada if we are to have an effective economic policy. Let me give some examples of questions where increased disclosure would help us. Every day we answer questions on our policies without the benefit of any good, hard knowledge about the underlying facts. We have decisions to make about the appropriate interest rate from time to time. We have to decide upon appropriate monetary policies. We have to decide how much liquidity there should be in our economy at any time. We have to look at competition and try to decide whether our system is functioning properly as a free enterprise system we have to analyse combines policy. We have to know something about our foreign exchange balances. We have the whole area of labour about which we are badly informed because we do not know how our economy is functioning. We have to make fundamental decisions about the allocation of resources in our society and we are not in as good a position to do that as we would be if we knew more about the operation of companies in Canada. We need more information in order to establish a good tariff policy.

One of the answers that might be tendered to this list of questions, Mr. Speaker, is that we have all this information but we have it in statistical form. We would have to agree that although we could have better statistics we do have very good ones. But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, we need to know more about the operations of certain companies in Canada. I do not agree with the position stated by the New Democratic Party. We do not have to invade privacy to the extent of knowing everything about every company in Canada. But companies reach a certain size where the economic decisions which they make are important and where a knowledge of their internal affairs would clearly assist us in establishing better public policies. Disclosure is the way to achieve this.

I am satisfied with the standard proposed by the government, Mr. Speaker. Originally they were suggesting a test of $3 million of assets or $3 million of gross sales or revenue a year. That has been moved upwards to $5 million of assets or $10 million gross revenue or sales. I have no complaint about that test. One of the things that convinces me it is the appropriate level is that we have been informed in our committee that 2,500 Canadian companies are of that size; that is, companies operating in Canada. In the formation of public policy it would be useful to know the details of how the 2,500 largest companies in Canada operate. It is a bit arbitrary, I agree. One could raise it by a few thousand or a few million dollars or lower it by the same amount, but the principle would not be affected. One has to have an arbitrary line in that kind of decision.

But there is another form of arbitrariness in the legislation which I find it difficult to accept, and which I would urge the government to reconsider. I refer to the decision to make the disclosure provisions applicable only to federal companies. I mentioned that there are only 2,500 companies in Canada that meet the test of size and I was referring to all companies that carry on business in Canada, wherever incorporated. Of those 2,500 companies, less than 20 per cent who do not now make disclosure would be affected by this provision. If we want to learn something about the way big business operates in this economy, why approach it with a proposal that will only reach 20 per cent of the companies not now making disclosure? This is a kind of tokenism, it seems to me, and it is a tokenism that is unsatisfactory. I agree that there ought to be a test, but why should that not apply to 100 per cent of incorporations in Canada instead of just 20 per cent?

Some of the consequences of limiting the test to federally incorporated companies will be very serious. I urge the minister to consider some of the consequences of the measure he is proposing. For one thing, the companies that now will be required to make disclosure claim that they will be put at a disadvantage vis-à-vis their provincial counterparts who are not required to make disclosure. I am not sure they are right, but they think they are right. They think that provincial companies of the same size ought also to be covered, and how can we argue with that? It strikes me as extremely discriminatory to impose regulations on companies that are incorporated under federal jurisdiction while permitting other large companies in Canada to continue carrying on in secrecy. Here we have a kind of tokenism that I find it difficult to accept.

• (5:10 p.m.)

It follows from what I have just observed that if these companies feel themselves put to a disadvantage, federal incorporation will become less popular. As a federal legislator who in these matters necessarily has a federal bias, I think we ought to encourage our citizens to make the greatest possible use of federal incorporation. We ought to introduce legislation that accommodates the interest of the business community; our legislation ought to protect shareholders. In these respects, our legislation is moving ahead. Most of the government proposals are excellent and we are about to introduce the most progressive corporation law in Canada.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): It has one or two flaws.

Mr. Kaplan: The question is, how interested will some of these companies be in federal incorporation when, by bringing themselves under the authority of another jurisdiction, they can avoid having to make the kind of disclosures which they find so distasteful. If statistics were to be offered, I would have to agree that there may be the same number of federal incorporations in the future as there have been in the past. There are substantial advantages in obtaining a federal charter. The national names of companies so incorporated are protected, and such firms have the right to carry on business in every province. But I suggest that such federally incorporated companies may well become shells held as subsidiaries probably by an Ontario company or, to an increasing extent, by a Prince Edward Island company. That is the kind of thing that people who like the idea of federal incorporation will be driven to by what is basically a discriminatory proposal. Such companies, I suggest, will make use of federal incorporation—

Mr. Fairweather: It will be known as the flag of convenience.

Mr. Kaplan: Exactly. Federal incorporation will be known as the flag of convenience. There are many advantages to federal incorporation and, as I say, the number of federal incorporations probably will not decrease. I am greatly afraid, however, that proper use will not be made again of federally incorporated companies, and that Canadians who

wish to incorporate will not make use of federal charters as they ought to be encouraged to do in the conduct of their business.

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the motion of the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Burton), may I say that the important aspect of his motion relates to the principle of disclosure. His motion recognizes that there may be companies of such a small size as not to represent any significant economic interest. The minister has the discretion to exclude such companies. Nevertheless, the hon. member's motion suggests that disclosure ought to be accepted as a matter of principle. In our society, people increasingly wish to know what is happening. They want to make their decisions and cannot do so unless they have adequate information at their disposal.

The hon. member who spoke on behalf of the Conservative party had developed great zeal in supporting the Auditor General. That member attacked the government for allegedly trying to silence the Auditor General. He said that we must have disclosure of all government operations to make sure that absolutely nothing the government does is withheld from the public. And that is so. Why should only the government be scrutinized? Why should the private sector be free to do exactly as it pleases? After all, most economic activity in our society still rests with the private sector and not with the government. I suggest that it is incumbent on my hon. friends to show the same zeal for the disclosure of information relating to the private sector as they showed with regard to information relating to the public sector.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Saltsman: After all, many people in our society are subject to scrutiny. For instance, we know how much teachers are paid, how much civil servants are paid and how much M.P.'s are paid. The salary of Members of Parliament can be a matter of public debate, as it ought to be.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): That is because they are paid by the public.

Mr. Saltsman: Indeed, why should others be excluded from scrutiny if Members of Parliament are not excluded? It seems that there is a double standard in these matters which is a carry-over from the view that business is entitled to a special niche. It is entitled to secrecy. There was a time when politicians were entitled to secrecy also; yet politicians make no claim to that secrecy now. They do not say their activities should not be scrutinized. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the private sector also should not be entitled to claim secrecy in this respect. At the moment, a great deal of mystery surrounds the operations of business. I am quite sure that most business operations are quite straightforward and most businesses can probably defend their activities. Yet, so long as the mystery exists, the suspicion will also exist that business is trying to hide something and that there is some benefit to be gained from maintaining the mystery. If there is to be rapport between our business community, our society, and those services that operate outside the business community, I think it is important for us to know how business carries on its affairs.

Not long ago there was a joint committee of the Senate and House of Commons to look into the question of prices. The Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford) served as the distinguished co-chairman of the committee. One of the committee's first decisions was whether there was to be public disclosure of information brought before it. A number of initial witnesses who appeared before it said, "Yes, we will tell you all sorts of things, but you must sit in camera". The committee decided that there would be no secrecy and that the information it requested would be made public. As a result of this decision something strange happened. Some businesses suffered, and they deserved to suffer because of their practices. But quite a number of businesses gained immeasurably, because the public became aware that they were acting in the public's interest as well as their own. Those firms found that disclosure brought enormous advantages.

It seems to me that those businesses that are worried about disclosure have a reason for being worried, whereas those that are conducting their business in a way that serves the public's interest as well as their own have nothing to fear and a great deal to gain for accepting the general principle of disclosure.

An hon. Member: What does Marcel say now?

• (5:20 p.m.)

Mr. Saltsman: The question of privacy is often raised. We have to be very careful in dealing with this question. We in this party have taken a very strong stand on personal privacy. We cannot go too far to protect the

right of the individual to live his own life, without public scrutiny, providing it affects no one else. It is his own business. Even the matter of abortion, which is raised so often by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis), deals with the question of privacy. We insist this must be a personal decision.

We must distinguish very carefully between privacy that affects only the individual and the privacy of corporations which affects all of us. The public has a right to know everything about those matters that affect us, whether they be related to governments or corporations. It is not idle curiosity to worry about our future. We want information as to how our future is going to be affected by decisions of public and private corporations. We have to be very clear in our distinction between the bedrooms of the nation and the boardrooms of the nation. There should be no secrecy attached to the operations in the boardrooms.

We in this society justifiably examine tax measures. No subject is so close to the hearts of people as the taxation policies of their legislators. Yet we forget that the private corporations, by their pricing and investment policies, in effect have taxation powers. The difference is simple. There is representation at the public level. It is possible to make some kind of a stand as to how one feels with regard to tax measures through his representative. What kind of representation do we have on the boards deciding the taxing and pricing policies of private and public corporations?

It may be argued that the marketplace disciplines them. If we were living in the 1700's or 1800's, I might agree that there is a tendency for the marketplace to discipline corporations with regard to pricing and other practices. The invisible hand may have been in evidence at that time. That is not so today. Today, through either monetary or patent rights, the corporations have the power to determine their own policies. If there is competition, it is a different kind than the traditional concept. Since business has what we in our party call the power to tax, the representatives of the people, and the people themselves, should have the power to investigate that power and the extent of that taxation.

The question has been raised by some hon. members as to what we want to know. They ask what we are trying to find out by this terribly vague resolution. The point was made that there is not even a standard for reporting this information. If there is going to be public disclosure, there must also be a standard for reporting those disclosures.

What do we want to know, Mr. Speaker? We want to know what the investments policies of these companies are going to be. We need to know whether their investment policies are good and whether they will create the greatest wealth and social benefit for our society. In a world of scarce resources, it is important that we know how efficient these companies are. From the viewpoint of public policy, it is important that we know whether there should be a tariff on a product and what sort of taxes should be placed on these companies. How valid are the arguments that are made against some of the approaches of government to these industries? It is very important that we know their pricing policies and practices. We already have some precedents for interfering, regardless of the size of the company, through the Combines Investigation Act.

It is of particular importance that we have this information because of the wide foreign ownership. What is the exact relationship between subsidiaries in Canada and the parent? We need more than the vague knowledge we now have on that point. It is important that we know when takeovers occur so that we do not need to call out the fire brigade, as was done recently with regard to the uranium industry. The waste in government is obvious. Any waste in government is exposed. We have a very diligent committee of this House and an Auditor General who is doing a good job. However, waste in the private sector is completely covered. There is a great deal of waste and it is important that it be uncovered. The public would be shocked to learn that the $15 million spent on refitting the *Bonaventure* is only small potatoes compared to the wasteful expenditures in the private sector.

In accordance with the agreement reached earlier, may I call it five o'clock and continue later?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. Pursuant to order made earlier in this sitting, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business, namely Notices of Motions (Papers).

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

TRADE

POTASH—REQUEST FOR CORRESPONDENCE ON SALE TO UNITED STATES

Mr. John Burton (Regina East) moved:

That an humble address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House copies of all correspondence for the period January 1, 1968 to September 30, 1969, between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States regarding the sale of potash to the United States.

He said: Mr. Speaker, on December 3, 1969 I moved this motion which was placed on the Order Paper early in the session. At that time the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Forest) replied:

Mr. Speaker, the only correspondence that the government of Canada has had with the United States government refers to the procedures followed by the United States authorities in their anti-dumping investigation of Canadian potash exports. This exchange is continuing and in these circumstances the production of papers for the period in question would not be in the public interest.

He then asked if I would agree to withdraw this motion which, of course, I did not do. The first point I want to make is that if, in fact, the point of the government is solely that the termination date of my motion, September 30, 1969, produced a problem, I would be quite willing to entertain an amendment which would extend the date to a suitable date that might be suggested by the government. In this way, all of the correspondence involved, which would give the complete picture, could be made available to the public.

I wish to give my reasons for requesting this information. The first reason is that last fall the Premier of Saskatchewan undertook discussions with potash companies, and more particularly with the Governor of the State of New Mexico in the United States.

• (5:30 p.m.)

During the course of this discussion it was decided to establish quotas on potash production in Saskatchewan. As you know, sir, all the potash production in Canada at the present time is in Saskatchewan. Prices related to the quotas were established. In other words, a quota would be established for a company only if it honoured the price commitment which was made, namely, $18.75 per ton. The Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce and any other federal agencies

which might have been involved appeared to have come into the picture only at a late stage.

The minister confirmed that there had been discussions between Washington and the Canadian government and between the Canadian government and the Saskatchewan government, but he appeared to wish to keep silent about the nature of those discussions. I believe it is important to know what the Canadian government said in the United States about this matter and what exchanges took place. I appreciate that consent has to be obtained from the United States government before its correspondence can be tabled.

Saskatchewan says that it obtained a good deal—based, apparently, on a production level of between 50 per cent and 55 per cent of total capacity. The question is: Was this deal in the interests of the United States potash companies who have holdings both in Saskatchewan and in New Mexico? Were these United States potash companies the real gainers in this arrangement?

We are all, no doubt, familiar with the development of the potash industry in Saskatchewan. Two mines were started before 1962 and each encountered considerable technical difficulty because of water problems. Once this difficulty had been overcome, construction on three more mines began in 1963 and early 1964. But when the new Premier came to power he wanted to push industrial development in line with his election platform, with the result that over development occurred. New production capacity was developed before obtaining the necessary markets; in other words, the supply of potash was far ahead of the demand. This is an example of poor planning in an important new industry. When the Premier of Saskatchewan found he was in a box, he embarked upon the discussions to which I have referred and approved the deal involving quota and price.

When the potash companies appeared before the Finance Committee recently in connection with the white paper on taxation hearings they stated that $18.75, the price presently paid, was marginal in terms of present production levels based on the quotas established. They also stated that if the mines were in full production, unit costs would be much lower. I have heard it suggested that unit production costs might be as low as $11 or $12 a ton at full production level. It is plain that Saskatchewan could out-produce the United States in the production of potash and that we have a competitive advantage. It

appears that many of the companies concerned have mines in Saskatchewan and in the United States. There is one German company in Saskatchewan and two Canadian companies; all the rest are United States companies. I believe all but one of those companies also have interests in New Mexico. These companies wish to protect their interests in the New Mexico mines.

Thus, there are a number of questions which need to be answered, and the information sought in this motion would be most helpful in this regard. First, was this a good deal for Saskatchewan? Second, did it protect New Mexico potash rather than Saskatchewan potash? Third, did the Premier of Saskatchewan overstep provincial jurisdiction in engaging in international negotiations on trade matters? Fourth, what representations did Canada make on this question? Fifth, what role did the United States corporations with interests in both Saskatchewan and New Mexico play in these arrangements? It seems to me there is a clear conflict here between the interest of these corporations and the interests of Canada, and in these circumstances I hope the government will see fit to accept the motion I moved on December 3.

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, I intend to speak briefly on this motion in support of my hon. friend, believing it is important we should persuade the government to produce the papers and correspondence connected with this issue. A number of telling arguments in favour of doing so have been put forward by my hon. friend from Regina East (Mr. Burton), and I agree with them.

The biggest potash mine in Saskatchewan is located in my constituency near the town of Esterhazy. When a large-scale lay-off took place there last January or February, many people were wondering why potash production was slowing down. Many believed the decision to curtail activity was taken in the interest of the United States companies who wished a quota placed on Saskatchewan potash production because they had mines in New Mexico as well. Since so many people are affected in Saskatchewan, particularly in towns such as Esterhazy, I submit it is essential that the government disclose the correspondence involved. It would give those concerned an opportunity to find out the facts upon which decisions have been based and they would be in a better position to assess the future of the potash industry.

[Mr. Burton.]

The situation in Saskatchewan has produced a minor crisis, the effect of which has been to slow down the economy in towns such as Esterhazy. A large portion of the work force of the province is already unemployed—according to the April figures about 8.8 per cent of the non-agricultural work force is in this position—and one element of this total is, of course, the potash workers, many of whom had been employed until this year. Of course, as all members know, when there is a slowdown in any industry, the whole of the community is affected. This applies to other towns in Saskatchewan such as Largenburg and Churchbridge, to mention only two, where today one can see empty houses and apartments, and where small businesses are experiencing declining sales. This situation is due in part to decreased employment in the potash mines.

According to a statement by Premier Thatcher, the potash mines will be operating next year at a capacity of 42 per cent. The reference is to the next potash year which is from July 1, 1970, to June 30, 1971. This leads me to think that the operation is not as efficient as it could be. Of course, the arrangement means that many people who were working in the mines will no longer be doing so. In a situation like this it is important that we should find out from the government the reasons which led these concerns to make a deal such as this.

• (5:40 p.m.)

Some of the planning which has gone on between the governments concerned had been very poor indeed. I recall that in the fall of 1968 the IMC plant at Esterhazy decided it would truck potash to the United States border instead of shipping it by rail as they had been doing. The reason for this was that Canadian National Railways would not agree with the company to ship potash by express, as the company wanted. They found it more economical to truck potash to the U.S. border and then load it on to U.S. trains for transportation to the market. As a result we have found that the railway workers in the area are afraid of losing their jobs because of the slowdown in rail transportation. At the present time the provincial government is planning to spend $6 million on maintaining the highway over which trucks carrying potash travel every day. And all this because the potash company could not reach agreement with CNR.

There are many other matters I could mention, but in view of the hour and because other members want to participate in the debate I will try and sum up my point very quickly. As I said, during the next year the mines will be operating at only 42 per cent capacity. This is a good indication that something is wrong and that the people of Saskatchewan need to hear about certain facts immediately. People living in these communities should be given as much information as possible about the future of potash mining in Saskatchewan, since many of them are buying homes, sending their children to school and planning to establish roots in the area.

If the government would let us have the correspondence for which we are asking, perhaps it would clarify the situation. Many people seem to think there is a conflict between the mining companies and the people of Saskatchewan. As my colleague for Regina East (Mr. Burton) mentioned, several of the mining companies operating in Saskatchewan also operate mines in New Mexico. It has been pointed out many times that the New Mexico mines are not as efficient as those in Saskatchewan and the supply of potash in New Mexico will probably be exhausted in a few years. Because of this the companies seem to have decided to mine potash in New Mexico rather than in Saskatchewan. If this is the case, I and the people of Saskatchewan want to know. Those who are directly affected want to be able to plan their future like Canadians in other parts of this country.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the motion moved by my colleague from Regina East (Mr. Burton) requesting the production of the exchanges, if any, between Canada and the United States concerning potash. I suspect there is very little, if anything, for the government to produce. It was the government of Saskatchewan that did the negotiating. The Premier of that province, acting like an Arab sheik in an oil kingdom, dealt with the governor of one of the states of the U.S.A. and these two gentlemen carried on what was, I submit, the business of the government of Canada and the government of the United States.

We want to know what representations the federal government made to the United States or what discussions were held in regard to the proposed threat to impose tariffs on Canadian exports of potash. I strongly suspect that if this tariff threat was made by the governor of New Mexico and was put before the United States trade commission, it was more bluff than a threat. If the Premier of Saskatchewan had chosen to make a common cause with the governors, senators and congressmen of 10 to 15 farming states on holding down the price of fertilizer, I submit there would be no likelihood of any attempt being made to impose tariffs on Canadian potash. In fact, I submit any such attempt would have failed.

What happened was the Premier of Saskatchewan and the governor of New Mexico chose to work out a deal between themselves. The Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) had egg on his face. He knew he was being imposed upon by the Premier of Saskatchewan. The Premier of Saskatchewan and the governor of New Mexico decided to come to a cosy arrangement between themselves, the benefits of which went to a few corporations that owned potash mines in both New Mexico and Saskatchewan. I should like to know what happened to the study made by the justice department as to the legality of this affair, a matter that is obviously within the jurisdiction of the government of Canada. In this regard I should like to read a short excerpt from the Ottawa *Citizen* of November 22 last, which carried a report on the study made by the justice department and about which we have heard no more. The article reads, in part:

> The regulations, which follow negotiations between Premier Ross Thatcher and the New Mexico governor...would limit production from Saskatchewan potash mines and...exercise some control over exports—

According to the article, it would also control the price of the exported commodity. The Premier of Saskatchewan pointed out that this sort of thing had been done by the government of Alberta in regard to oil. But this was strictly for the purpose of conservation; nobody could suggest for one moment that this was the purpose of the production controls in Saskatchewan.

The article continues:

> —the agreement between the New Mexico and Saskatchewan that led to the Saskatchewan regulations was the answer to a prayer for New Mexico's Carlsbad-based potash industries—

These were worn out, in course of being phased out and in no way could compete with Saskatchewan production as to price or as to quality. This was a neat arrangement to bail out corporations which had mines in both places, at the expense of Saskatchewan pro-

duction and Saskatchewan employment. Prorationing of production in Saskatchewan is nothing more nor less than export control. The Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce refused to exercise its jurisdiction and allowed the Premier of a province to assert that responsibility which the federal government chose not to accept. Setting a minimum price of $18.75 a ton, which it is now suggested should be raised to $22.75 a ton, was again controlling the price of an export commodity. The people of Canada, and particularly the people of Saskatchewan, want to know what the federal government did on their behalf in a matter that was absolutely and completely within its jurisdiction.

I submit that if the government fails to produce these papers and to give us this information, it is in fact admitting either that it did nothing in the matter or it agreed to something that was not in the interest of Canadians, particularly in Saskatchewan, but was in the interest of the corporations which owned the potash mines. Therefore, I submit the government was party to this cosy little deal between the Premier of Saskatchewan and the governor of New Mexico. Even though the federal government failed to prevent the government of Saskatchewan from acting in a matter not within its jurisdiction, I hope the government will indicate that it did make some representations on behalf of Canada.

Mr. Steven Otto (York East): Mr. Speaker, having listened to the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat, I should have thought he was speaking about the Premier of Newfoundland. I have not heard the Premier of Saskatchewan condemned in such a blatant way for a long time—in fact, ever.

Mr. Benjamin: I do it every day.

Mr. Otto: The issue here does not relate to industry in Saskatchewan, be it the mining industry, the forest industry, the potash industry, or whatever it may be. The issue is whether the government should make public correspondence, research or studies passing between the United States government and the government of Canada. I realize we have participatory democracy, but there is a limit even to participatory democracy. If this motion were carried and production of these papers ordered, it would mean that hon. gentlemen opposite would have the right to decide whether the government acted or did not act in a certain set of circumstances. If the House were doing this on every issue and in respect of every bit of correspondence—

• (5:50 p.m.)

Mr. Benjamin: They have already done it.

Mr. Otto: As the hon. gentleman said, they have already done it. The opportunity exists. The estimates are before the House and the committees and at any time hon. gentlemen opposite are welcome to point out to a minister that he has not exercised his proper, judicial function or that he has not made the correct decision. I have done this myself on many occasions.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. In order that we may not become involved in difficulties later, I wonder whether it might be understood that if my hon. friend from York East (Mr. Otto) is interrupted by a certain knock on the door, this motion could retain its position on the list of motions for papers.

Mr. Forest: That is the agreement.

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

Mr. Otto: It is so agreed. I believe the knock has already come. This is the shortest speech I have ever made.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

A message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod as follows:

Mr. Speaker, the Right Honourable the Deputy Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable House in the chamber of the honourable the Senate.

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

• (6:00 p.m.)

And being returned:

Mr. Speaker informed the House that His Excellency the Deputy Governor General had been pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the royal assent to the following bills:

An act respecting Brunner Corporation (Canada) Limited

An act to amend the Criminal Code

An act respecting the expropriation of land

An act to incorporate National Farmers Union

An act to amend the Oil and Gas Production and Conservation Act

An act to provide for the relief of persons who have been convicted of offences and have subsequently rehabilitated themselves

An act to amend the Supreme Court Act

An act to amend the Industrial Research and Development Incentives Act

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

FINANCE

TABLING OF LETTER FROM MINISTER OF FINANCE TO CHAIRMAN OF STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE, TRADE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

Hon. Herb Gray (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have your indulgence to revert to motions for the purpose of tabling a document under Standing Order 41 (2).

Mr. Speaker: Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Gray: I should like to table at this time copies in English and in French of a letter from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) to the chairman of the House of Commons Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, which was sent to him today.

At 6.07 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CANADA CORPORATIONS ACT

ADMINISTRATIVE AND CONSEQUENTIAL AMENDMENTS

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-4, to amend the Canada Corporations Act and other statutory provisions related to the subject matter of certain of those amendments, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, and Motion No. 7 (Mr. Burton).

Mr. Saltsman: In my earlier remarks, Mr. Speaker, I was pointing out that a great deal of waste occurs in the private sector and passes unnoticed because we assume that the private sector has the right to keep its business to itself. We fail to take into consideration the fact that waste, whether it occurs in the public or the private sector, affects every citizen of the country because it ultimately reduces his standard of living and has the same effect as the imposition of an additional tax.

The business organizations that appeared before the committee took the position that disclosure was a very bad thing, that it was sheer idle curiosity on the part of those who wished fuller disclosure. Businessmen should realize that disclosure may not be a bad thing and that in many cases it may be of considerable benefit to them. We have to assume that most businessmen do not like waste any more than do parliamentarians, and that they would like to avoid many of the difficulties which result from business operating blindly.

I say this without tongue in cheek because I have seen many businesses suffer because they did not have prior knowledge of their competitor's activities. If they had had prior knowledge of their competitors' intentions everybody, including the public, would have been better off. I have seen shopping centres being opened when negotiations were going on for another shipping centre in the same area, with the result that nobody could recover their capital investment and eventually they all had to raise prices to try and recover overheads and capital investment. There is no profit for anybody in this situation and the government does not receive the taxes it would like to have. The public does not get the benefit of lower prices, either.

Perhaps the most glaring example of mismanagement, lack of investigation and lack of prior knowledge of business transactions is the potash industry of western Canada. In that case everybody rushed in to develop. They overdeveloped, with government incentives, until it reached the point where nobody could recover their investment. The government is suffering as a result. They have had to prorate production and reallocate the industry because of its failure to regulate itself. The market is not very effective, particularly when business has to plan and make commitments over a long period of time.

The recess gave me an opportunity to obtain a newspaper clipping which I think illustrates that lack of knowledge contributes to business inefficiency and business losses. This article is from the *Globe and Mail* of October 25, 1967, and reads in part as follows:

> He quoted the example of a company that built a $5 million chemical plant in Montreal. The day they got it in operation a competitor announced a new process for making the same chemical at double the productivity and half the cost.

Disclosure will not solve that problem. Having more frankness and a greater awareness of what people in society are doing should benefit everyone. Like MPs, business-

men will find that disclosure does not hurt very much once one gets used to the idea. When businessmen talk about keeping things close to their vest, one would think there were great secrets in business. There is no secrecy in business, in my experience. Very often competitors know almost exactly what their opposite numbers are doing in certain fields, except in the area mentioned earlier where they really manage to keep it a secret.

• (8:10 p.m.)

Industrial spies garner secrets. Travelling salesmen go around and manage to catch a few words here and there. Employees have a way of telling secrets. In addition, there are official agencies which exist simply to supply information to other people. The group that knows the least is not the businessman's competitor but the public. It is the public we are concerned about in this debate; it is the public that ought to know about these activities.

The other day an interesting little blue book was sent to our offices from the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission. It is entitled, "Business Forms". It tells an interesting story about those who manufacture business forms in Canada. These people have no secrets from one another. They have formed a little club and have appointed an executive secretary. They even tell each other what they sell, how much they sell it for, and to whom. But the public does not know about this. The minister may say, "That is exactly why we have a Restrictive Trade Practices Commission. It must find out these things".

Instead of playing cops and robbers in order to find out what is going on, would it not be better if we asked these people to lay everything on the line? They may have good reason for carrying on as they do. I do not want to pass judgment on them at the moment; that is not my job. Unless there are good reasons for not doing so, the kind of activity that has been carried on in secrecy should be exposed. Is it not far better for companies to expose their operations than run the great risk of arousing suspicion in the public mind and be chased all the time by the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission which wishes to find out how honest their operations are, to what extent they are competing and whether, so to speak, they are holding hands?

Another question that has been raised is this: What is the point of asking for disclosure at the federal level when so few companies in Canada come under federal jurisdiction, and when there is no agreement with the provinces under whose jurisdiction such companies are incorporated? If we examine our laws I think we will find that almost every worth-while piece of legislation has been introduced at the federal level. If there is public acceptance of the legislation, as I think there will be of this legislation relating to full disclosure, it is not long before the provinces pass similar laws. On other occasions provinces have introduced good legislation and the federal government has followed suit. I believe this is good legislation. I think the minister himself believes that disclosure is good. After all, he fought very hard for the minor changes which appear in this bill. We are asking the minister to recognize the importance of the principle and to go all the way.

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in this debate may I say that I find the bill complex and somewhat difficult to understand. I have serious doubt whether it will do what it is intended to do. I would feel much happier about this portion of the bill we are discussing if I could be sure that the position the government has taken with regard to disclosure will bring about the desired effect.

Bill C-198 of the previous session died on the Order Paper and was replaced by the bill we are discussing. I should like to refer to a press release which is mentioned in a brief which the Parkin Company presented to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs. It speaks of a press release concerning Bill C-198, issued by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford) on May 22, 1969. The press release states in part:

> The disclosure amendments also constitute the government's first legislative action in an area commented upon by the Watkins Committee on Foreign Ownership and the Structure of Canadian Industry. 'This will meet the concern about how hard it is to get information about important private companies, particularly those which are wholly owned by foreign companies,' Mr. Basford said. 'There is no question of discrimination against foreign-owned companies, however, since we have decided it is in the public interest to have public disclosure by all federally-incorporated companies which are significant to the economy.'

Another memorandum released by the Department of Corporate and Consumer Affairs on May 22, 1969, said the following about section 121E of Bill C-198 of the previous session:

> This section makes the financial statements of companies to which paragraphs (a) and (b) of

subsection 121E(3) apply (public companies and companies having gross revenues or assets in excess of $3 million) accessible to the public. It is enacted in recognition of the fact that the existing definition of public company ... is totally unrealistic in Canada today. This is so because many of the most important companies in Canada are 'private' subsidiaries of foreign companies. New section 121 sets out a better test for distinguishing between those companies which are 'economically significant' (and whose financial affairs are therefore a matter of legitimate public interest) and those companies which are truly 'private'. This reflects, at the federal level, the public disclosure recommendations of the Watkins Committee on the Structure of Canadian Industry and the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons on Consumer Credit and Prices.

It is not clear from this memorandum whether the government is looking into the question of foreign ownership in Canada or into private companies which practice non-disclosure. If it is thought desirable to control or classify the problem of foreign ownership in Canadian companies, it might be better to approach this matter in a different way. For instance, any company which is foreign-owned above a specified degree could be required to make public disclosure. We already do this in commerce, communications, broadcasting and finance. This is a requirement under the investment companies act.

Companies operating in the fields I have mentioned must limit their degree of foreign ownership. On the other hand, if it is desired to bring about wider disclosure by private companies which are subsidiaries of large public companies, it may be better to pass legislation specifying such disclosure. To some extent the problem could be solved this way. In addition to mentioning the problem of foreign ownership, the Watkins task force said in its report:

It is a prerequisite to public discussion of government policy and the formulation and implementation of actual policy that more information be available on the activities of corporations, particularly large corporations, both Canadian owned and foreign owned.

The Watkins task force defined the three distinct purposes for which corporate information is needed. They are, public disclosure, economic analysis and government surveillance. The Watkins task force, at page 185 of its report, said that corporate information for the purpose of economic analysis was "generally very good." On the other hand, it concluded that information for the purpose of surveillance was "inadequate" and information for the purpose of public disclosure was "grossly inadequate". What does this mean? If the amount of corporate information is good enough for purposes of economic analysis, what more could be required? It is in this area that the bill leaves something to be desired.

The thread running through the testimony of witnesses appearing before the Finance Committee was that public disclosure by small companies would be damaging competitively. Large companies found, on the whole, no real difficulty and felt there would be no competitive disadvantage as a result of public disclosure. On the other hand, some companies at the lower level of the economic scale felt that they would be at a serious disadvantage if there were public disclosure. For this reason the minister has broadened the criteria for public disclosure. I agree with this. Canada has many small corporations, as is disclosed by the white paper. Public disclosure may work great hardship in this area. Mr. Watkins observed this deficiency. Page 357 of the Watkins Committee report reads in part:

• (8:20 p.m.)

For the purposes of economic analysis, the Dominion Bureau of Statistics must collect and analyse data made available by corporations on a confidential basis and published in aggregative form which does not permit identification of individual companies. For purposes of surveillance, relevant government departments and agencies must collect and use data on individual companies on a confidential basis.

If it is decided that it is necessary for the government to survey businesses and companies, then it is logical to use the approach that data can be collected on a confidential basis at a much lower level than is contemplated in this bill. If it is necessary for the government to survey and chart its financial course, it would be much more complete. Much of our business is already at a level below that set in the legislation.

In industry comprised of many small companies the total information is as complete as if the field were held by one large corporation. The provinces do not have this legislation, so there is little point at this time in the federal government's requiring federally-incorporated companies to make public disclosure. Witness after witness who appeared before the committee indicated that in the future, because of the present legislation, companies will elect to be incorporated as provincial entities. On that basis, this portion of the legislation will be an empty shell. It will not be effective and it will not be acceptable to the business community.

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): I will be very brief, Mr. Speaker. I agree with the other members of our group who are very much in favour of these disclosure provisions. I know that for a long time the minister has been in favour of such provisions. There was a good deal of discussion this afternoon regarding the type of disclosure required. I wish to make one further suggestion. As far as the public are concerned, there are certain types of disclosure which go beyond what is being proposed. This is good.

This afternoon I received several letters from my constituency. They are a form type of letter. A certain firm is being transferred to the United States. The people who are losing their jobs are very concerned about this. The public, particularly those who are employed or are likely to be employed in industries, have a right to know on what basis these companies are being moved and whether there is a need for the move. They should be informed of the plans of this industry. I wish to read one letter. Copies were sent to me by several employees, including a die-maker and a welder. The letter reads:

> Power Machinery, engaged in the manufacture of chain saws for 25 years, was purchased by the Chicago-based Skil corporation in July, 1968.
>
> Skil corporation plans to move the operation to Chicago; one hundred and twenty-five employees will be out of work and business will be lost for local suppliers. Another secondary industry, so sorely needed in the area, will be gone.
>
> A local consortium, who felt that movement of the plant was not in the best interest of the company or B.C., was put together by management personnel of Power Machinery after officials of the parent company, Skil, announced plans to shut down the operation and shift production machinery to Chicago. Financial backing for the consortium was available.
>
> Negotiations have broken off and Skil corporation has restated that the operation will be phased out in three to six months.
>
> I ask, in the interest of retaining secondary industry and employment in Canada, that you raise this matter in the House of Commons.

I raise the matter now. The minister appreciates the situation in British Columbia in general, and in Vancouver in particular. If this company is transferred, 125 employees will be unemployed. Their families will be without income. The various suppliers will be depressed as a result of the industry being moved. I know the minister feels this will be a danger spot if it happens in Vancouver.

We in British Columbia are most anxious to build secondary industries. Without any warning or public disclosure, this firm has suddenly announced that it is transferring to Chicago. The employees will be out of work. There will be all the attendant evils for their families and the suppliers of this firm. A local consortium was prepared to invest the money necessary to keep this firm in Vancouver. Those negotiations have now broken off. The company has stated that the operation will be phased out in three to six months. This action should not be permitted without some type of disclosure as to why it is necessary to deprive these 125 people of Vancouver and their families of this form of employment, particularly at this time when there is such a high level of unemployment in that city.

When the minister is replying, I ask him to take a few minutes to state whether he knows anything about this situation, and to tell us what can be done. These people are appealing to the government, the minister and their elected representative to see if anything can be done about the situation. I know that the proposed disclosure provisions will not solve this sort of problem, but it is the responsibility of the government to ensure that such firms are not moved away without explanation in view of the loss of employment and wages which is entailed.

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, a number of members have used the occasion of this debate on the amendment moved by the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Burton) to discuss the general principle of public disclosure by private and public companies of economic significance. I do not want to discuss that part of the question at any great length. The principles of greater corporate disclosure were decided when this House gave second reading to Bill C-4 which is now before the House. This subject was dealt with exhaustively in 19 committee meetings of the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

I want to deal with the amendment and some of its specific recommendations which I oppose. I say to the hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Kaplan) that I appreciate his position and am sympathetic to it. However, we have been talking in this country for many years about the need for greater disclosure by corporations and about the need to provide that companies of economic significance should make certain information available. Here at least the government is making a beginning, and I hope the bill will be passed

as quickly as possible in order that we can open the door to a greater degree of corporate disclosure.

• (8:30 p.m.)

I would remind the House that this bill was first introduced in May of 1969. It was reintroduced in October, 1969. We are now in the month of June, 1970, and it is still not the law of the land and it still has to be approved by the members of the other place. I would say to the hon. member for Don Valley that here we are at least adopting the principle that private companies of economic significance should disclose as public companies do.

I am hopeful that provincial governments will follow the lead which the federal government has set. The hon. member for Waterloo (Mr. Saltsman) touched upon this aspect of the matter and I agree with his remarks in that respect. Of course, if what I have suggested does not happen we shall have to consider other measures to ensure that the principle of corporate disclosure becomes applicable in the years ahead not only to federal companies but to all companies incorporated under provincial acts.

I listened to the two hon. members who spoke for the official opposition, the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) and the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Ritchie). I became somewhat confused when I listened to the spokesmen for the Conservative Party on this issue. I do not want to re-debate the whole principle of corporate disclosure, but I was confused when I listened to them because they opposed it on second reading, they opposed it in committee and they are opposing it tonight. I only wish that the hon. member for Edmonton West and the hon. member for Dauphin would consult with their leader, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield) who said as recently as last April:

> There is also the problem of getting adequate disclosure of information. At the moment, Canadian disclosure requirements are among the lowest in the world.

Here we are trying to improve disclosure laws in Canada, as I take it the Leader of the Opposition was advocating in April, while his minions from Edmonton West and Dauphin are opposing what he is trying to do.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): I am no minion.

Mr. Basford: I have great difficulty figuring out just where the Conservative party stands on this issue. To deal with the substance of Motion No. 7 moved by the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Burton), it is an amendment which in no circumstances can the government accept. Bill C-4 provides that private companies with assets of $5 million or sales exceeding $1 million shall file annual returns with the companies branch of my department, and that those returns shall be open to the public and treated in the same way as annual returns from public companies. The amendment before us would provide that all private companies, no matter of what size, would have to follow the same procedure and be regarded as public companies. All their returns would be made public.

There are two objections to this proposal. First, it would mean that all sorts of very small and insignificant companies would be obliged to go to the expense and trouble of making an annual return—and for no conceivable purpose. I fail to see any merit or wisdom whatever in requiring small private companies to do this. If we believe, as I do, that private companies of economic significance should disclose in the same way as public companies, there is surely not much point in saying that small private companies having capital of $50,000 or $100,000 should go through all the operations required of a public company. That suggestion makes no sense whatsoever.

The amendment provides that the minister may exempt a company from this requirement on an individual basis, upon application. But this would involve the minister, who at this particular time is myself, dealing with some 15,000 applications a year from private companies with assets of less than $5 million. All of them would, I am sure, apply to me for an exemption. This, in itself, would amount to a very large administrative task and one which would produce absolutely no benefit, though it might well cost the taxpayers a great deal.

Then again, the trend for some years has surely been away from the granting of ministerial power of discretion. I have listened many times to members of the opposition advocate that the power of ministerial discretion should be curtailed. Yet here we find the New Democratic Party seeking to give me discretion to decide whether or not some 15,000 companies should publicly disclose particulars of their operations. This is not the kind of discretion I want, and it is certainly not the kind of discretion a minister should have.

Surely, as in this case, we should write good laws which are progressive and modern. Equally, the corporate community, the legal profession and the accountancy profession are entitled to know with some certainty what the law is. If the amendment were adopted, no one would know whether a company would have to disclose or not. One year the minister might permit an exemption, the next year he might not. Ought we not try, as the government has sought to do in Bill C-4, to write some rules which are fairly certain and easy of interpretation, so that companies would know whether they have to disclose or not? The amendment before us destroys that certainty and makes it impossible for companies to know where they stand. For these reasons I must oppose it.

Mr. Burton: Mr. Speaker, would the minister not agree that ministerial discretion could be exercised by dealing with some of the cases to which he referred by way of general rules which would apply unless there was a specific case where a different situation prevailed? Second, cannot a distinction be drawn between ministerial discretion which is exercised with public knowledge and the exercise of discretion which cannot become public knowledge, when the public does not know that discretion is being exercised?

Mr. Basford: I suppose it would be possible for the minister to pronounce some rules by which he would be guided, but whether he did so or not these rules would be made purely at his own discretion and this is what we are trying to avoid. If the hon. member feels that rules should be pronounced, does he not think they should be provided for in the legislation so that people would have the benefit of knowing what the law says? I do not think the suggestion contained in the hon. member's question is really very practical.

• (8:40 p.m.)

Mr. Saltsman: Mr. Speaker, the minister has made a great point about ministerial discretion, but surely this is within the capacity of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. He often makes decisions on specific questions which are referred to him. For example, just recently he made a decision in regard to drugs. I do not think this power is specifically spelled out in any legislation, but it does seem to me that virtually everything the minister has done in this connection in recent times has been through the exercise of discretion.

[Mr. Basford.]

Would the minister not agree that we also gave this ministerial discretion to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) in order to free him from the rigidity of rules that had not worked and with regard to which people had fallen between stools? The minister would have to answer to Parliament for the exercise of his discretion, and this would be very desirable because we could then scrutinize his activities and he would have to be responsible for his acts.

Mr. Basford: I think that the rules applicable to whether or not a company should disclose, and what kind of annual statements and returns it should prepare, should be spelled out in the legislation.

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

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Section 11 of Standing Order 75, a recorded division on the motion No. 7 stands deferred.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West) moved:

That Bill C-4, an act to amend the Canada Corporations Act and other statutory provisions related to the subject matter of certain of those amendments, be amended by deleting in clause 20

(a) line 16, page 62, the words "every company" and substituting therefor "every public company"

(b) subparagraphs (3) (4) (5) of section 121E, being lines 32 to 44 inclusive, page 62, lines 1 to 43 inclusive, page 63, and lines 1 to 18 inclusive, page 64.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in moving this amendment, I do not intend to repeat the remarks I made when discussing the motion moved by the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Burton). However, I am following up the remarks I made on that occasion with the proposal that the disclosure called for in this bill shall be limited to what it is in the present law; in other words, it will be applicable to public companies.

I have given a number of reasons for contending that disclosure of the information requested in the government's amendment is

not worth a fig. I was absolutely astounded at the remarks of the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis), who felt that by reason of such disclosure at this time the situation of the people on whose behalf she was making representations would be affected. I contend their situation would not be affected one iota. It would not affect the filing of an annual balance sheet, a profit and loss statement, a source and application of funds statement and a few other pieces of information. That is not disclosure.

I have no qualms at all when the minister tries to nit-pick some remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) on the subject of disclosure. I agree that many matters in the bill relating to disclosure are important, though this is not disclosure of the kind of thing we are talking about now. The Leader of the Opposition was talking about meaningful disclosure in respect to such matters as takeover bids. Let us talk about insider trading, but not of the kind that is meant here. True enough, lip service is paid to the principle of greater disclosure in regard to insider trading, but frankly this is a dead letter from the word go.

Again, this is an attempt at substitution for what would be a meaningful national securities commission act. It is a stock exchange operation. It is like reporting cases of insider trading to the Ontario Securities Commission on a regular basis, such instances being published in the financial papers so everyone is aware of them. Here it will be filed in company files. A news reporter will have to call on the directors of corporations and comb through the company files to see whether there has been any declaration of insider trading, and he will pay $1 for each search. Is that meaningful disclosure? There is no power under the act to authorize the director of a corporation to maintain a running record of insider trading. Not only that, he is not empowered to do it nor is he authorized to disclose it. The hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Kaplan) feels there is a great deal of merit in this sort of disclosure, but I say that if its purpose is meaningful disclosure, I think frankly it is a sham.

The minister has stated that he has maintained a meaningful dialogue with the provinces. In 18 months he has not talked to the provinces about a national securities commission. He has not done so because of some stupid and wrong-headed ideas—I do not know whose they are—as to who will control a national securities commission and where it will be located. The minister has made much of this bill. It was first introduced in 1968, I think in May, in the other place. We are now in June, 1970, and the bill still is not law. And I should hope not, Mr. Speaker; the Senate kicked the stuffing out of the original bill because it was such a bad bill.

Mr. Basford: The bill started here, not in the Senate.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): The bill was brought in last October, but it remained on the Order Paper and was not called by the government. Ultimately it was referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, which organized public hearings. As I have indicated, some 17 organizations and individuals appeared before the committee to comment upon it. Let me tell the House just how good a bill it was. As a result of these comments, 39 printed pages of amendments were introduced by the government during the committee hearings, completely altering some of the features of the bill. Even the five-ten formula was changed as a result of the representations made before the committee. Some sections of the bill are unrecognizable when compared with the original sections.

• (8:50 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, the original bill had 106 printed pages. The amendments totalled 39 printed pages. Therefore, over one-third of the bill went into the wastebasket. On that basis, I do not believe it is a good bill. Tonight we will be asked to vote on three small, inconsequential amendments which were the result of poor drafting by the government. I maintain that we are talking about disclosure for a mere 375 companies. That is the number of companies that will be caught by the government's amendment—375 companies out of a total of 1,500 private companies under federal registration.

We will be asking these companies to file a balance-sheet not of a uniform nature. We will be asking them to file a profit and loss statement not of a uniform nature, a performance fund statement not of a uniform nature, as well as some additional information depending on how the information is filed. We are not introducing disclosure to protect the public, because the public will not be offered the shares of these companies; the public cannot invest in them.

We are to examine these companies, and there is no way to collect the information except by a one-by-one file search of apples, oranges, grapes and bananas. Yet it is suggested that we will obtain meaningful information and meaningful conclusions. Let us not make a joke of this matter. The hon. member for Don Valley indicated that there is not a solicitor worth his salt who would advise a company or an individual wanting to incorporate as a private company to come under federal jurisdiction. It would be much easier to go to Toronto or British Columbia. If one wishes to operate in one of the other provinces, one registers under the general provisions of the Companies Act of the province. This completely defeats the purpose of the disclosure set out in this bill: it can be ignored. All this measure will do is drive more and more companies away from registering under the federal act. The arguments of the hon. member for Don Valley are unanswerable in so far as the future effect is concerned in respect of registration of those companies under the minister's control. In other words, the minister will have disclosure on a diminishing basis.

There is no guarantee that the provinces will follow the federal lead. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it is a safe bet that the province of Ontario will not follow because this is a half-hearted—it is not even half-hearted but, rather, one-tenth hearted—attempt to have a substitute for a national securities commission. If the minister really wants to do something, let him get down to meaningful discussion with the provinces to establish on a co-operative basis a national securities commission. Then he will obtain all the disclosure he wants from the public companies. If he wants information of a certain kind from private companies which conduct business in excess of $250,000 in a year, let him come in with amendments to COLURA. If he wants statistical information, that is how to obtain it, because it is filed on a statistical basis and can be collected and collated by somebody who understands something about statistics. In that way meaningful conclusions can be reached.

Mr. Speaker, it is a joke to think that someone could go through the files of the directors of corporations, look at the various balance-sheets and profit and loss statements of 375 private companies and come up with meaningful conclusions. It is for this reason I have moved the amendment. To me this practice would be discriminatory of private companies operating under federal charter. I should like the minister to restore this measure to what it was. If the minister wishes to do something meaningful in respect of disclosure, I suggest that he proceed on a positive basis along the lines I have indicated with regard to either a national securities commission or amendments to COLURA.

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, as I said a moment ago, the whole question of greater public disclosure by private companies was dealt with exhaustively by this House at the second reading stage and during the 19 meetings of the Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, where the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) raised all the points he raised tonight, all of which were answered in the committee to the satisfaction of the committee.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Ho, ho!

Mr. Basford: During the committee proceedings the hon. member was unable to persuade either myself or many of the members of the committee concerning the merits of his case. We can state our case only so many times. Quite obviously the hon. member for Edmonton West, in spite of what his leader said, will not be persuaded that this is a good development. Quite obviously, also, the hon. member for Edmonton West was unable to convince members of the committee and will be unable to convince members of the House of the merits of his case.

The matter has been dealt with exhaustively and thoroughly on many occasions. I am sure that whatever I might say tonight would not persuade the hon. member for Edmonton West. All I can say is that many authoritative studies in Canada have shown the need to have companies of economic significance in this country disclose their affairs as provided for in Bill C-4. I believe the case in this regard was made out in the House this afternoon by members who have spoken. I also believe the case has been made out by the Porter Commission, by the joint committee of the House and Senate, by the task force on the structure of Canadian industry, by commentators and some financial analysts. So I believe the case is there. Obviously, we will not persuade the hon. member for Edmonton West that the case has been made.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On division.

Motion No. 8 (Mr. Lambert, Edmonton West) negatived.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs) moved:

That Bill C-4, an act to amend the Canada Corporations Act and other statutory provisions related to the subject matter of certain of those amendments, be amended by striking out line 1 on page 79 thereof and by substituting therefore the following:

"(c) sections 18 to 21, subsection (2) and paragraph (b) of subsection (3) of section 22, sections 24 to"

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is an amendment to the text of section 147 of the Canada Corporations Act which in error was dropped out of the text of the new section as printed in Bill C-4. The purpose of this amendment has been explained to the hon. member for Edmonton West. We are agreed on this matter. The reinsertion of the reference to section 22 of the act in section 147 will allow corporations incorporated under part II of the Canada Corporations Act to use as their legal designation either the English or the French form of their corporate name. This has been the law and, as I said, it was left out by inadvertence and error in reprinting. Allowing companies to do this is a matter of convenient practice and there is no reason to put an end to it, as the error would have us do. Therefore, we are reinserting the reference to section 22 so that companies may use their name in either French or English.

• (9:00 p.m.)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion No. 9 (Mr. Basford) agreed to.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs) moved:

That Bill C-4, an act to amend the Canada Corporations Act and other statutory provisions related to the subject matter of certain of those amendments, be amended by striking out lines 19 and 20 on page 96 thereof and by substituting therefor the following:

"(ii) letters patent issued under section 5A or 5D of the *Canada Corporations*".

He said: I have also explained this amendment to hon. members and I think there is agreement to it. However, I would like to explain the amendment, for the record. The amendment is to correct an oversight. This matter was left out of the bill when it was before the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs. I would like to explain briefly why we are proposing this amendment to clause 30 of the bill, which provides for a consequential amendment to the National Energy Board Act in its definition of "special act".

Section 25 (1) of the National Energy Board Act provides that "no person other than a company shall construct or operate a pipeline". Section 2C of the act in its present form defines a company as a person having authority under a special act to construct or operate pipelines. Clause 30 of Bill C-4 which is now before the House extends the definition of "special act" to include letters patent issued under section 5A of the Canada Corporations Act.

There is a possibility that the National Energy Board Act provisions as amended by Bill C-4 would be interpreted in such a way that a company now incorporated by special act of Parliament which chooses to take advantage of the new section 5D, and is continued under the Canada Corporations Act, might not qualify under section 25 (1) of the National Energy Board Act as a company authorized to construct or operate a pipeline. This, of course, is not at all what the legislation intends and in order to remove the possibility of misinterpretation I propose an amendment whereby the words "or 5D" be inserted in the definition of "special act" in clause 30 of Bill C-4. A company continued by letters patent under section 5D would then clearly be, by definition, a company within the meaning of the National Energy Board Act and there would be no question of its power to construct or operate a pipeline. This is a somewhat technical amendment which I am sure will have the concurrence of all members of the House.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion No. 10 (Mr. Basford) agreed to.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): This concludes the consideration of all motions at the report stage except deferred Motion No. 7.

Division

The question is now on Motion No. 7, moved by the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Burton), as follows:

That Bill C-4, an act to amend the Canada Corporations Act and other statutory provisions related to the subject matter of certain of those amendments, be amended by striking out in clause 20, paragraph (b) of subsection (3) on pages 62-63 and substituting the following:

"(b) A private company except as provided in paragraphs (c) and (d);

(c) section (b) does not apply to a private company that is a personal corporation within the meaning of section 68 of the Income Tax Act in the whole of the year in respect of which a financial statement is required by this Act;

(d) the minister having regard to the public interest may grant an exemption to a private company if revenue does not exceed ten million dollars in any period ending in or after the year in which this section comes into force, in respect of which a financial statement is required by this act to be prepared, or whose total assets on the last day of any such period do not exceed five million dollars".

• (9:10 p.m.)

The House divided on Motion No. 7 (Mr. Burton) which was negatived on the following division:

• (9:20 p.m.)

YEAS

Messrs:

Barnett,
Benjamin,
Burton,
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands),
Gilbert,
Gleave,
Harding,
Howard (Skeena),
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre),
Lewis,
MacInnis (Mrs.),
Orlikow,
Peters,
Rose,
Rowland,
Saltsman,
Skoberg,
Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley)—18.

NAYS

Messrs:

Alexander,
Alkenbrack,
Allmand,
Anderson,
Andras,
Badanai,
Basford,
Béchard,
Beer,
Bell,
Bigg,
Blouin,
Borrie,
Breau,
Caccia,
Carter,
Chappell,
Chrétien,
Clermont,
Comeau,
Crossman,
Crouse,
Cyr,
Danforth,
Danson,
Davis,
Deachman,
Deakon,
De Bané,
Dionne,
Douglas (Assiniboia),
Downey,
Forest,
Forget,
Forrestall,
Fortin,
Francis,
Gendron,
Gibson,
Gillespie,
Givens,
Godin,
Gray,
Grills,
Guay (St. Boniface),
Guilbault,
Hales,
Hees,
Hellyer,
Hogarth,
Hopkins,
Horner,
Kaplan,
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand),
Lambert (Edmonton West),
LeBlanc (Rimouski),
Lefebvre,
Legault,
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean),
Loiselle,
Macdonald (Rosedale),
MacEwan,
MacGuigan,
Mackasey,
MacLean,
MacRae,
McCleave,
McCutcheon,
McGrath,
McNulty,
McQuaid,
Mahoney,
Marceau,
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo),
Marshall,
Matte,
Morison,
Nielsen,
Noël,
O'Connell,
Otto,
Paproski,
Pelletier,
Penner,
Perrault,
Richardson,
Ritchie,
Roberts,
Robinson,
Rochon,
Rodrigue,
Rondeau,
Roy (Timmins),
Ryan,
Schumacher,
Serré,
Smerchanski,
Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi),
Smith (Saint-Jean),
Southam,
Stafford,
Stanfield,
Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay),
St. Pierre,
Sullivan,
Thomas (Maisonneuve),
Thomas (Moncton),
Trudel,
Turner (London East),
Wahn,
Walker,
Whelan,
Whiting,
Woolliams—114.

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard).]

• (9:30 p.m.)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost. When shall the bill be read a third time?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, should we not deal with the report stage first?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs) moved that Bill C-4, to amend the Canada Corporations Act and other statutory provisions related to the subject matter of certain of those amendments, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Basford moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I intend to say only a few words about those features of the bill of which we approve. There are a number of them. As I have al-

ready indicated, a great number of changes were made in this bill at the committee stage. These changes greatly improve the bill. In many sections the bill is barely recognizable. I am sure all members appreciate the greater flexibility in incorporating federal companies and the alternative method of amending companies which have a federal charter from this House. I think that is a big improvement.

With regard to disclosure, there is certainly a vast improvement on takeover bids. Those persons or organizations taking over a federal company now have to pay the same price to all shareholders of the company, not just the majority of shareholders, leaving the small shareholders high and dry with 10 per cent or 15 per cent and at the mercy of the takeover principle. I am having a tough time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Can we have quiet in the chamber.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): There are also improved conditions with regard to the solicitation of proxies. The changes in the act are more in keeping with the representations of the witnesses who appeared before the committee. The act is improved to that extent. My complaints about what the minister calls disclosure by private companies certainly were not argued during the 19 committee meetings. The minister was not there. Outside of two or three minor witnesses, everyone was against the features that the minister indicated. Quite frankly, some of them will be in a difficult position. They would get out of their federal registration if it were not for the difficulties with regard to taxation; there is no doubt about that. I say to the minister and to those members who are solicitors that clients will not be advised to incorporate private companies under federal charter.

There are many improvements in this bill. It was good that the bill was before the committee. We spent many long sessions on it. I think the committee members should express their appreciation to those members of the public, associations and companies who made many constructive suggestions which were accepted by the minister. This is an important bill and I am glad it received the treatment it did. But the minister retreated on one point. Frankly, we think he spoiled a good deal of the bill by the limits he imposed on disclosures of private companies. This bill is not so good because of that action.

Mr. Saltsman: Mr. Speaker, we find it very difficult to understand, with the takeover of Canada by international corporations, why a Corporations Act should be introduced that does not take this serious problem into consideration. We find this bill most unsatisfactory. The fact that it cleans up a few minor matters relating to takeover and proxy voting does not commend it, in light of the problems facing this country. We hoped the minister would do the same with the Corporations Act as was done with the Bank Act, namely, limit foreign ownership to 25 per cent and include a clause that would provide some exceptions.

• (9:40 p.m.)

We should change the assumption which has been made so far about foreign ownership and which has led us into our present situation, namely, that all foreign investment, no matter how it behaves, is good. That assumption should no longer be made. There may be cases where foreign investment would be valuable to Canada, and opportunities should be available for a case to be made; but from now on the assumption should be that there has been too much foreign investment and a halt must be called. If we do not do that, the question of disclosure by corporations, proxy voting, and so on, will become the least of our considerations. This is our objection to the bill as it stands.

There is another objection related to the disclosure provisions but, as I say, our principal objection is that the bill fails to deal with the serious problem of foreign ownership. One of the less desirable features of foreign ownership is that decisions are not made in this country; that laws made in other countries intrude into Canadian affairs, making it difficult to take certain actions. Then again, we do not know to what extent research is being carried out abroad at the expense of research which would otherwise be carried out here.

If the present situation continues to develop, this country will be deprived of the ingredients necessary to our continuance as a nation. We have recognized already the serious danger which exists in connection with specific fields such as banking and financial institutions generally, newspapers and television. It is important, while we are debating the Corporations Act, to point out the need for enacting similar provisions with regard to all corporations in Canada. Nobody wants to be faced every month or so with the need to

take emergency, fire brigade action, action of the kind which faced us when we had to step in to prevent control of the uranium industry passing out of Canadian hands. People are now talking about the development of a computer industry in Canada and there is a danger that this industry, too, may slip away from Canadian control, meaning that an essential ingredient of our future development may be lost. It seems to us it would be better to pass legislation which would inform foreign investors of the position this country takes with regard to certain industries and give the minister authority to prevent takeovers by foreign corporations.

There are some who talk about foreign ownership in Canada as a form of twentieth century imperialism, and the term is really not too far out. Foreign corporations are making familiar arguments about their civilizing influence, the role they play in increasing wealth and improving technology; they are carrying the modern-day white man's burden even when the people resent the kind of intrusion into their affairs which takes place when a foreign corporation moves in. The central issue for most societies, not only for Canadian society, is the extent to which they will be able to exercise control over their own future, the extent to which they will be able to make their own decisions.

Having said this about ownership, I should make it clear that a simple change of ownership would not in itself solve the problems facing Canada. Domestic ownership can be just as unthinking and unfeeling about the future of the country as foreign ownership. But at some stage, as a necessary first step we shall have to call a halt to this taking over of the country, if only to enable us to determine our own future. For these reasons we find this legislation to be inadequate. The meagre changes which have been introduced are not satisfactory, and the government has lost a great opportunity to take a stand for Canadian nationalism.

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to cover the ground that has been covered so adequately, by my hon. friend from Waterloo (Mr. Saltsman), but I wish to make a few comments as we approach the end of a lengthy debate on the overhaul of an important statute on the law books of Canada, the Canada Corporations Act. This measure took a long time to prepare. It involved the setting up of a task force which reported to the minister, a draft bill last session, reintroduction of the bill this session, lengthy committee hearings and, now, further debate at the report stage and third reading.

This entire process could be summed up in one phrase—the mountain laboured mightily and brought forth a mouse. There have been some minor, tinkering changes which in themselves are useful, but in terms of dealing with the fundamental problems involving corporate activity and the relationship of corporate bodies to the total economy and Canadian society as a whole, the bill is totally inadequate and I fail to see how I can support it on third reading.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the indication from hon. members opposite that we may get third reading this evening. Like them, I shall be brief. I wish to comment on the number of people who appeared before the Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs and, like the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) I appreciate very much the effort which many trade associations, professional groups and individuals made in preparing briefs and giving us the benefit of their particular knowledge.

As a result of the work of the committee a great many improvements have been made in this bill. It was a better bill when it came out of the committee than when it left the House after second reading. The members of the committee are to be commended. Company law is a dull and tedious subject and I appreciate very much the way in which the members of the committee stuck with the bill, dealt with the hearings, improved the measure and sent it back in a better form. The amendments which were made and accepted by me did, in my opinion, clarify many of the provisions and constituted a great improvement in the bill. I refer in particular to the provisions relating to proxies and proxy solicitations which had the effect of making the bill more uniform with company law in the various provinces. I believe this will be of great convenience to the business community.

The provisions of the original bill relating to notices of meetings and entitlement to vote at meetings have been redesigned to take into account the views expressed by the business community in the course of the hearings. A provision has been added which would allow the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission to impose, upon the recommendation of the min-

ister, security for the costs of an investigation in the case of a shareholder who applies for an investigation in circumstances where suspicion exists that the application might be frivolous or malicious. This was an amendment in which I believe the hon. member for Edmonton West concurred. I know it did not go as far as he would have wished, but I believe he will regard it as an improvement and as an additional safeguard in investigation and inspection procedures.

• (9:50 p.m.)

We have had in this House, in the committee and again today many debates on the question of corporate disclosure and whether or not private companies should disclose. My reading of what was said in the committee by members of the committee leads me to believe that there was a consensus reached by the committee that financial disclosure by companies of a certain size was important in our economic system, even in the case of privately incorporated companies.

I think it was agreed there was also a consensus that the law should provide for such disclosure, and this bill does that. As I have said before, there is a great amount of arbitrariness in any criterion or figure under which private companies should disclose, and amendments were made in the committee raising the threshold over which they have to disclose. As the hon. member for Edmonton West indicated, while he does not agree with the whole concept of disclosure, this at least was an improvement. I think those amendments accomplish our original purpose of having companies of economic significance make disclosure and at the same time they avoid some of the difficulties that the figures used in the bill when first introduced might have created.

I think this is significant, Mr. Speaker, after so many years in Canada during which the only disclosure required was that of public companies. While the members of the New Democratic Party are not satisfied with what the bill does, I think it is an important step forward. The bill opens the door to having corporate laws in Canada that would require public disclosure by private companies. As I indicated earlier today, this is something that many groups in the Canadian community have been advocating for many years. This important and significant development in Canadian corporate law, when it becomes effective will provide us as Canadians with a little better idea of what is going on in our economy, what important sectors of the economy are doing and how they are performing.

In conclusion, the amendments made by the committee, in my view, and I think in the view of many members, have considerably improved the bill originally presented to the House. I repeat my thanks to the committee for the job it has done, and also to the many members of the business community and legal fraternity who took the time, trouble and energy to appear before the committee to make their views known to us. Both I and my officials found those views extremely helpful.

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, what I wish to say at the third reading stage of this bill can be said in one or two sentences. I think it should not go unnoted that in the remarks of the minister he expressed no concern whatever about the increasing degree of foreign ownership in this country. I can only take it from the absence of any reference to this question that he is expressing the complete lack of interest of the government to which he belongs in this very important matter.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On division.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Shall I call it ten o'clock?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, perhaps you might call it ten o'clock, but before you do I wonder whether the acting House leader could tell us the business for Tuesday and Wednesday of next week? That implies that we know what it is for tomorrow and Monday.

Mr. Gray: Mr. Speaker, I should like to read into the record a statement of House business on behalf of my colleague, the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald). The business for the week commencing June 15 will be as follows: First of all, as the House knows, this coming Friday and the following Monday will be allotted days. The business

for Tuesday will be as follows: first, the Canada Labour (Standards) bill, Government Order No. 97; second, the Excise Tax Act, Government Order No. 94; third, the Canada Elections Act, Government Order No. 98. For Wednesday, if we make sufficient progress on the items I have read out we will proceed with the Canada Elections Act, Government Order No. 98. On Thursday we will have the final allotted day in this period.

Finally, I would call the attention of the House to a notice which will appear in the name of the House leader proposing an extension in the hours of sitting in the next two weeks, in the hope of completing the agenda of business by June 26.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

CANADA ASSISTANCE PLAN—REFUSAL OF BENEFITS TO MEMBERS OF B.C. BUILDING TRADE UNIONS

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, it is now nearly two months since I first drew to the attention of the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro) that welfare minister Gaglardi of British Columbia was refusing welfare payments to workers involved in labour disputes. On that occasion the minister replied that such action was contrary to the Canada Assistance Plan, and that if specific instances of refusal were found he would have "no choice but to take appropriate action in terms of reducing the moneys payable to that province under the Canada Assistance Plan".

A number of specific instances were found. I provided several to the minister myself and also copies of a directive sent out by welfare workers on provincial government stationery, stating that welfare payments would be refused to persons involved in a labour dispute. Since then the federal minister has travelled to British Columbia and has met with his counterpart, Mr. Gaglardi. The Vancouver *Sun* of June 8 headlined the result in bold type, "Munro, Gaglardi reach agreement" and in less bold explanation added, "But on what, not specific". The story related that the federal minister had explained that the Canada Assistance Plan provides that welfare should be issued solely on the basis of need. But Mr. Gaglardi said he was going to keep on doing exactly what he had been doing before the discussion with the federal minister. As one newsman put it, "The farther Mr. Gaglardi got from Mr. Munro's suite—and the closer he got to reporters—the more he reverted to his previous position".

I am now reliably informed that a directive has gone out from Mr. Gaglardi's office to all welfare officers in British Columbia that persons who can show they are completely destitute as a result of current labour disputes are entitled to food vouchers; that is provided there is no food in the house. The directive makes clear that under no circumstances are persons in this category to receive cash welfare payments. If this is so—and I am confident that I can secure copies of the directive within a few days—it means two things: first, the provincial minister of welfare is continuing to break the federal-provincial agreement; second, he is compounding the offence by creating second-class welfare recipients—those involved in a labour dispute.

As an example of what this means, a family of three on social assistance in British Columbia is ordinarily entitled to $165 and is allowed to have the same amount in the bank. Under Gaglardi's new regime, this family must show that it has no money and no food. They can then get $70 in food vouchers. They do not get the balance of the $165; that is, they do not get the $95 allowed for items other than food—rent, light, clothing and the rest. I think this is a shocking betrayal on the part of a welfare minister. I cannot believe that the federal minister agreed to this further flouting of the Canada Assistance Act. I hope he will not wait for me to collect the evidence of this latest piece of high-handed injustice on the part of a provincial minister. I hope he will demand immediate compliance with both the letter and the spirit of the act.

• (10:00 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, seven weeks have gone by in which families in British Columbia have been denied their rights under the law. During these weeks these families were without light or heat until the family allowance cheque arrived to relieve the worst of their miseries. I think it is time the Minister of National Health and Welfare called his counterpart's bluff and set a deadline by which, unless he lives up to the terms of the law, the provincial minister will find the federal funds cut off. I believe if steps were taken to get the facts to the people of British Columbia, the

federal minister would receive their full support and the deadline would be met. Highwaymen cannot be allowed to continue their careers indefinitely without danger not only to public well-being but to the respect in which governments are held in this country.

I hope the Minister of National Health and Welfare will stop the game of cat-and-mouse which Mr. Gaglardi is inviting him to play in this regard, and will take steps to call the bluff of one of the most bluffing provincial ministers of welfare we have ever had in the province of British Columbia.

Mr. Rosaire Gendron (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, in response to the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis) the minister indicated that if specific instances could be identified whereby recipients are denied benefits contrary to the terms of the Canada Assistance Plan, he would have no choice but to take appropriate action to ensure that the terms of the agreement are being honoured. I can only report on the minister's behalf that a number of specific examples have been received by the department. These have been referred to the officials of the British Columbia department of rehabilitation and social improvement with the request that the circumstances be investigated to determine whether the person is in fact in need of and eligible for assistance as provided in the province's agreement under the Canada Assistance Plan.

I can also report that the Minister of National Health and Welfare and Mr. Gaglardi, Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement for British Columbia, have discussed the welfare status of employees locked out in a labour dispute in relation to Canada Assistance Plan benefits, in order to resolve this matter. The minister will soon make a statement in the House on the results of his discussions.

BROADCASTING POLICY—SUGGESTED REFERENCE OF ACT TO COMMITTEE IN LIGHT OF TECHNOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENTS

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, before another long, hot summer approaches, when hopefully we will be involved in another session, something new will be in the living room of every Canadian home. I refer to a video recording apparatus which can tape from one's TV set programs from that set. If one wishes to watch one program and see what is on another channel, one will be able to do that, so complex and interesting is this apparatus. This information was given to us in the broadcasting committee and it prompted me to ask the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) whether, in light of this and other developments, he would consider examining the Broadcasting Act at the earliest possible opportunity to take into account all the technological changes in the communications industry.

The minister was good enough to say that because there were technological changes involved, he would examine the question and, I think, examine it seriously. So perhaps I am here under false pretences tonight, because I really do not quarrel with the answer he gave. I thought that if we discussed this matter we might have some fun on the "late show." Imagine the great benefit of having delayed video recordings so that one could play back the final game of the Stanley Cup series, for example, in the summer when one needs something to make one a little cooler. If you cannot love Lucy in the morning, you might be prepared to do so in the afternoon, or possibly in the evening. When I say "you" I am speaking in a very abstract sense, Mr. Speaker. If Soames Forsyte cannot win back the fair Irenee in the spring, could she fall for him in the summer?

We have all heard the story about the crazy Canadian who lost a bet on the time that the winning goal would be scored in the hockey game, and then lost twice that amount of money on the instant replay. Just think of the fabulous opportunity it would give that gentleman to lose even more money on delayed video recordings. As I say, the possibilities are rather awesome, and all of this will be before us before we reach another June 11. That prompted my question. I think it is one of the latest developments that affects broadcasting. Let me reminisce for a moment. We know that the Broadcasting Act which we now live under, or perhaps as some broadcasters would say, suffer under, was stimulated by the thrust of cable television. We have great technological changes coming about, not only the ones I have mentioned but those in the trade known as EVR and through Telsat, if the Minister of Communications (Mr. Kierans) is ever able to get it off the ground—and knowing what he does with our mail one is entitled to have some doubt about that.

Be that as it may, those two changes alone and other things that the communications industry has cooked up for us will provide a very exciting, immediate future for Canadi-

ans in illustrating the change which technology will bring about in the important field of communications. That was the purpose of my suggestion that it was time for the Secretary of State, his officials and the government to give serious consideration to studying the Broadcasting Act which we now have, in view of the things that will be here within a year, or three years, to see whether it belongs to the age of the dinosaur—even though it was only passed two years ago—or whether it can stand up to what we face in the very near future. In that friendly spirit, hopeful of consideration of my request by the Secretary of State, I appear on the "late show" tonight.

Mr. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, since the hon. member started with rather light remarks may I point out that they were not in the spirit of the act or of the regulations, because the programs he mentioned would not constitute 60 per cent Canadian content. I congratulate the hon. member for his concern for technological development. I agree that we should all follow these developments very closely. But I should also say that if the hon. member reread the Broadcasting Act and refreshed his memory on certain of its provisions, he would see that it is a very farsighted piece of legislation which encompasses not only the developments that had taken place at the time the act was adopted, but even some future developments—which might be called progress or which some people might call possibilities for further nuisance and noise pollution. The act envisages many developments that are not with us yet but that were known to be on the cards at that time. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member has not convinced me that we have to be very worried. I certainly do not think that we have to insist on revising the Broadcasting Act before June 26. Next fall, after having had in his livingroom for two months, this marvelous gadget that he heard of in the Standing Committee, he might come back even more convinced that we must change the act. Then we will all listen to him very intently. Until that happens, however, I think we can survive with the Broadcasting Act as it is.

• (10:10 p.m.)

IMMIGRATION—REPRESENTATION OF APPLICANTS BEFORE APPEAL BOARD BY UNQUALIFIED PERSONS

Mr. Hyl Chappell (Peel South): Mr. Speaker, during question period I asked the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen) the following question:

> In view of the fact that hundreds of would-be immigrants are being badly represented before the Immigration Appeal Board, by people who pretend to be but are not solicitors and are not capable, will the minister, as requested by the Immigration Appeal Board, amend the regulations to the act, to stop this abuse of so many would-be new citizens?

If an applicant for admission to Canada is refused by the departmental immigration officers, or if anyone else is ordered deported by these officers, he may have a hearing before an inquiry officer pursuant to the provisions of the Immigration Act. If he is still unsuccessful, he has the right of appeal to the Immigration Appeal Board pursuant to the Immigration Appeal Board Act. I shall read the relevant sections of the act, Mr. Speaker. Section 27(2) of the Immigration Act provides:

> the person concerned if he so desires and at his own expense shall have the right to obtain and to be represented by counsel at his hearing.

This is, of course, a hearing by a special inquiry officer as provided for by section 2 (b) of the regulations to the act. Departmental form 689 which is headed, "Notice concerning the rights to be represented by counsel at an immigration inquiry," contains the following paragraph:

> If you so desire and at your own expense, you have the right to retain, instruct and be represented by counsel. Counsel need not necessarily be a lawyer, but may be a friend, priest or minister of your church, or a representative of the Salvation Army—

The Immigration Appeal Board rules, section 11 (2), provides that:

> An appellant or respondent whether or not he appears in person before the board, has the right to be represented by counsel, at his own expense.

Section 2 (b) of the rules states:

> Counsel means any person authorized by the appellant or respondent to represent him before the board, and is not restricted to barristers, solicitors or advocates, and in the case of an appellant or respondent who by reason of age or physical or mental condition is unable to act or proceed on his own behalf or to authorize counsel to act for him, includes any person interested in his welfare.

So by departmental form in respect of a hearing before a special inquiry officer and by a rule—not parliamentary legislation—in respect of a hearing before the Immigration Appeal Board, the newcomer or deportee who wishes to stay in Canada, perhaps more than anything else in the world, can be represented by absolutely anyone. The ability, training,

integrity or character of this "anyone" does not in any way impair his capacity to solicit clients from and prey upon these newcomers who are not familiar with our languages or their rights in Canada.

In all other courts of record, that is to say, the county and district courts and the supreme courts of the provinces, the Supreme Court of Canada and all other federal courts of record, a party may appear for himself, but otherwise he must have legal counsel. Not even a law student is allowed to appear on his behalf. In England they are even stricter. The laywer must be a barrister. In Canada, although not compulsory, it is customary for barristers rather than solicitors to appear in court. The reason for this is that the matters under review are important. In a criminal matter, liberty or life is at stake. In a civil matter one's financial affairs, and thus one's fortune, are at stake. To protect their interests, the parties require a lawyer and the court usually requires the lawyer's assistance. Provincial laws made it an offence for anyone who is not a lawyer to practice law.

Obviously, provincial legislators feel it would be dangerous and wrong to allow those who are not qualified to act as a lawyer, just as it would be wrong to allow those who are not qualifed as doctors to carry out surgery. This feeling is so widely accepted that eight out of ten provinces have passed or are about to pass legal aid schemes so that everyone, regardless of his financial means, may have the lawyer of his choice. The exceptions are Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island. This is paid for by the people and, in Ontario, at least, is accepted by 100 per cent of the people.

Why is it different when it is an appeal before the Immigration Appeal Board? I expect someone thought that they were doing the subject of inquiry or detainee or deportee, as he may be called, a kindness in allowing him to bring a friend, priest or minister who would assist him without charge. These people do not act as counsel. They know better. They advise him to get a lawyer and they come along as a witness and friend.

Who is representing all these people at these special inquiries and before the Immigration Appeal Board? In hundreds of cases they are represented by people who pretend to be lawyers or "consultants" in immigration matters but are without any legal knowledge, training or ethics. They set themselves up as notary publics or travel agents and thus snare these new immigrants. They are usually assisted in getting this business by the fact that they can speak that person's language. They are not doing it as a friend, but for money—all they can get—often on a contingency basis and for more money than a lawyer would charge. No matter how bad may be their advice, their character or their behaviour before the board, there is no authority to discipline them. Unless the Law Society of the province in question takes on the job of policing these inquiries and charging these people for acting as lawyers, they continue with a free hand.

May I cite some examples. A travel agent has appeared on hundreds of appeals before the board. This gentleman pretends to be a lawyer and even takes written legal retainers and, of course, charges for these services. In another case a former employee of the department, now a travel agent, in an appearance before the board on behalf of someone ordered deported, argued that although he had refused him admission when he was an assessor in the department, he had changed his mind and would now give him something like another 14 points so he could be admitted. Obviously, when he was being paid to do so he reversed his view. This behaviour certainly would not impress the board or assist the cause of the appellant. In another case a former interpreter with the department set up in business as an immigration consultant and now appears before the appeal board, although earlier involved in a criminal charge in connection with applications for landing in Canada.

These are important matters. People can be refused admission although their families are here, or deported up to five years after acquiring landed status and in some cases after even a longer period, although their families would remain here in Canada. If anyone can appear as a lawyer for these people, why not let anyone appear as a lawyer in all courts? Why bother with the expense of training lawyers, when travel agents and notaries public can appear in an appeal court of record?

These people are methodically preying upon new arrivals in Canada who, because of their inability to speak English and lack of knowledge of our country, are easy victims. The public has provided funds so that they may be assured of a lawyer, and those who get the proper advice do have a lawyer. These people being allowed to appear before the Immigration Appeal Board make a mockery of this. Legal aid is even available for those who appear before the Immigration

Appeal Board from those two provinces that do not have legal aid schemes. Surely the minister should amend the departmental form and the rules, as requested by the Immigration Appeal Board, to provide that only legal counsel may appear. If he is not agreeable to going this far in respect of inquiries before the special inquiry officers, the minister should provide that there be an appearance only by legal counsel or a representative from the church or social agency.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gendron: Mr. Speaker, the minister has informed the hon. member, by an exchange of correspondence, that no decision has as yet been taken on a recommendation made by the Chairman of the Immigration Appeal Board that henceforth only legal counsel be allowed to appear on behalf of appellants before the Board.

There are very compelling arguments both for and against such a move. The hon. member will note that the present government policy is based upon the recommendation of the white paper issued by the Joint Parliamentary Committee that studied this problem very carefully over a prolonged period of time and recommended that the government should not be a party to any system which forces a person to retain legal counsel, possibly at considerable expense.

Furthermore, there is ample indication that many appellants very definitely prefer to be represented before the Board by relatives, friends, clergymen, members of the ethnic community or indeed Members of Parliament because the nature of their appeal to the Board is not based on legal grounds but rather on compassionate or humanitarian considerations in which area the Board does have authority to exercise discretion in its decisions. Many of these non-legal persons undertake such representation without a fee and at their own expense.

On the other side of the issue, there are good arguments that if only legal counsel were allowed to appear before the Board, a greater measure of control cound be exercised through the responsible professional associations in the matter of fees charged and the conduct of counsel from a standpoint of both ability and ethnics.

The minister agrees that some measure of control is necessary, since he has been made aware of some questionable practices on the part of certain non-legal representatives. However, the incidence of this seems to be so slight in relation to total numbers appearing before the Board that a measure depriving people of the possibility of being represented by whomever they choose might seem oversevere. He feels that a sufficient measure of control might be achieved by other regulatory measures which would at the same time not prevent an applicant from choosing his own representative.

The minister hopes that after consultation with the parties involved an equitable and practical solution for all concerned might be found shortly. He appreciates the hon. member's arguments and suggestions, which will certainly prove helpful in finding a better solution to the problem.

[*English*]

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, June 12, 1970

The House met at 11 a.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. BALDWIN—FAILURE TO TABLE LE DAIN COMMISSION INTERIM REPORT

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege which affects all members of this House. It is based on the failure of the government to table in the House and make public the interim report of the Le Dain Commission inquiring into the non-medical use of certain drugs. I have given Your Honour the required notice of this question of privilege.

Public inquiries or commissions come under the Inquiries Act and are established "to permit the Governor in Council to conduct inquiries into and concerning any matter connected with the good government of Canada or the conduct of any part of the public business thereof." There is nothing in the Act which authorizes the government to hide or conceal, even for a limited time, any report or reports made. In support of that I refer to the report of the commission on security. In that case the government saw fit to hold back part of the report but justified it on the ground that the national interest must prevail.

The very careful wording of the Act constitutes an irrebuttable presumption that the public interest of the people of Canada is involved. This and the fact that the Canadian taxpayer is footing the bill make it impossible for the government to maintain that any report of this or any commission, either interim or final, is the private property of the leaders of one political party to be suppressed or publication delayed to suit the partisan convenience and interest of such people. To do so is a contempt of the rights of this House.

Tradition, constitutional precedent, and the present practice in this country and in the United Kingdom where this type of inquiry originated all support the view that a report must be tabled in this House when it is received by the government.

Nor should the government or any minister be permitted to play games by pretending that the report has not been officially tendered to the government when in fact the contents have been made known.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baldwin: I draw Your Honour's attention to the fact that it is public knowledge today that the commissioner involved has made some serious charges in this regard. In the United Kingdom the present practice is to fix a time limit and publication must be made in accordance with this.

Finally, in this contemporary age of a great public interest, on an issue of such tremendous importance, and at a time when the right of the public to be fully and immediately informed is accepted as part of our democratic system, the failure of this government to be frank and honest and table the report constitutes a contempt and a breach of the privileges of the members of this House as trustees of the rights of all Canadians. This represents a conflict between the "just society" and the "secret society". I therefore move:

That the question of the failure of the government to immediately table the interim report of the commission of inquiry into the non-medical use of drugs be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections to consider and report back to this House whether such failure is a contempt and a breach of privilege and for a declaration as to the duty of government to table reports of commissions of inquiry forthwith after they have been received.

If Your Honour holds there is a prima facie case, I ask that this motion be put.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. As hon. members know, the ruling which the Chair has to make before the motion proposed by the hon. member can be put is whether there is a prima facie case of privilege. I have serious doubts about this. I recognize the importance of the matter raised by the hon. member. The hon. member referred to the fact that in another jurisdiction there is a rule which specifies a time limit within which certain reports have to be filed. There is no such rule in our Standing Orders. On the contrary, there is a procedure which is specified in the Standing Orders whereby members of this House can obtain production of documents or pro-

duction of papers, that is, by making such a motion. It may be that hon. members do not think this procedure should be followed in the present instance, but I do not believe there is a prima facie case of privilege and the motion should not be put.

• (11:10 a.m.)

[*Translation*]

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Sixth report of Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development—Mr. Watson.

[*English*]

NATIONAL RESOURCES AND PUBLIC WORKS

Eighth Report of Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works—Mr. Hopkins.

[*Editor's Note: For text of above reports, see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

TAXATION

CHANGES IN PROPOSALS FOR REFORM—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave under Standing Order 43 for the unanimous consent of the House to introduce a motion on a subject of urgent and pressing necessity.

At 6 p.m. yesterday the Minister without Portfolio from Windsor West tabled, pursuant to Standing Order 42(2), a letter from the Minister of Finance to the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs wherein the Minister of Finance announced changes in the personal income tax rates during the first five years after the coming into effect of the tax proposals so as to neutralize some of the tax increases incorporated in the white paper proposals. Included in the statement is the following sentence on page two:

> But I have said the white paper proposals are going to be changed and the changes will substantially reduce the amount available for prospective tax cuts.

Such an indefinite and confusing statement can only create uncertainty and bewilderment in the minds of the members of both parliamentary committees now hearing public testimony on the government's tax proposals and in the minds of the public making representations. Why discuss proposals and changes which no longer are relevant or which may have been materially altered? A clearcut statement of the changes decided upon is called for immediately along with the reasons for the changes. The responsibility rests with the government.

I therefore move, seconded by my hon. friend from Halifax-East Hants.

> That this House request the Minister of Finance to issue a concise statement with reasons for the changes decided upon in the white paper on tax changes, and that the same be communicated immediately to the parliamentary committee studying the said white paper.

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the motion proposed by the hon. member for Edmonton West under the terms of Standing Order 43. This motion can only be put by unanimous consent. The Chair will inquire whether there is such consent.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is no unanimity, and the motion cannot be put.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): This simply discloses their closed minds.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

DRUGS

REQUEST FOR TABLING OF LE DAIN COMMISSION INTERIM REPORT—POSSIBLE RESIGNATION OF CHAIRMAN

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether he will ensure that the interim report of the commission inquiring into the non-medical use of drugs is tabled in order to avoid forcing the resignation of the commission chairman in the middle of a very useful study? I call the attention of the Prime Minister to this statement attributed to the chairman:

> Failure to table the report before the House rises at the end of June could raise such serious questions about government intentions and the utility of the commission's work that the commission would no longer have an atmosphere of sufficient confidence in which to operate.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): If the report is tabled it will certainly not be

under any threat, either that of a question of privilege or the resignation of the chairman. I do not believe the chairman made such a threat in those words.

This being said, I can only repeat your own ruling, Mr. Speaker; it is usual for a government to take cognizance of a report before tabling it, and this is what the cabinet is now in the process of doing. There has been no indication of when we would table it and I cannot give any indication this morning.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, if the Prime Minister is not moved by the chairman's conception of the usefulness of inquiry in these circumstances, would he not be moved by the urgent desire of the public for this information and the urgent need for more research, as well as the dismay of all those concerned in this question, including the social agencies, at the delay in tabling this report, which is viewed as accruing to the detriment of many young Canadians and their families?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that the so-called dismay seems to be exaggerated. It is not unusual for government to take at least a week or more to consider the report of a royal commission. I repeat, this is what the government is in the process of doing. I have very high regard for the members of the commission and I understand their anxiety. They have published what is an interim report, and the government is considering it as such.

Mr. Stanfield: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the Prime Minister intending to indicate that the minister of health has had this report for only a week?

Mr. Trudeau: I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that it came to cabinet within a week or less, and it is only within that time that we have had the report in both languages.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary to the Prime Minister in connection with this matter. Bearing in mind that all parties in the House are perplexed, even divided, on this question and that we do not want to make an issue out of it or pose any threats, would the Prime Minister give serious consideration to the tabling of the report at an early date without comment, even before the government takes a position, so that the public can have the information contained in it?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, that is a very simple question. The answer is yes, we will give consideration to tabling it. The part of the question of privilege that we could not admit was that it asked for the report to be tabled immediately, and there is no rule here or anywhere else that a royal commission report should be tabled immediately.

Mr. Baldwin: Then there ought to be one.

Mr. Trudeau: Why don't you move one and then we will know what "immediately" is. However, I can give the House the assurance that the report will be tabled. May I just put it to the opposition parties that I hope they will make a statement of their position on the report as quickly as the government will.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

GOVERNMENT POLICY REGARDING FOREIGN OWNERSHIP OF METAL AND PETROLEUM REFINING INDUSTRIES

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister arising out of the information given by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce in answer to Question 1,304 put by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby, which information is to be found at page 7946 of *Hansard*. The information discloses that in the smelting and refining of metals foreign-dominated companies now control 84.9 per cent of the business, and in the petroleum refining industry foreign companies now control 99.9 per cent of the industry in Canada. In light of these facts, and in view of the fact that the Prime Minister intervened in the case of the uranium industry in order to preserve Canadian ownership, may I ask the Prime Minister whether the government intends to intervene in this matter, and has he any intention of making an announcement before the House adjourns regarding the government's policy on foreign ownership?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I believe I said some weeks ago that the government did have the intention of taking a position and stating its policy with regard to the whole problem of foreign investment. I indicated that this certainly would not be done, as I said then, within a matter of a couple of months but that it would take some time. This work is progressing. I think we will probably take the same position as the New Democratic Party in rejecting the extreme position submitted by Mr. Watkins in Winnipeg.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I have a supplementary question,

Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that we have been waiting for some time for the government to announce a policy arising out of the study being conducted for the cabinet by the Minister without Portfolio from Windsor West, may I ask the Prime Minister how soon we can expect some statement of policy from the government in light of the very serious information produced by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce in answer to the question to which I have referred?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I cannot answer concerning how soon. I would indicate that it would be a matter of several months. I can only give that as the minimum time it would take us to come to grips with this problem which is one that I do not think can be changed overnight even if we were to make our announcement of policy within a few weeks. Therefore I cannot encourage the hon. member to think that these statistics will be suddenly changed by any magic.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO ESTABLISH CANADA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister a question regarding a matter which the government has indicated as policy, namely, the implementation of the recommendation of the Watkins commission in respect of the setting up of a Canada Development Corporation which the government has been promising for years. May we expect legislation to set up the Canada Development Corporation during this session?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in view of the number of days remaining and the number of urgent matters on the Order Paper, obviously I cannot give such an undertaking. If I were sure that the House would agree to the policy decision taken by the government and pass it into law in a very short period, say a day—if we could have that undertaking by all parties I could give the undertaking asked for by the hon. member.

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

CANADIAN REPRESENTATION AT INTERNATIONAL SONG FESTIVAL IN ATHENS

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Secretary of State I will address my question to the Prime Minister.

According to reports, Renée Claude, a Montreal singer, who will represent Canada from July 10 to 12 in Athens, has proudly stated that if federalists are stupid enough to call on independentists, so much the worse for them. I would therefore ask the Prime Minister whether he could make representations to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, as usual, in order that we be represented in Athens by someone who sings about the unity of Canada instead of singing about its division.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to pass on to the CBC the representations the hon. member has just expressed.

I do not care any more than he does to be called an idiot, but I think that those who take pride in the fact that they are prostituting themselves to get the federal government's money are not in a better position than we are.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[*English*]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—INCREASE IN BANK PROFITS—SUGGESTED MEETING OF MINISTER OF FINANCE AND BANK PRESIDENTS

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance whose day it is to be in the House, but in his absence I shall direct it to the Prime Minister. In view of the 27.7 per cent increase in the profits of the chartered banks during the first six months of their fiscal year, would the Prime Minister suggest to the Minister of Finance that he might sit down with the presidents of these organizations with the least possible delay and suggest to them that, as this very large increase in profits comes on top of a very good year last year, the chartered banks can very well afford a substantial decrease in their interest rates which would greatly help to stimulate the economy and employment, both of which very much need stimulation at this time?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I will gladly transmit this suggestion to the Minister of Finance. We are very glad the Conservative party is taking this tough line with the banks.

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to ask the Prime Minister a supplementary. Does the Liberal government take an equally tough line?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Hees: Do you or do you not, or are you taking a soft line with your friends?

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CANADIAN PARTICIPATION IN PROPOSED CONFERENCE TO SETTLE VIET NAM WAR

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): My question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In reference to a statement by the Secretary General of the United Nations yesterday to the effect that Canada should be involved in an international conference to settle the Viet Nam war, can the minister advise whether recent discussions have been held on this important matter and whether the government has indicated its willingness to participate in the kind of conference envisaged by U Thant?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have kept the House informed on most of these initiatives, I think, and have indicated that we would be prepared to attend such a conference.

TAXATION

PUBLICATION OF CHANGES IN WHITE PAPER PROPOSALS—RAISING OF EXEMPTIONS

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, in the unscheduled absence of the Minister of Finance I will ask the Prime Minister whether the government has decided on certain changes in the proposals in the white paper on tax reform, as indicated in the minister's letter, and, if so, what are they and will they be published shortly to remove the uncertainty that is surrounding all of the discussions at the present time?

Hon. Herb Gray (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I can respond on behalf of the Minister of Finance who is presently attending the annual meeting of the Canadian Bankers Association in Vancouver.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baldwin: There's your liaison.

Mr. Gray: He would therefore be in a position to express any necessary remarks to them to ensure that they do their share in ensuring the economic stability of the country.

An hon. Member: It is a bit late, is it not?

Mr. Gray: I would like to respond further by saying that when the government is ready to announce modifications in the tax reform proposals it has put forward, it will do so in the usual manner and in due course.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Does the minister agree then that any discussions that may be held with the public at the present time are arguments in a vacuum because many of these points may become academic?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will appreciate that this is an argument.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): But it is so obvious.

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): My question is directed to the Minister without Portfolio speaking for the Minister of Finance. Since considerable changes have been indicated in the white paper in advance of the committee report and since there is an indication that the government may not be in a position to implement some of these measures before 1972, is it the intention of the government to at least bring in a measure to raise the exemptions before that time?

Mr. Gray: I have nothing to add to my previous answer which I think covers the point raised by the hon. member.

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. When the Minister without Portfolio talks to the Minister of Finance today, would he pass along my suggestion to him while he has all the boys together so we can perhaps get some action on bank rates by next Monday?

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): I have a supplementary question for the minister. How are members of the public who are concerned about the tax proposals to know what are still government proposals and what are not government proposals in light of the minister's comments in the letter? Has the Minister without Portfolio any way of indicating to the public what are still government proposals?

Mr. Gray: I am sure that the representations made by the public to the committee and to the government will continue to be very useful. When decisions are ready to be

announced, this will be done in the usual way.

Mr. Stanfield: Would the minister not agree that the representations being made to the committee are directed to certain proposals on the assumption that these are proposals of the government and that it is a travesty for the government to continue to invite these representations?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is obviously debate. I would not think the question is acceptable from a procedural standpoint.

PUBLIC WORKS

FUTURE USE OF VACATED KINGSTON LAKESHORE LAND

Mr. David Lewis (York South): I should like to direct a question either to the acting Minister of Transport or to his Parliamentary Secretary or perhaps to the Minister of Public Works. I do not know exactly where the responsibility lies. Is the minister aware of the fact that a couple of industries have vacated lakeshore land in Kingston and that there is now a question as to the ownership of that land and whether or not the land should be given to a private developer from Ottawa or be developed as a recreational facility? Further, if he is aware of this would the minister undertake to assert federal ownership of the land or interest in the land, and also assure the House that it will not be handed over to the private developer?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I know nothing about this matter but I thank the hon. member for drawing it to our attention. I shall talk to the Minister of Transport, and if there is Public Works responsibility in the matter we will see to that.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps the minister would be good enough to draw it to the attention of the Minister of Transport so that the whole thing may be dealt with.

Mr. Laing: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is what I said I would do.

[*Translation*]

THE MINISTRY

PUBLIC WORKS MINISTER'S OFFICE—EMPLOYMENT OF MR. JEAN-PAUL LEFEBVRE

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works.

[Mr. Gray.]

Can he tell the House if Mr. Jean-Paul Lefebvre, former Liberal member for Ahuntsic, is still a member of his staff, since his appointment as general director of the Liberal party of Canada, Quebec section?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member's question, in as much as it is in order, should be put on the order paper.

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REPRESENTATIONS BY UNITED STATES CONCERNING ENTRY INTO CANADA OF YOUNG MEN OF DRAFT AGE

Mr. P. V. Noble (Grey-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Have the United States authorities indicated to the government their concern respecting the entry into Canada of a significant number of young men of draft age?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): No, Mr. Speaker. I have had no representations of that kind and so far as I know none have been made to my department.

PERU—FURTHER ASSISTANCE TO EARTHQUAKE VICTIMS

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland-Colchester North): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. Is he in a position to indicate whether or not the government intends to reassess the degree of assistance it is going to give Peru in view of the information that has now been made available as to the extent of the disaster in that country?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the government made further decisions to extend additional aid to Peru. We are sending some tents and we are sending a cargo of flour. The government also has under consideration even further measures if these can be useful.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

COMPLIANCE OF MINISTERS WITH ROSTER SYSTEM

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Prime Minister about the roster system. Is he aware that 12 ministers are defying the roster system today with respect

to House attendance? Ten are not here and two are here when they should not be.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Bell: Is the Prime Minister also aware that a former minister, the hon. member for Trinity, has been in his place for three days in a row with a smile on his face?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Well, Mr. Speaker, I share the distress of the hon. member. As the hon. member may have noticed, the ministers who are present in some three cases are pinch-hitting as acting ministers for some who are away on urgent government business—in Paris, in Vancouver, and in other parts of the world. But if the hon. member looks around at his own ranks he will realize that toward the end of the session attendance tends to drop down a little bit.

Mr. Bell: Would the Prime Minister mind answering the latter part of my question about the possibility of the hon. member for Trinity going back into the cabinet now that his policy has been adopted?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I would not think that part of the question is in order.

Mr. Hees: A supplementary—

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

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

GOVERNMENT POSITION ON SALE OF PHANTOM JET PLANES TO ISRAEL

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of a press report which attributes certain remarks to him with regard to the sale of Phantom jets to Israel, could the minister tell the House what is the government's position on this matter?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in view of the publicity that this press report has been given I think it essential that I set the record straight. The report is inaccurate. I made no comment whatever—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Of course the minister can do this only on a point of order or question of privilege because of the well-established rule that members cannot ask ministers about statements made outside the House, but if there is agreement the minister might be allowed to make this statement. Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: On motions.

Mr. Sharp: Then, Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Since the question has been raised I think it is important, if the House will permit me, that I should put the record straight. It is causing some confusion.

I made no comment whatever in Rome concerning a possible sale of military aircraft by the United States to Israel, either at the NATO meeting or at any press conference, other than to say that this subject had not been discussed at the NATO meeting. We did, of course, discuss the Soviet build-up in the United Arab Republic, which is causing very grave concern. I expressed no opposition and I do not do so now to the possible sale of military aircraft to Israel, and it is most unfortunate if any such impression had been created by this inaccurate press report.

NATIONAL PARKS

SUPREME COURT DECISION UPHOLDING VALIDITY OF PERPETUAL LEASES—DISPOSITION OF BILL C-152

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Now that the minister and his officials have had an opportunity of studying at some length the decision of the Supreme Court as to the validity of certain types of leases in the national parks, would the minister advise whether it is the government's intention to go ahead with Bill C-152, or is it to be a dead letter as it should be?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, we have not yet completed our studies of the problem and of the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada. As soon as we have, I shall be glad to report to the House and to the hon. member.

[*English*]

GRAIN

EXPLANATION BY WHEAT BOARD OF DEMAND FOR REPAYMENT OF CASH ADVANCES—DRAWING OF 1970-71 ADVANCES

Mr. A. B. Douglas (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the minister in

charge of the Wheat Board. Will the minister take steps to see that letters of explanation and apology will be sent by the Canadian Wheat Board to those farmers who have been wrongfully sent letters threatening them with legal action and penalties with regard to outstanding balances on 1968-69 cash advances which in most cases are not in default?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I will take the specific suggestion of the hon. member under consideration and discuss it with the Wheat Board. I have discussed the matter with them, and they have made it clear in press releases that no farmer who has been delivering grain on quotas will be considered in default with regard to payments outstanding from the 1968-69 crop year. I will certainly be glad to check if that information is being adequately given to farmers who have received these notices.

Mr. Douglas (Assiniboia): Will the minister again recommend that prairie farmers be permitted to draw their full 1970-71 cash advances this fall, in line with the policy of last year, even though the previous year's cash advances may not be fully repaid?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, no decision has been taken on that as yet.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—RESTRAINT ON BANK PROFITS IN LINE WITH SIX PER CENT WAGE INCREASE GUIDELINE

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Prime Minister. In view of the wide discrepancy between the 27.7 per cent increase in profits announced by the banks and the 6 per cent wage increase policy of the government, is the government giving consideration to a policy of restraint on profits such as it is proposing on wages?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has obviously misunderstood the purpose of the whole operation. He is referring to percentages that have accrued over the past and it would obviously be easy to indicate many salaries and many wages which had gone up over the past by considerably more than 6 per cent—

An hon. Member: Twenty-seven per cent?

Mr. Trudeau: Yes. Some unions are asking for 30 per cent and 40 per cent, as the hon. member knows—

[Mr. Douglas (Assinboia).]

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: So the question is really as to the future and the controlling of inflation. The hon. member should remember that the guidelines regarding profits were laid down last February, I believe it was, when the—

An hon. Member: For banks?

Mr. Trudeau: —banks and other members of the professional financial community agreed to certain guidelines, and that they would not raise their prices or charges as much as their costs. This is obviously intended to squeeze their profits. Once again these voluntary approaches can only work if we have the co-operation not only of all members of the community but the active support of all members of this House—that is, if they are really serious in wanting to fight inflation.

Mr. Orlikow: In view of the fact that the 27.7 per cent increase in the first six months of this year for the banks comes on top of a 25.5 per cent increase last year, or an increase of 53 per cent in two years, does the Prime Minister not think that the supposed guidelines should be looked at again to see if they really mean anything in terms of restraint on profits such as is proposed for wages?

Mr. Trudeau: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The guidelines proposed by the Prices and Incomes Commission are being looked at by that commission. That is why from period to period they have come up with new proposals and the government thus far has always supported them.

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): A supplementary question to the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker. Does the Prime Minister not agree that the fight against inflation would be greatly helped if he would screw up his courage, meet with top labour leaders of this country and discuss with them the important economic problems facing this country—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hr. Hees: —instead of being afraid of meeting with a rebuff from the labour leaders?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps I should remind hon. members that when the Chair calls for order, that is an invitation for hon. members to observe the request of the Chair. I believe the hon. member for York South wishes to ask a supplementary question.

Mr. Hees: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I apologize. There was so much noise coming from the other side of the House that I could not hear you. I therefore apologize, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. David Lewis (York South): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I should like the Prime Minister to explain to the House either now or at some other time why the working people of Canada, some of whom are making incomes that are fairly low, and the unions representing them should agree to a 6 per cent limit on increases in their incomes—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: —when the banks have enjoyed much larger—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps I should have intervened earlier in this debate. We have clearly entered the field of debate. This is the question period. I think that the last two or three questions were more in the realm of argument than in the field of questions. I think I ought to allow the hon. member for Lisgar to ask his question.

Mr. Lewis: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. With great respect, I realize that the time is passing but I do not think we were debating. The government has enunciated a policy. Something has happened in the economy which is normally—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That is not a point of order. The hon. member is debating. He first debated, in my view, the question and now he is attempting to debate the ruling of the Chair. I think we ought to call on the hon. member for Lisgar.

GRAIN

BARLEY—AMOUNT OF DELIVERIES TO THUNDER BAY UNDER ADDITIONAL QUOTA

Mr. George Muir (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister without Portfolio in charge of the Wheat Board. Would the minister inform the House how much barley the Wheat Board hopes to receive for delivery to Thunder Bay under the extra quotas now in force in Manitoba and Saskatchewan for that grain?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, the Wheat Board has very substantial shipments of barley to move. I do not have precise figures before me, but they are in the order of 20 million bushels or more which are required in the period. In the last week on which I have seen reports, 5.2 million bushels came in.

WHEAT—ESTIMATE OF SEEDED ACREAGE—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON REDUCTION UNDER LIFT PROGRAM

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister without Portfolio. In view of the fact that the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool crop report shows plantings of approximately 8 million acres in the province as of June 5, as well as seeded acreage for other crops, can the minister inform the House whether his department has had surveys conducted of the acreage sown to wheat in the three western provinces to determine if it is in line with the Lift program?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, the simple answer is that no comprehensive surveys of any great accuracy have been made. I should caution the hon. member against relying too heavily upon the figures to which he referred since I believe the analysis is very limited and in percentage form. The hon. member, I think, should not put money on those figures.

Mr. Gleave: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate very much the advice the minister gave me. I will therefore ask him if he will take an opportunity before the end of the present session to make a statement on motions to indicate to the House the acreage reduction under the Lift program and the probable amount of money that therefore will be disbursed to the farmers in the western region?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I will be very glad to do so if the figures available by that time are sufficiently accurate to allow anything very substantial to be said.

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Labour. Would the minister take it upon himself to advise that economic apologist, Dr. John Young, that he cannot put the blame for unemployment and other problems on the backs of labour but that he should place it on a bumbling government where it belongs?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East.

Inquiries of the Ministry

NATIONAL DEFENCE

REPAIR FACILITIES FOR MARITIME PATROL AIRCRAFT

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Supply and Services. Would the minister indicate whether or not any active negotiations are being carried on today or this week in connection with the overhaul and maintenance programs relating to Tracker and Argus aircraft and whether or not there is any future possibility of employment for the four or five hundred men involved?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, the department is now in active discussions with a number of companies concerning the repair and overhaul of Tracker and Argus aircraft.

INDUSTRY

PROPOSED CLOSING OF CANADIAN SUBSIDIARY BY SKIL CORPORATION OF CHICAGO

Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Acting Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce arising out of an earlier exchange on foreign ownership. Is the minister aware that another foreign-owned company, Skil Corporation of Chicago, is planning to phase out its west coast subsidiary, Power Machinery, which will entail the loss of 125 jobs? Also, will the minister undertake to investigate this matter thoroughly to see what can be done?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Acting Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, the officials of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce have been in touch with company officials about this matter and are pursuing it with them. However, the company in question has indicated that no firm decision to close has in fact been made.

[*Translation*]

THE CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

QUEBEC—POWER TO AMEND SECTION 128 OF THE BRITISH NORTH AMERICA ACT

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

Did the government of Quebec submit a request to him concerning an amendment to the constitution on the oath of allegiance to Her Gracious Majesty Queen Elizabeth?

[Mr. Speaker.]

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any request having been made to my office or the office of the Minister of Justice. If such a request had been made, I would advise the member, but as far as I know, such is not the case.

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

In view of the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition in the Quebec legislature on the need for co-operation on the part of the federal government to achieve such a change, would the Prime Minister say whether he shares the opinion expressed in the said statement?

Mr. Speaker: The question asked by the hon. member is essentially the same as the one put yesterday by the hon. member for Shefford, I think. He is inviting the Prime Minister to express a legal opinion. I suggest that the question, in such terms, is not in order.

Mr. Pierre De Bané (Matane): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary.

I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether the matter of the oath of allegiance is being considered by the Department of Justice, and as for as it comes under the jurisdiction of the federal government, whether the latter will gladly extend its full co-operation in order to solve a problem which, in my opinion, does not prevent an elected member from fulfilling his duties.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member expresses an opinion, and in that sense, his question is out of order. However, I wish to mention that the first part of the question is in order—

Mr. De Bané: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Would the hon. member please resume his seat.

To that extent, the Prime Minister would perhaps like to answer.

Mr. Trudeau: As for the first part of the question, Mr. Speaker, I must say that I am not aware that such a proposed change is considered by the Minister of Justice. I will inquire in this connection, but I do not think that I will have to tell the House otherwise.

[*English*]

NATIONAL PARKS

BONNE BAY, NFLD.—EFFECT OF PROVINCIAL INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT PLAN ON ESTABLISHMENT

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to my genial friend, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Would he indicate whether he is considering the white paper proposal by the province of Newfoundland to approve an integrated development plan which would superimpose the establishment of a park in the Bonne Bay area?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I am not concerned by the problem of the Newfoundland government's white paper. My problem deals with the enforcement of the National Parks Act and I have clearly stated in the House—and I have also advised the Newfoundland government—that we will be ready to act when it is willing to surrender the land we need, subject to the usual regulations providing that there must be no mining or oil operations on such land.

[*English*]

Mr. Marshall: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister indicate if the province has threatened to withdraw from signing the agreement for the Bonne Bay Park if the federal government would not accept the integrated development plan in the white paper?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: No, Mr. Speaker, they did not make any threat concerning the proposal for the setting up of a national park.

[*English*]

URBAN AFFAIRS

POSITION OF QUEBEC AND OTHER PROVINCES ON ESTABLISHMENT OF FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL-MUNICIPAL COUNCIL

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister without Portfolio in charge of housing. It has to do with his recent announcement indicating that the government is interested in urban councils. I wonder whether the reversal by Mr. Bourassa of Mr. Tessier's indication that he found nothing wrong and as a matter of fact encouraged municipalities to deal directly with the federal government has been jeopardized as a result of Mr. Bourassa's reversal?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): I am not aware of any reversal, Mr. Speaker. It has been indicated to me that Mr. Bourassa made a statement yesterday afternoon to the effect that he has no objection to municipalities discussing matters directly with the federal government. He agrees with the formation of a tri-level council. He reiterated the position, with which I thoroughly agree, that Quebec will not give up jurisdiction over municipalities. In any event, that was never the intention of our suggestion.

Mr. Alexander: A supplementary question. Can the minister advise whether he has received approval from any of the provinces of the plan submitted by the government? If not, does he intend to hold meetings with their representatives as soon as possible in order to acquire the required approval?

Mr. Andras: As has been indicated, I have had a specific agreement from Mr. Tessier. Prior to that I had some rather casual conversations, not in the precise form that I suggested the other evening and I intend to address myself to a discussion with my counterparts in the provinces as quickly as possible.

POLLUTION

EFFECT OF SPRAYING OF ARSENIC ON HORSESHOE BAY FERRY DOCK

Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey): I intended to address my question to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry but in his absence I will direct it to his Parliamentary Secretary. It is in connection with complaints emanating from the lower mainland of British Columbia regarding the reported spraying of arsenic on the B.C. Ferries dock at Horseshoe Bay and the danger to the water and fish in that area. Can the Parliamentary Secretary tell the House what the situation is and whether the government is interested in it?

Mr. E. F. Whelan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that we are aware of it. We are checking to see what effect this is having on shellfish in the area. I understand the spraying is done to keep the termites from eating the dock or something of that nature.

Mr. Alkenbrack: They are also in the Liberal party.

Inquiries of the Ministry

HARBOURS

COME-BY-CHANCE, NFLD.—BENEFITS TO PROVINCE UNDER FEDERAL AGREEMENT TO BUILD WHARF

Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West): My question is directed to the Minister of Public Works. When I directed this question to the Minister of Transport on June 9 he suggested that I direct it to the Minister of Public Works when he was next in the House. My question concerned a statement by an official of the Department of Transport to the effect that the federal government agreement to build a $16 million wharf to serve the planned refinery at Come-By-Chance, Newfoundland, is contingent on certain additional benefits guaranteeing more revenue for the province of Newfoundland. What are the additional benefits?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, the government of Canada had undertaken an offer to build the wharf at Come-By-Chance. It was subject to a clarification in the agreement between the federal government and the province with respect to their ability to repay the investment. The cost of the wharf is recoverable. At the present time there are continuing discussions between officials of the government of Canada, the provincial government and the company with a view to seeing whether we can get this matter straightened out and the work undertaken.

Mr. Carter: Can the minister indicate if the signing of the agreement will be contingent on Newfoundland getting additional benefits other than those already agreed to by the company and the province?

Mr. Laing: What we are interested in, Mr. Speaker, is a financial provision so that the considerable amount of money involved, probably $16 million, will be returned to the government.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We have just about run out of time. Perhaps the House will allow the hon. member for Broadview to ask a question. He has been trying to do so for a few days.

PENITENTIARIES

REQUEST FOR PUBLIC INQUIRY INTO CONDITIONS

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): My question is directed to the Solicitor General. Last Friday I asked the Solicitor General to have a public inquiry or set up a committee to investigate the conditions in penitentiaries across the country, especially the high suicide rate at the present time in some of our penitentiaries. The minister said he would consider this and make a decision. Has the Solicitor General made a decision with regard to this very important problem?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, it is not our present intention to set up any such commission.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Speaker: Is the President of the Privy Council rising on a point of order?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Yes, Mr. Speaker. There have been discussions among the representatives of the parties. I think there is general agreement to an order that for the purpose of today's debate the initial spokesmen in each group should be allowed 20 minutes and the remaining speakers allowed 15 minutes. If agreeable, perhaps this could be made an order of the House.

Mr. Alexander: There is agreement on this side of the House with respect to the proposal made by the Government House Leader.

Mr. Speaker: Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: It is so ordered.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 58—HOUSING—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON GOVERNMENT ACTION TO INCREASE CONSTRUCTION, ETC.

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West) moved:

This House declares that the government must, in view of the disastrous decline in residential housing construction, announce before the summer recess new measures to stimulate a significant expansion in the number of housing units being built, to reduce the total cost of individual homes for middle and low-income Canadians, and to reduce or eliminate unemployment in the construction trades.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I suppose many members wonder why this motion has been placed before the House and the people of

Canada. Your Honour has just read the motion, thus giving an indication of what it is about. It is only necessary to read a few newspaper editorials to see the publicity being given to the gathering momentum about the lack of initiative by the government with respect to housing starts. I wish to put on the record some statements, particularly from Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. I quote from an article which appeared in the May 9, 1970, issue of the Hamilton *Spectator*. This article quotes Albert Fish, past president of the Ontario Association of Real Estate Board and reads in part as follows:

> Canadian cities are heading into the worst housing crisis since the end of the Second World War and it is becoming impossible for nine out of ten city families to own a home, a housing expert said yesterday.

An article which appeared in the June 10, 1970, issue of the *Globe and Mail*, emphasizing the gravity of the situation is headlined, "Housing Starts in Ontario off 44 per cent". The article reads in part:

> Urban housing starts in Ontario totalled 14,114 in the first five months of this year, 44 per cent fewer than in the corresponding period last year, preliminary figures from Central Mortgage and Housing Corp. show.

What is even more significant, this article, by way of Dow Jones Service, reads:

> Housing starts in urban centres totalled 8,392 dwelling units in May, off 50.1 per cent from a year earlier—

I now refer to an article which appeared in the June 2, 1970, issue of the Ottawa *Journal*. This article quotes Mr. Johnson, president of the National Housebuilders Association, as follows:

• (12 noon)

> We may be seeing a real housing shortage by next spring. Rising costs have priced homes out of the reach of over 80 per cent of Canada's wage-earners.

He goes on to state:

> The federal government raises sales taxes on construction materials, then runs around like a chicken with its head cut off trying to lower housing costs.

What is the situation in Hamilton? I quote from an article which appeared in the Hamilton *Spectator* of June 4. The headline reads, "Multiple Dwellings Hit Hardest—20 per cent Drop in House Building". It begins:

> Housebuilding in Hamilton has dropped 20 per cent so far this year compared with the first five months of last year.

Any forecast of things to come is, at best, nothing more than an educated guess, and two of the leading educated guessers are Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation and the Economic Council of Canada. Both predict a decade of tremendous demand for housing accommodation, great and conflicting pressures in providing it in the urban environment of the seventies, and exceedingly keen competition for the means to finance what is needed. In mid-January, Mr. Herbert Hignett, president of CMHC said that 2,500,000 dwellings must be produced in Canada during the seventies—1,100,000 by 1975 and 1,400,000 by 1980. He set a price tag of about $4 billion on this construction.

According to the Economic Council of Canada, of ten highly-industrialized nations Canada ranks only eighth in the percentage of population living in urban areas. In 1961, this proportion was 62 per cent as compared with Britain, in first place, with 77 per cent. But Canada was way out in front when it came to the average annual percentage of growth of urban population. It topped the other nine nations with an annual rate almost twice that of the next in line—4.1 per cent as compared with second place United States with 2.7 per cent. Fortunately or unfortunately, depending upon how one views urban development, this pre-eminent rate continues. Canada's strong increase in population growth and rate of urbanization is likely to continue until 1980 at least.

The Economic Council forecasts a population of about 26 million by 1980, a growth since 1965 of 28 per cent. This is the highest growth rate for that 15-year period of seven leading countries including Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Sweden and the United States. The council estimates that of this 1980 population of 26 million, 20 million will reside in urban areas. Perhaps of more significance is the estimate that while all urban areas will grow immensely, those which are already the largest will grow most rapidly and disproportionately. With millions of new urban dwellers being pushed into existing facilities, it is not hard to perceive the outlines of some of the problems which will be created.

I noticed in the Ottawa *Journal* of April 13, 1970, an article by James Nelson under the heading, "Five Million Families Push Housing Needs". It states in part:

> About the middle of this year, the number of families in Canada should reach 5,000,000, twice what it was in 1940 and 1,000,000 more than in 1959.
>
> The figure is important in projecting sales in all lines of business, but particularly in housing. Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation estimates that the current 190,000 a year growth in demand for accommodation will jump nearly 230,000 in 1971-76.

Request for Housing Statement

The unfortunate fact about today's development picture is that almost all single-family dwellings are designed for the taste and the purse of an affluent society. Yet the urgent need is not among the affluent; it is largely among the group which lies between the poverty line as defined by the Canadian Welfare Council, around $3,000 per year, and the poverty line as set out by the Canadian Labour Congress—$10,000 or $11,000. The need is greatest in the twilight zone of our affluent society, among those without economic elbow-room who are prisoners of the city.

I should like to put on record what the Canadian Welfare Council said in its statement of April 26, 1970. It read from the first page as follows:

> The committee views the current housing situation as continuing to be an emergency for people of low-income and a serious problem for middle-income Canadians. In terms of rent levels, vacancy rates, and mortgage interest rates, it is obvious that conditions have deteriorated since the conference was held in 1968.

It is against this challenge to produce less expensive, relevant housing that the government's taxation policies in general and the white paper proposals in particular must be measured. Against this background, Mr. Speaker, you will be keenly aware of one of the fundamental shortcomings of the government white paper: it covers only part of the tax field. No one has any idea of government policy on consumption and sales taxes. In considering the impact of new tax programs on the housing industry it is surely of prime importance for us to know whether the government is now willing to contemplate any relief from the onerous 11 per cent sales tax on building materials. This demand has been made so often that we proponents of it must be sounding somewhat like a broken record. But it still remains a valid demand.

There are a number of proposals in the white paper which will generate great frustration and confusion for home owners and for people in the real estate business. The major one is, of course, the proposal to apply capital gains tax to owner-occupied homes. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson), as I understand it, wants to exclude most Canadian homes from capital gains tax, but unfortunately the white paper does not say just how this is to be achieved, nor does there seem to be any practical and simple method of accomplishing this end. Not only would homes be tied up in endless red tape, but it is noticed there are major discriminatory features attached to this proposal.

[Mr. Alexander.]

For example, a home owner would be exempted from tax if he moved from one area of Canada to another in connection with a change of work. On the other hand, no consideration is given for any other reason for selling a house and buying another—expanding family needs, for example. The value of a home will be fixed on valuation day. How does a home owner ensure that valuation is made in a way which will give him some protection? The Minister of Finance says, "Put your own value on it and we will take your word." But he says nothing about what is likely to happen when a dispute arises with the government over the size of the capital gain.

The minister has indicated that the Department of National Revenue will accept any reasonable value which a home owner may establish, for example, by looking at newspaper advertisements or talking to neighbours. I can see the courts and lawyers having a field day with this idea. Further, will Canadians have the foresight to open new books of account? Will they have proof of every home improvement valued at more than $150 so that costs can be applied against the capital gains they realize when selling? Now we hear that the $1,150 annual exemption on individual homes may not be high enough to exempt most homes from capital gains tax.

This is the kind of frustration which Canadians will face daily if the white paper is implemented as it stands. But having regard to the major housing problems likely to arise in the next ten years, there are much more fundamental objections to certain other proposals in the white paper. Perhaps the most serious is the proposed abolition of the two-level system of taxing companies without the substitution of an alternative. This would strike a severe blow at the smaller construction firms which are so important to our housing program. The incentive to plough back investment so as to expand production would be removed as far as the small firms are concerned. The much-needed growth in our productive capacity would be threatened and, in the face of continuing demand, prices could only rise.

I realize that the present lower rate applies even to huge corporations and the two-level system was often open to abuse. But it is unacceptable to me that the system should be abolished without presenting some offsetting provision to help overcome a capital market bias against smaller businesses. Higher taxes on the major elements of the

housing market can only add to the cost of housing, and the less generous depreciation provisions for apartment building will, as the Montreal Real Estate Board recently pointed out, drive rents up faster. While taxation policy alone will not solve our housing problems, it is important that we should not increase the obstacles through our tax policies. Yet that is just what the 11 per cent sales tax on building materials and the white paper proposals seem to be doing. Little wonder, then, that many are questioning the government's intention to be more effective in making homes available and in encouraging home ownership. At this stage the government should face up to realities and release from the proposals the personal, permanent residences of Canadians.

• (12:10 p.m.)

However, what disturbs me even more is that this situation is a prime example of what this government has been doing. It has shown a lack of co-ordination in the federal approach to the urban environment, particularly to the housing problem. The tax policy is merely the most visible symptom of a general failure to examine and to co-ordinate all policies as they affect housing. There is no over-all design; there are simply unrelated policies. What particularly concerns me and many members of the House is that when the minister appeared before the Committee on Health and Welfare during the committee's examination of his department's estimates, he said the projected housing figure for 1970 was 180,000. We know the Economic Council of Canada has indicated we must have at least 200,000 units per year. Let me just read once more the statement of the Canadian Welfare Council, which goes even further than this. They say:

> However, in view of CMHC's own statement that "a program as high even as 250,000 units per year would not create a sufficient stock within five years to bring an end to overcrowding, doubling up, and the continued use of deficient dwellings", the committee questions the degree to which this can be considered an achievement. The committee is also alarmed that in the first quarter of 1970, an annual rate of only 160,000 starts was maintained.

I remember questioning the minister with regard to what his position was on the government's anti-inflationary policy, which had certainly been increasing unemployment, the figure now being almost 7 per cent. The minister said this was just a regrettable side-effect of the government's policy and that he would have to go along with it. But when wearing his other hat he said the government was interested in seeing that it reached the target of one million homes announced in the Throne Speech. I also asked the minister, with regard to the government's anti-inflationary policies, why the private sector was going to become involved in mortgages only to the extent of about 10 to 15 per cent of its involvement last year. I quote from the minutes of the committee on this point:

> Mr. Alexander: Is there any indication why their funding would be down?
>
> Mr. Andras: Yes, there is. I think I would come back to the point that they plead, and with some justification, I think—they plead the effect of anti-inflationary measures, the tight money fiscal policy of the government to combat inflation.

So there you have it, Mr. Speaker. The government is being blamed because of its anti-inflationary policies which have not only increased unemployment in this country but have made sure that Canadians will not have the required number of housing units. In regard to unemployment, we must bear in mind the number employed in the housing industry today compared with previous times. I have figures that compare 1969 with 1970. They show that in January, 1969, there were 431,000 employed in the construction industry, and that in the same month of 1970 there were only 416,000—a decrease of 15,000, or 3 per cent. In February, 1969, there were 419,000, compared with February, 1970, when there were 391,000—a decrease of 28,000, or 6 per cent. In March, 1969, there were 416,000 in the construction industry, compared with 406,000 a year later—a decrease of 10,000, or 2½ per cent. In April, 1969, there were 431,000, compared with 426,000 in April, 1970—a decrease of 2½ per cent.

In other words, there are a further 10,000 people without work in the construction industry. Perhaps they are working somewhere else, but the point is that as a result of government policy we have in 1970 an unemployment rate of 21.9 per cent in the construction industry, compared with 18.2 per cent last year. This represents an increase this year of 3.7 per cent. I cannot understand the government's thinking in this regard. We are living in an urban-oriented society and housing will unquestionably play a critical role in urban life. Unless the government realizes this fact and appreciates that some priorities must be set in terms of housing, the present situation, which has reached critical proportions since the last war, will be further aggravated.

We have on several occasions indicated that alternatives should be considered by this government. I was pleased to note that the minister indicated approval of one of these alternatives on returning from his trip to Europe, namely, that there is some acceptability of the concept of building societies. The other day I asked the Minister of Finance whether the government would review its policy in this regard, but the minister adopted a kind of smart aleck attitude and said that anybody could start a building society. What he did not say was that in order for a building society to become a reality, there would have to be some tax incentives.

I hope the minister will take this question to his colleagues again for consideration. As long as interest rates continue to rise to the present level, which is around 10½ per cent, more money must be brought into the housing field. I asked the minister about this matter the last time the committee considered his department's estimates, and he said that CMHC could not put more money into housing. I asked him about the billions of dollars in the pension funds, and he said there were some problems with the provinces in this regard. Although that may be true, I should like to know whether the minister is making any moves to acquire some of this money for housing purposes. I think the minister, in all fairness, would agree that one practical solution to the housing problem these days would be the creation of building societies.

Another proposal we have made to the minister is the removal of the 11 per cent sales tax on building materials, a tax that has a very real effect at this time. I do not know why the minister has not indicated whether this is feasible at the present time. I understand that it would take $600 to $700 off the price of a house, at the very minimum. Another alternative to present government policy is to control land prices and to limit speculation by having, not so much land banks but by acquiring land that is serviced. I see no possibility of our being able to help those in the lower-income bracket, much less people in the middle-income bracket, if the cost of land continues to escalate.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member's time has expired, but he may continue with the agreement of the House.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Alexander: Mr. Speaker, I will not take up much more time since there are others who would like to condemn the government for its inhumane attitude toward the housing situation confronting many Canadians, a situation that will continue to exist with present government policy. All I can say is that we in the opposition have every reason to put before the House and before Canadians the motion I have moved. I hope the government will give housing a high priority and that it will accept some of the alternatives put forward by the opposition in order to alleviate the housing shortage. I was pleased to hear the minister indicate the other day that he is all for urban councils. I was also pleased to note that it was this party which initiated this idea. We stated that unless we had three-level conferences there would be no way of solving the problems of urban development, one of which is housing.

I close by saying that urban renewal is still a fact of life. It is a fact of life because, even though the freeze is on, urban decay continues. I hope the government is conducting some research into this matter, rather than just imposing a freeze as part of government fiscal policy. In view of the heartache, frustration and alienation caused by the policies of the government, it is beyond my comprehension how the government could think that such policies could find acceptance. I hope that before the end of this year the government will introduce a firm policy defining what urban renewal means, particularly in terms of rehabilitation, and will offer some guidelines in this regard.

• (12:20 p.m.)

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, the members of the New Democratic Party completely agree with the substance of the motion brought forward by the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander), to the effect that there has been a serious decline in housing in the first five months of this year and that the minister should take immediate steps to stop the crisis that has been created and introduce measures to solve the problem. In fact, yesterday I proposed a motion under Standing Order 26 to have a special debate on this very matter. Yesterday I also asked the Minister in charge of housing to set forth in a statement on motions some of his ideas in respect of meeting this critical situation.

The Minister without Portfolio in charge of housing (Mr. Andras) has reached the same position concerning housing that he reached as Minister without Portfolio in the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. He has indicated that he is a man of

concern, compassion and knowledge, but having acquired these three attributes he finds he cannot do what is required to be done and what he would like to do to solve the problems. The minister attempted to do something in respect of the Indians and Eskimos across Canada, but as soon as he commenced to do so he was stopped.

Now he is confronted with the same problem in regard to housing. He now has a new role; he is now the apologist for government inaction. He is the greatest builder of paper houses this country has ever known. He has become the smokescreen of the government. When the crisis emerges, he makes suggestions such as the one he made last year, that in the CMHC budget for 1971 he would bring forward $200 million for what is known as experimental building in order to develop some of the innovative ideas the builders might have. In respect of that $200 million we have not seen an indication of any great innovation. When he knew he was on the griddle for his poor performance in respect of housing starts in Canada, he came forward with the urban council idea. I recall that at the federal-provincial conference in 1967, Right Hon. Lester B. Pearson brought forward the same idea. Members of the New Democratic Party agree with this idea and I think most Canadians would agree with it. It received a cool reception, however, and was not acted upon. I think it would take more than two or three years to set up the proper framework for an urban council so that it would have immediate direction and would be in a position to take meaningful action in respect of housing problems.

I find that the minister in charge of housing has become a sophisticate in housing jargon. Ever since he read the book on housing dynamics he has attempted to use all the jargon referred to in that book and seems to be trying to confuse the issues. I recall that in his first speech after being appointed minister in charge of housing he said the simple way to solve the housing problem in Canada is to build houses, more houses and more houses. But now he has changed his tune and has become the apologist for the government.

If the minister were in private industry, on his performance to date he would without doubt be fired because of his incompetence and inaction with regard to housing. Let me review his record since he was appointed to this portfolio. In May of this year, CMHC figures indicated a 50.1 per cent decline in housing starts in urban centres as compared with a similar period last year. Now the projection has dropped to 169,000 housing starts for 1970. Last year there were 210,000 starts. This was the first time the country had broken the 210,000 housing starts barrier. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the government indicated it wanted to build one million homes over the next five years. The figure has dropped to 169,000 for 1970. This indicates a substantial drop in respect of achieving the target of one million homes over the next five years.

I recall the statement by CMHC back in 1969 in which it was said that a program even as high as 250,000 units per year would not create a sufficient stock of houses within five years to bring to an end the overcrowding, doubling up of families in housing accommodation and continued use of deficient dwellings. Here we have CMHC referring to 250,000 units, the Economic Council of Canada refers to 200,000 and 210,000 units and the government of Canada refers to one million units over the next five years. Yet the projection for this year is 169,000 units.

I recall the CMHC budget for 1969-70, which the minister set forth. There was to be a substantial increase in the support of low-income and moderate-income housing. The figures I have indicate that only 27,000 units were built last year, which amounts to only 7.9 per cent of all housing starts in Canada. The minister's projection for 1970 is 35,000, although he must know there are 100,000 people on the public housing waiting lists throughout Canada, and that in Toronto alone there are 18,000. His record with regard to starts is most discouraging. In respect of rents across Canada, the consumer price index indicates an increase of 5.5 points for the 1968-69 period, compared with an increase of 3.5 points in 1966-67 and 4.7 in 1967-68. It would be fair to say that the consumer price index for 1969-70 will rise above the 5.5 points increase of 1968-69. The minister has taken no action to request that the provinces impose rent controls, especially in the major cities throughout Canada, as a measure to fight inflation.

The NHA interest rate at the moment is 10.3 per cent. The conventional rate is 11 per cent, and the rate on second mortgages ranges between 15 per cent and 20 per cent. There has been a substantial drop in the prime rate which the banks charge, and yet CMHC has taken no action to bring down the interest rate charged by conventional lenders, or even by itself on its mortgages. People cannot buy

homes at these exorbitant interest rates. With interest rates of 10 per cent and 11 per cent, and with mortgages ranging between $20,000 and $25,000, by the time a person has paid off the mortgage he has paid more than double its principal amount. When we think of a 35-year or 40-year mortgage being assumed by people 25 and 30 years of age, we realize that they will be 65 or 70 years of age before they make their final payment.

• (12:30 p.m.)

With regard to the financing of homes, we have experienced a substantial drop in mortgage financing by major lending institutions, insurance and financial companies. When the minister appeared before the committee he attempted to put the blame on pension funds, but he did not say that he would get tough and require that a percentage of investment portfolio moneys held by these companies be directed toward financing housing. He did not hesitate to change the 25-year mortgages to 5 years to give the financial institutions a decided advantage with regard to interest rates, nor did he hesitate to free mortgage interest rates. But when it comes to telling the banks and other financial institutions that they must direct a certain percentage of their investment portfolio to the financing of housing, he remains silent.

The record also indicates that home ownership for low-income Canadians appears to have been reduced in the last few years. The percentage of NHA mortgage borrowers in the lower-third income group dropped from 17.9 per cent in 1965 to 6.4 per cent in 1969. With regard to housing, apartments have composed the highest number of building units to date; 52.7 per cent of all starts in 1969 were apartments, compared with 38.3 per cent in 1966. In Toronto alone, of the housing starts 77.8 per cent were apartment dwellings, and in Montreal the figure was 80.7 per cent. This trend to high-density units corresponds neither to the preferences nor to the needs of most Canadians. All these factors have resulted in an emergency for people in all income categories and a serious problem for middle-income Canadians.

After spending a few minutes setting forth the record of the minister in charge of housing, I find it incumbent upon me to tell the House what we in the NDP would do if we were faced with the same problem. First, we would bring forth legislation dropping all mortgage interest rates to 6 per cent. This would help to curb inflation and would stimulate home buying. It would help to decrease rents across the country. We would then bring forth legislation, if necessary, to ensure a steady and sufficient flow of mortgage moneys so that homes may be built across the country; and we would give priority to certain types of homes.

Mr. Francis: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Gilbert: I will be glad to answer any questions when I have finished my remarks. We would make sure that residential homes and apartments had priority over shopping centres, luxury apartments, gas stations and other commercial ventures throughout the country. This would be a step in the right direction toward solving the housing problem.

Second, we would ask the provinces to impose rent controls in major cities or areas where it is shown that high rents are contributing to inflation and making it difficult to obtain shelter at reasonable rents. Third, we would introduce new subsidy programs to assist people to purchase or rent homes. In 1969, people at all income levels spent only $20.9 million on public housing subsidies, and the federal contribution amounted to only $12.6 million. This amounts to about 60 cents per person.

Compare that with subsidies for family and youth allowances, which amounted to $29.12 million; subsidies for post secondary education, 13.59 million; railway subsidies, $5.73 million; dairy subsidies, $6.20 million; defence subsidies, $86.22 million. When you compare those subsidies with the 60 cents per person paid for housing, you realize what a low priority the government gives to assisting people with low incomes to obtain housing. It is without doubt a shameful record.

Our subsidies program would include housing allowances to individuals to help them pay their rent. It would include rent supplements to low-income residents in non-profit and co-operative housing. We would subsidize interest rates to all income families, including condominium and co-operative homes. Fourth, we would curb inflation in the cost of land and we would impose a capital gains tax on land speculation. We would acquire large tracts of land with provincial and municipal co-operation. When these lands were obtained, we would lease them and exercise more positive and direct control with regard to land use. If any appreciation in value was obtained as a result of the development of these lands, this appreciation would go to the

public rather than to a private person or company. We would use a minimum of $100 million of the experimental $200 million fund that the minister set up as a start, to acquire these lands, and no sale of Crown lands would be made to private companies.

The hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) asked the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Laing) questions with regard to the development of housing in land on the Kingston area waterfront. We were told that at this time a private developer by the name of Teron is interested in developing waterfront property in the Kingston area which should be used for public recreational purposes. I ask the minister to direct his attention toward helping people of Kingston develop these waterfront properties for public housing and for public recreational use.

I ask that he contact the municipal officials in Kingston, give them assistance for urban renewal projects in this area and allocate some of the $200 million of the experimental fund to develop this area. To sell this property, which really belongs to the public, to private interests would be indicative of a preference for individual profit rather than concern for the public of Kingston. I ask the minister to apply his immediate attention to this matter.

Fifth, we would develop a program of rehabilitation, because the home improvement loans program has failed as a result of high interest rates and the limitation on the amount that may be borrowed. We would make grants and low-interest loans to enable people to improve their homes. Sixth, we would have citizen participation in neighbourhood improvement organizations, in housing design and development, and in housing management. If we are to have participatory democracy, we must start at the grass roots. Through citizen participation in these areas, the principle of participatory democracy would be fostered.

Seventh, we would set up a separate ministry of housing and urban affairs, and we would have full consultation with all levels of government to assess housing needs. Thus we could allocate housing moneys to those areas of Canada which need housing most. We would give some direction with regard to the type of housing that should be built. We would also set up a Crown building corporation which would use all the newest ideas with regard to design and building techniques in the development of homes. We would stress the importance of building homes for the lower income groups and for senior citizens. In this way the Crown building corporation could give the lead to Canada with regard to co-operative housing.

• (12:40 p.m.)

I have come close to the end of my 20-minute allowance, Mr. Speaker. Much like the hon. member for Hamilton West, if I were to record all my criticisms of the government I would require two hours and 20 minutes. I hope the minister will implement some of our ideas with regard to meeting the housing crisis, and that he becomes more than a builder of paper houses, an apologist for the government and a smokescreen. I hope he shows the man of concern, compassion and knowledge that he really is, and that he makes a deep impression in the housing field. If he does not, he will have to transfer from this department as he did from the Department of Indian Affairs, except that next time he will not have a ministry; he will be relegated to the backbenches. I hope that does not happen, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce): Mr. Speaker, it is true, as the motion points out, that recently there has been a decline in residential housing construction. This is a regrettable situation. I know the minister is aware of the problem and that he is trying to do something about it. It is very easy for opposition members, and for backbenchers in this party to be critical. I am sure the minister would like to see built all those houses that he talked about when he first assumed this portfolio. But it is not always as easy to get things done as it would appear; certainly, it is not as easy as it is to stand up in this House and criticize. However, I hope the minister will be able to deal with the problem and that before the House adjourns he will be able to make further announcements of steps to stimulate construction of residential housing.

As a representative from Montreal I would point out that the situation there is not nearly as bad as it is in other Canadian cities. I am not as familiar with other cities as I am with my own, but I understand the housing situation is much worse in Toronto, Ottawa and other places. Within the last three months I purchased a small home in my Montreal constituency. Prior to that I had been checking the Montreal housing market. The housing advertisements showed small homes for sale at a low price not equalled in many other places. There have been advertisements

regarding housing developments on the south shore of Montreal, in Brossard, Candiac and elsewhere, where three-bedroom, fully contained houses are offered for sale at $14,000 with a $500 down payment. These are new houses.

I have in my hand the Montreal *Star*, and here I see an advertisement for a house for sale in my constituency. The price is $22,000. It is a six-room house, with playroom, 1½ bathrooms, fireplace, appliance kitchen and garden. They are asking $4,000 in cash, with a first mortgage at 7 per cent. As I say, the total price is $22,000. It is in Montreal west, one of the garden municipalities. Here is an advertisement for a two-year old home in my constituency. It has four bedrooms, 2½ baths, family room, fireplace, double garage, with a 9 per cent mortgage and a $9,000 down payment. Here we have a house in Boucherville, on the south shore of Montreal, with three bedrooms. The mortgage interest is 5½ per cent, with mortgage payments at $71.45 per month. There are other very good homes advertised. Here is a bungalow built in 1970, for $19,750, which has three bedrooms, playroom, fireplace and garage. These homes are in Montreal, close to the centre of the city. Many of these places are within 15 minutes' driving distance of downtown Montreal. They are residential areas. They are not what can be considered rundown areas. I realize this may be exceptional in Canada and that these conditions are not to be found in other places. However, this is not to say that there is not much to be done in Montreal.

The area in which Montreal is most lacking is that of public housing. The examples I have given are of homes which middle-income people could purchase with $4,000 or $3,000 down payments. I do not have the advertisements here from the Saturday papers, because it seems our library does not keep the Saturday papers, but I have seen the Saturday papers advertising $14,000 homes with $500 down payments. As I say, the lack in Montreal has been in the area of public housing. But in the last year and a half there has been a great improvement. Up until then the situation was deplorable. Montreal, the largest city in Canada, had only two public housing projects, proportionately away behind Toronto, Vancouver and other major cities. A year and a half ago the Montreal city administration finally realized the city was badly lacking in public housing and now homes are being built for low-income people. These are attractive homes and are being built properly.

[Mr. Allmand.]

Another phenomenon of the housing situation in Montreal is the high vacancy rate in apartments, not only in luxury apartments but in middle-class apartments. As has been pointed out by other hon. members, families, especially those with young children, do not prefer to live in apartments. Many of the apartment units in Montreal have fairly low rents, and there are many vacancies. They are in areas of Montreal which are not away out in the suburbs but which still are residential areas.

I understand that the minister will point out again that there has been an increase in investment in public housing, although there has been an increase in investment in public housing, although there has been a decline in housing starts. As a matter of fact, he has already announced a great shift in priorities, and the volume of public housing has increased. We who are interested in the problems of the cities were greatly encouraged by the minister's recent announcement concerning the possibility of the establishment of an urban council. As a representative from the province of Quebec, I was particularly pleased to note the statement made by Mr. Tessier, the provincial minister of municipal affairs, clearing the way for Quebec municipalities to consult directly with the federal government. Some opposition members have stated that they suggested this step many weeks and months ago. That is true, Mr. Speaker. Many of us have done the same, but the fact is that when we were trying to encourage constitutional change it was not appropriate to invade an area of provincial jurisdiction without provincial consent.

• (12:50 p.m.)

The present constitution gives over-all or comprehensive jurisdiction for municipalities to the provinces. No matter how much the federal government may have wanted to deal directly with the municipalities, it could not ignore the views and attitude of an important and significant province of Canada, such as Quebec. That is why it was very difficult to deal with certain municipalities directly, and I can appreciate the difficulty. Montreal withdrew from the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities four years ago, precisely because of pressure brought to bear by the government of Quebec. The announcement by the Minister without Portfolio in charge of housing (Mr. Andras) and the Quebec minister of municipal affairs has greatly pleased me. Clearly, there has been a great change of

policy in Quebec. Not only have there been statements in Quebec saying that there would be co-operation with respect to cities, but last week agreements were signed to establish the first national park in that province. The agreement signed with respect to regional economic expansion will do much for the city of Quebec and the region of Trois-Rivières. My colleague for Trois-Rivières (Mr. Mongrain) is present in the House and no doubt will say something in this debate. There was also an agreement signed with respect to new industries in the Granby area, which also is most encouraging.

Speaking as a citizen of Montreal, I would now encourage the leaders of that city to rejoin the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities. Since it is one of the most dynamic cities in Canada, it could contribute much to the federation, and it has much to gain. I think the city's counsel would be meaningful for the federation. I hope Montreal will soon take steps to rejoin the federation and participate in the proposed Canadian urban council.

The motion before us refers to the cost of homes and asks the government to take steps to reduce the total cost of individual homes for middle and low-income Canadians. The minister has announced that several research and pilot projects now under way are designed to do that. I have met architects from the Montreal area who are working on programs of this nature and who have participated in low-cost housing programs.

The task force on housing has said, as have many other people, that there is room for great improvement in this area. They mean that the technology of mass production in housing must be improved. Whereas the manufacturers of most consumer products have for a long time reaped the benefits of mass production and new technology, the house builders have lagged far behind. Whereas the price of items inside the home—items such as household appliances and furniture—have been greatly reduced in price over the past 30 or 40 years, the price of homes has not been reduced mainly because methods of mass production have not been used in the housing industry.

I do not think that we at the federal government level can find all the solutions to that problem. It is true that unions involved in house construction have not cleared the way for the implementation of new mass production techniques which could be used. If we are to introduce mass produced housing on a large scale, we must obtain the co-operation of a number of unions. Also, if we are to build great numbers of mass produced housing units, we must ask for changes in zoning regulations and building codes, and these are matters which fall under provincial and municipal jurisdiction.

We shall also need co-operation to curb land speculation and to build up public land banks for housing purposes. There must be co-operation in the provision of more and better serviced land on which large housing projects can be built. I know that portions of the agreements signed by the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) with Newfoundland, New Brunswick and Quebec provide for the establishment of serviced land with sewers and other facilities.

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

Mr. Bell: Let the hon. member finish.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous agreement?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, I shall finish with the point I had begun making. I thank hon. members for allowing me a few extra minutes. I was saying that agreements which the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion signed with several provinces provide for the establishment of serviced land to be used for municipal purposes and housing. I think this is a step in the right direction. In conclusion, in common with the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) I regret the decline in residential housing starts and hope that the government will be able to do more to promote the expansion of such housing. I know the minister is aware of this problem. I feel that he is doing his very best. I should like him to be able to carry out the request made in this motion.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until 2 p.m.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I wish to take part

in this debate on a subject of great urgency and importance. I begin by expressing surprise that when the mover of the motion and the first speaker for the New Democratic Party spoke this morning, stressing the importance of this matter and putting forward certain proposals, no spokesman for the government felt it was necessary to respond. I am not insisting that the minister should speak right away. However, it seems to reflect the attitude of the government toward this House and this subject. It is hardly in keeping with the situation that exists with regard to housing in Canada today.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: It is not necessary to go over the ground already covered with regard to the housing situation in Canada. It has been clearly established that housing starts were substantially down for the first five months of this year. Housing construction is down approximately 43 per cent. It is down with regard to all parts of the country. The month of May was even worse than previous months. There has been a crisis developing with regard to housing in every province in Canada. In Saskatchewan, housing starts are down 90.4 per cent. In the great province of Ontario, one of the industrial centres of Canada, the figure is down 48 per cent. In the city of Windsor housing starts are down 80 per cent, and in the city of Toronto 53 per cent. The prospects for the next few months are no better, based on information available with regard to applications for new loans.

A few weeks ago, when the situation seemed very serious, the minister estimated there would be 180,000 housing starts in 1970. Is this still the forecast of the minister? If not, how many housing starts does the minister now expect? What is the minister's target? I think the House is entitled to know his expectations. What does the minister propose to do to achieve this target? So far this year the course has been steadily downward. We must speak frankly in situations such as this. The estimate with regard to the number of housing starts can only be the result of horrible forecasting or callous disregard of the implications. I do not want to accuse the minister of callously disregarding the implications because I do not think he is that kind of man. Therefore, I must accuse those responsible for forecasting for the government of a very high degree of incompetence.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[Mr. Stanfield.]

Mr. Stanfield: I cannot believe that even this government would have sat back had they foreseen what was going to happen and what has happened. This is a very important subject because of the effects on people seeking shelter. It is also important in a number of other respects. It is important with respect to the major fight this government claims it is contending, the fight against inflation. The cost of houses has risen between 55 per cent and 60 per cent since 1965, far exceeding the rise in salaries or wages. The cost of housing is one of the leading components in the consumer price index. It has already been pointed out that this index has gone up and up. In the month of May the consumer price index rose .2 points and the cost of housing rose .7 points.

• (2:10 p.m.)

Moreover, housing is one of the most heavily weighted items in the consumer price index. Clearly, therefore, the cost of housing is a most important factor in inflation. The increase in the cost of housing is reflected in the demands for wage and salary increases; there is no need to elaborate on this point. While we must agree that in Canada, generally speaking, inflation is not due to a shortage of goods or to too many dollars chasing too few goods, the area of housing is plainly one in which shortage of supply is reponsible for the steady rise in cost and, by extension, for the steady increase in the cost of living. In other words, this is an area in which shortage of supply is an inflationary factor and in which a policy of restraint is the worst thing in the world a government could contribute toward reducing inflationary pressures.

Obviously, an important part of any successful anti-inflation fight in Canada is to increase the supply of housing. The supply of housing must be increased, and we must get rid of the tax on building materials. Increased flexibility must be attached to the making of loans for the construction of housing units of all kinds, and this must be done on a regular basis, not on an intermittent basis.

The minister has admitted that the government's policies of restraint have been a substantial factor in the disaster which has taken place this year with regard to housing. He has admitted that the change in taxation policy adopted by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) in 1969 as far as life insurance companies are concerned has affected their willingness or ability to advance money in the housing market. He has admitted that the

tight money policy followed by the government has placed the banks in a position where they have been unable to move strongly into this area. The policy which the government has followed is, therefore, inflationary as far as its effect on housing is concerned, and this is bound to be reflected in the demands of the working man for salary increases.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: Now, in the month of June, figures for the first five months of the year are before us and they show some of the results of the government's disastrous housing policy. The Economic Council of Canada had the following to say in its Sixth Annual Review last September. I will read at some length because I believe it sums up the whole question very well.

> In view of the large rise in the total housing stock required to 1975 under conditions of rapidly rising levels of new household formation, it is essential that a high rate of new residential construction be maintained, and that there should be no major setback in this sector, such as occurred in 1966. Indeed, over the next year or two, it is particularly important that a very high rate of new housing completions be achieved to increase the relatively low vacancy rates now prevailing in various major Canadian cities. This is one essential requirement for achieving a moderation in the recent very high rates of advance in shelter costs. In these circumstances it is vitally important especially under the financial conditions of today, that the seasonally adjusted annual rate of new housing starts be carefully monitored month by month. If there should be any clear sign that new housing starts are falling off in a significant way, possible remedial actions should be quickly considered. We are now in a situation in which a major housing crisis could develop within a very short period of time.

That is what the Economic Council of Canada said last fall, and I think it is not unfair to say that the government seems to have completely ignored the warning. Yet this is a government which prides itself on efficiency and says that everything is happening as planned. It has bungled, despite warnings from very high places. I do not like to say this, but I think it is true. The only explanation I can find—and I do not think it applies to the minister in question today—is that the government has been so set on getting at labour and picking a fight with it that it has failed to take seriously the developing crisis in housing.

I have been advocating a fair set of guidelines for this country for the past two years. Six per cent is not fair; it cannot be called fair when an increase of 10 per cent occurs in other places. But the government is insisting on a 6 per cent limitation. We need an incomes policy, but hon. gentlemen opposite have made it very difficult to achieve such a policy in Canada, with public support, because of the way in which they have been behaving.

What is urgently needed as part of any anti-inflation program is a serious attack upon the human misery which has resulted from the disastrous fall-off in housing which we have experienced this year. If imaginative measures were called for in 1969, then certainly bold and imaginative measures are needed today. The matter is urgent because the government has allowed to happen the very thing which the Economic Council warned should be avoided at virtually any cost.

It is high time the minister rose to tell us what his plans are to make more money available for housing at lower cost, whether the government intends to re-examine the level of CMHC loans and make more of them available, and what it will do to end the policy of turning on and off the amount of loan capital available for housing construction—a policy which is disastrous not only for housing starts at any time but in its disruptive effect by weakening the ability of the industry to respond again in a satisfactory way.

I ask him to tell us what the government intends to do about the 11 per cent sales tax on building materials and what action it proposes to take to remove the unsettling effects of the white paper proposals as far as they concern home ownership. I call upon the minister to answer these questions. I do not ask him to explain what has happened. I know what has happened: the government has bungled; the government has allowed housing starts to settle to a disastrously low rate. This has happened as a direct result of government policies. The government must accept full responsibility for what has occurred.

• (2:20 p.m.)

A number of suggestions have been made from the opposition side of the House. More money should be made available for housing, and the cost of the money lowered. Let the government reduce the cost of building materials by eliminating the sales tax. The problem of housing is a long-term one, but I address myself this afternoon particularly to the immediate emergency in which the country finds itself in the field of housing as the

direct result of the policies of this government. I ask the minister to get off his seat and to tell the House and the country what he proposes to do about the situation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Before recognizing the hon. member for Trois-Rivières (Mr. Mongrain), is the hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Kaplan) rising on a point of order, or to ask a question?

Mr. Kaplan: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman permit a question?

Mr. Stanfield: Certainly.

Mr. Kaplan: The hon. gentleman indicated that for the last two years he has been recommending a fair system of guidelines, and he rejected 6 per cent as an appropriate rate. What rate does the hon. member regard as appropriate for these guidelines?

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I have not rejected 6 per cent in principle, or in any other way, as an appropriate rate. What I reject is the way the government has gone about the whole question. In view of the way it has proceeded, how can the government expect anybody to accept the package it proposes when it is so obviously unfair in the circumstances? I simply say to my hon. friend that the guidelines package, to be acceptable, must be fair. I would ask him at some time to try to convince me or any fair-minded person that what the government proposed recently is fair in the circumstances and does carry conviction.

[*Translation*]

Mr. J.-A. Mongrain (Trois-Rivières): Mr. Speaker, from reading the motion, it is easy, I think, to realize that the mover, the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander), is good-natured, mature and broad-minded. He could have said, with some malice not often heard from him, that this House wants to blame the government. But far from doing so, he proposes that, and I quote:

> This House declares that the government must, in view of the disastrous decline in residential housing construction, announce before the summer recess new measures to stimulate a signifiant expansion in the number of housing units being built, to reduce the total cost of individual homes for middle and low income Canadians, and to reduce or eliminate unemployment in the construction trades.

At first glance, the motion seems mild. In fact, it refrains from blaming the government too strongly, and I guess that the mover, even if he sits in the opposition, realizes that the housing shortage is a problem for which not only the government is responsible.

There are several factors. For instance, the scarcity of available capital, the rise in interest rates—for which the government is not necessarily responsible—and the disastrous strikes which occurred in Quebec when certain labour unions refused to co-operate with the government. All these factors played a part in the economic slowdown in the construction field.

When the mover asks the minister to announce measures, I have the impression that he will not have to wait too long and that he might learn a great deal this afternoon because we on the government side know that the Minister without Portfolio in charge of housing (Mr. Andras) is very active and deeply concerned about the housing construction problem in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to relate certain recent decisions to the construction problem.

First of all, I would like to thank the government, and especially the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand), for having designated Trois-Rivières as a special area. The latter recently announced measures which will improve the substructure of my area and therefore will facilitate not only the establishment of new businesses but also the construction of new houses.

I am particularly grateful to the government for having taken this decision which was welcomed by the population. It had the effect of a shot in the arm for our economy. As everyone knows, activity in the building trade is a sign of general prosperity. That is why we are all in favour of incentives for construction. The minister could give more details than I could and he will be able to do so when he speaks this afternoon. I would also like to comment the recent statements made by the Quebec Minister of Municipal Affairs. He said that he was hoping for better co-operation among the three levels of government.

This is not a new request, but I am pleased to note that for the first time in several years, when we are all wishing for an improved climate among the three levels of government, the Quebec Minister of Municipal Affairs, who is a former mayor and president of the Union of Quebec Municipalities and who is quite aware of the problem, has just made the statement that the Canadian Federation of Mayors has been asking for for several years.

I will remind the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) that in 1963, while I was president of the Canadian Federation of Mayors, I had had the honour of being received by him at his office in Halifax. I had been given the responsibility of putting before him before a meeting of all the Canadian premiers this request of the Canadian Federation of Mayors for a conference on municipal problems.

Obviously, we all know that municipal affairs fall under provincial jurisdiction but we do not think it is interfering with the latter if Canadian mayors are allowed to meet in order to exchange views and decide on the best ways to play, with the help of the other two governments, the part assigned to them within their jurisdiction. They are not forbidden either to consult American or European mayors. I had myself on several occasions the opportunity to do so. It is, I think, an enriching experience for everybody, and it does not in any way infringe upon provincial jurisdiction.

I think it is time we should stop considering mayors and members of municipal councils as not qualified in this field. For my part, I believe that the three levels of government are important. In fact, not one of them should be considered as inferior to the others, but the municipal government, usually regarded as such, is probably nearer to the people and in a better position to get the feel of public opinion.

• (2:30 p.m.)

I am happy about the attitude of the government of the province of Quebec. With that kind of understanding and broad-mindedness, we will manage to solve problems such as, for instance, that of building enough houses to please everyone, and that of unemployment which we all deplore and which is inherent in the inflation period that we are going through.

In that connection, I should like to remind the House that, some years ago, I introduced a motion that advocated the setting up of an intergovernmental advisory commission similar to that in the United States. Indeed, an intergovernmental advisory commission, made up of representatives of the federal, State and municipal governments, exists in that country. Its members meet to compare notes and see what the best solutions might be to various problems such as the housing problem.

To my mind, what the minister has just proposed strongly resembles the setting up of an intergovernmental advisory commission which would enable us to remove the obstacles, fill the gaps and achieve better understanding between the three levels of government which must join in their efforts to solve such major problems as that of housing.

I congratulate the minister on his statement in Halifax, and I am sure the majority, if not all the mayors in Canada, and those in my province in particular, will accept his proposal and participate in the joint efforts of the representatives of the municipal, provincial and federal administrations, to solve our problems.

Still with regard to the need for new housing starts and consultation between the people involved, if we want to solve problems as serious as those—I should like to inform the House about an informal organization that just sprang up amongst hon. members about a year ago already. In fact, certain members, some of whom had been mayors in the past and had worked within municipal and provincial associations or with the Canadian Federation of Mayors, decided to join together in order to provide a link between the municipalities and the provincial and federal governments. About a score of us meet informally three or four times a year. In my opinion, all the members who were mayors in the past rejoice as I do about the announcement made by the minister in Halifax and the stand taken by the Quebec Minister for Municipal Affairs. In fact, we notice already better co-operation between those in charge who have to join together if a solution to the construction problem is to be found.

There have been complaints about the fact that the high cost of construction might explain why this industry is in the doldrums. But, I think that this is relative, and that the provinces have a responsibility in this field. And I could give some examples. In fact, in my own riding, some builders sell for $10,500, $11,000 or $15,000 five-room houses, approved by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. But, I have seen the same houses sold for $16,500, $17,000 or $17,500 in Toronto while in Montreal they sell for $14,000, $14,500 or $15,000.

So there is an element of relativeness which would come, I believe, under the provincial responsibility rather than under that of the federal government and here again the co-operation we are endeavouring to establish at all government levels could help to solve that problem.

I approve of the representations made by some opposition members to the government

about the removal of the 11 per cent tax, which increases housing costs. I admit that this problem goes probably beyond the responsibility of the minister in charge of housing and that it comes instead under that of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson), who finds good arguments for upholding that 11 per cent tax. But I do not think it would be betraying my party to join those who ask the minister in charge of housing to seek some way of removing it.

In connection with housing, I should like to deal with a problem that does not come directly under the Parliament's jurisdiction. As a member of Parliament, I think I may be allowed to use this forum in order that my remarks may be carried further than if I were addressing myself to a particular individual. There is in Quebec at this time a trend according to which the Municipal Commission of Quebec wants to make it compulsory for municipalities to auction available land that could be sold to people who want to build houses.

I believe this is a ludicrous and foolish measure which is working against the objectives that we should have, namely, keeping the cost of housing as low as possible, because if a municipality wants to sell a few hundred lots to people who want to build decent homes at a reasonable price, it is obvious that the auction sale will make prices go up. The large building companies could make higher bids than the small ones, which would contribute to worsen the housing crisis that we now deplore.

I should like to ask the Quebec authorities and the authorities in all other provinces where such a situation might prevail, to make it a rule to sell their land as cheap as possible.

In my municipality, for instance, some lots sold at 10 or 15 cents per square foot. The price was the same for everyone and the rule was: first come, first served. The lots were reasonably priced for small wage-earners. Now, it is ridiculous, unsound and silly to compel municipalities to auction their land.

Some landowners want to buy slopes bordering on their property and of no use whatsoever. They wish only to help their municipality. They ask that the land be sold to them for $1 and other considerations, conditional on proper maintenance. In such cases, bidding is absolutely ridiculous.

Basically, we are almost all in agreement on the substance of the said motion. Indeed, everybody wants to put construction back on its feet. However, there is no unanimity when the opposition seeks to hold the government responsible for the present situation. The fact that certain things do not come to the attention of the government is overlooked. Perhaps opposition members forget that the minister in charge of housing in Canada is actively concerned with this problem. Government members know it, for nearly every day, they have an opportunity to discuss the matter with the minister. That is why I do not hesitate to share the views of the opposition members who have shown their wisdom in avoiding to use the expression "blame the government". The opinion is simply expressed that the minister should announce something new. I have the impression that were the minister to mention what he has done these last weeks, he would have many new things to announce, and the opposition would be satisfied. For once, there would be perfect agreement between all parties in the House. Further, co-operation similar to that which is being initiated between the three levels of government would allow us to hope that all our problems, even the most severe ones, will be solved in the near future.

[*English*]

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, in 15 minutes it is impossible to cover the subject before us. Many of the details have already been dealt with. I want to start by saying in the presence of the minister that a simple fact is that in the field of housing and urban affairs this government has fiddled and diddled for the last two and more years, with disastrous consequences for Canada and for the people of Canada.

This minister, like the minister before him, the hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Hellyer), and like the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) so often, has developed a rather disarming habit of sounding cheerful about the situation. The minister always expresses concern for and great sympathy with the disadvantaged people. Indeed, he is always full of concern and pain, but completely empty of policy and action. His concern and sympathy will not build homes. They will not provide accommodation for the disadvantaged people of Canada. However sincere he may be—and I do not doubt his sincerity—the fact is that for years now the housing situation in Canada has gone from bad to worse. The government has stood still without taking any of the steps that might have enabled it to improve the

situation, so that every year we are in a worse situation than we were in the year before.

Mr. Speaker, all of us in the opposition—I know I am, and I am sure all my colleagues in the New Democratic Party are—are aware of the fact that the housing problem in a sense is a universal one. There are very few cities in very few countries of the world that have been able to keep up adequately and quickly enough with the rapid urbanization which has been taking place in the last several decades in all the industrialized centres and countries of the world. No one can expect this or any other government to solve the problem overnight, because it is a cumulative problem which results from the rapid urbanization which is more rapid in Canada than anywhere else.

It is a problem which cannot be solved except in the course of some years. Perhaps it cannot be completely solved except in the course of a generation. It is precisely because of this fact that I say to the minister, with all the seriousness of which I am capable, that the fact that there has been an accumulation of decades of mismanagement in the past, together with the fact that this is the result of rapid urbanization which grows year after year, and the fact that it might be years before we can solve the housing problem, is all the more reason this government should be soundly condemned for not having taken the first steps toward a solution.

• (2:40 p.m.)

No one expects miracles from the minister, but one did expect from the Prime Minister, the swinger of 1968, and from this government some kind of modern approach to this problem, some recognition of the urgency of the problem. We expected some steps which would indicate that we were making at least a modest start on licking the problem of the shortage of housing, of the slums in the cities, of the deteriorating homes in which people have to live, of the overcrowding, of little children playing in the streets because of the absence of parks and playgrounds in our cities, of the traffic jams in the cities, of the air and water pollution and of all those things about which government spokesmen have sounded lyrical and poetical for years now. That is why I for one was forced to say to the conference of mayors and municipalities, at which I had the pleasure of speaking last Tuesday at lunch, that it seems to me these problems are so overwhelming now that they have become almost entirely unmanageable.

The failure of this minister to do the least that should be done with respect to solving these problems, his failure to take some fundamental approaches in this respect, makes the problems worse every day. It is not as if this or the former government were not fully aware of this problem. I re-read only this morning, in preparation for my comments now, a speech which the former Prime Minister, Right Hon. Lester B. Pearson, made to a federal-provincial conference on housing and urban development held in Ottawa on December 11, 1967. At that time Mr. Pearson said:

> Although every level of government has had its failures in this increasingly vital area of our national and local life, fortunately we still have time in Canada to correct our mistakes and to avoid repeating them in the future.

It is a pity that the present Prime Minister was perhaps absent when Mr. Pearson made the statement, because we still had a little time then. We still have a little time now, but we are not correcting our mistakes and apparently we will not avoid repeating them in the future. On the contrary, we continue to compound them and to make the situation worse. Mr. Pearson in the speech to which I have referred also made the following comment which I draw to the attention of the minister and of the Prime Minister. Having said earlier that there were difficulties and limitations as to jurisdiction, he said:

> But the urban environment is now of such fundamental importance to every aspect of Canadian life, including the health of the whole nation and its economy, that local problems in all areas of the country collectively present a national problem which clearly concerns the federal government.

This was said on December 11, 1967, and I am certain that if I looked through *Hansard* and if I had the time to re-read speeches made by Mr. Pearson and other people in the years before 1967, I would find exactly the same kind of statement—that our program until now has been a failure, that we still have some time to correct our failures, and that all of this is a national concern and a national responsibility. But as I look at the picture in 1970 as compared with 1967, I see that the housing situation now is worse. The price of our houses has gone up, our rents have gone up and the total urban picture has become worse since December 11, 1967. This government, as is apparent from what we see all around us, stands clearly condemned for total failure in the important national area of housing and urban affairs.

It is not as if construction has not been going on. You cannot visit any city in this

country without seeing construction taking place, unless there is a construction strike. There is not a city in this country—and I have been to many cities in recent months—where you do not see luxury apartment buildings going up, entirely unnecessary office buildings and unnecessary and redundant commercial buildings going up, whether they be shopping plazas or service stations at some corner, the only corner that is left at the intersection, all the other corners already being occupied by gas stations or bank buildings. It is not as if construction was not going on in Canada, but in social terms it is totally unnecessary construction.

If the funds, the effort, the labour and the resources which are spent in this field of socially unnecessary and less than useful construction at this particular time were turned over to the construction of public housing, to the rehabilitation of old homes, and planning and beautifying the cities, we would not be in the serious difficulties in which we now find ourselves.

I do not make any apology for emphasizing the social philosophy I and my colleagues have often expressed in this House. Our present housing crisis is one of the most visible results of the total failure to organize our society and our economy, of our inclination to leave it to private developers—as I said to the conference of mayors and municipalities in Halifax—to shape our cities, because in the long run they are the ones who do so. They decide what kind of construction they will undertake and they make the decision as to what kind of plan they want, even though municipalities frequently have plans and zoning by-laws. As I said to the conference, I do not know of any single case where the objectives of the municipal plan have not been bent, and perhaps even abandoned as a result of the pressures and the lobbying of the private interests which conflict with the public goals which the municipal councils and planning agencies have set for the city.

We have permitted the private developers to do this. I do not condemn them; they are playing according to the rules as they know them and they are interested in profit, which is why they are in business. They are interested in a situation which will maximize that profit. But I do condemn government at all levels for its failure to demand that our cities be planned, that the people in the cities, rather than the private developers, have something to say about the shape of our urban environment, and that we set priorities for the use of capital and resources for construction.

Top priority should be given to public housing. The second priority should be given to area development and rehabilitation, and the third priority should be given to low-cost housing for the lower and middle-income people. Only when these priorities in construction are met should we permit the building of banks, office buildings and high-rise luxury apartment houses. These are the priorities that we should set for ourselves in Canada. This is the only way in which this problem can be tackled. It will not be solved in a year or two, but it should be tackled so that the people can have hope that it will be solved, that the quality of our urban life will not be undermined and that the hopelessness of a great many of our low-income people can be removed and some hope given them.

I think my time is about up, so I will draw my remarks to a conclusion. I know that in the files in my office—and I am sure in the files of every hon. member of every party—there are literally hundreds of letters written over the last few years by old people, people with families, young people who cannot afford to pay the rent they are forced to pay, who cannot buy the homes they want to buy, who have nothing left to eat after they have paid the rent, who are on welfare, who are on a long waiting list for public housing and who are totally desperate about their position with regard to accommodation.

• (2:50 p.m.)

These are the facts, Mr. Speaker. I join the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) in demanding from the minister not merely an expression of his concern, because we accept the fact that he is concerned. We demand not merely an expression of his sympathy, because we know him to be a generous and sympathetic person. We ask that he not waste any of his time telling the House he is as concerned as everybody else—we take that concern for granted—or telling the House he is sympathetic, because we take that as given. We demand that he rise from his seat and tell this House and the people of Canada what he will start to do tomorrow to meet this urgent and overwhelming problem in our cities.

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): Those are interesting challenges, Mr. Speaker, and I can understand and feel the concern—I use the word of the hon. gen-

tleman who preceded me and who talked about his earnestness. Perhaps we all have words to which we stick very faithfully.

There is reason for the concern expressed by hon. members, particularly about the low level of housing starts in May. In fact, if anyone were justified in projecting to the end of the year the May rate of housing starts, or anything close to it, the implication would be that we would get less than 140,000 units this year, and this would also probably include in the same projection only 15,000 starts in low-income housing. Certainly a low level of achievement of that nature would justify the most profound criticism of and concern for the government's policies in this area. But I say with the most deliberate emphasis that there is no justification for such a dire projection.

Dealing with the month of May, the fact is that there were several factors combining to yield the low level of housing starts, but they will not persist.

Mr. Orlikow: How about April and February?

Mr. Andras: I referred to these factors briefly in the House yesterday, but I think they will bear repetition. First, there was a temporary decline in low-income housing starts. In April, starts of these dwellings had totalled 2,488 units but in May they totalled only 896 units. This kind of fluctuation has to be expected from time to time, reflecting the combination of decisions about the start of construction of low-income housing projects by provincial housing agencies and by non-profit or low-income housing corporations. I may say that there were events taking place in some of the larger provinces during May that gave rise to their preoccupation with other measures. But this decline in activity in May did not reflect any cutback in commitments for this kind of construction on the part of the federal government.

In fact, at the beginning of that month over 13,000 loans were approved for these dwellings, for which construction had not yet started. For your information, Mr. Speaker, and that of hon. members, this was almost three times the number committed to this program at that time a year ago. I can assure you that those financial commitments, while not resulting in starts in the month of May, will not go to waste. If ever there appeared any danger of that, of course we could quickly reallocate them and find many other willing takers for the funds we are providing. So this activity will recover. But I do expect, and I think we should all face it, that the starts of such dwellings will fluctuate from month to month. I think everyone should face this fact.

The second of the special circumstances was the impact of construction stoppages in Quebec and British Columbia. The Quebec stoppage is already over, I believe. I do not pretend to know what will be the future course of the B.C. situation, but the work stoppage will not last forever. When it ends there will be a catching up on the construction that has been delayed, for which the land has been acquired and for which the financing and all other preparatory work has been completed.

The decline in starts of low-income housing and the impact of construction strikes are estimated to have accounted for about three-quarters of the decline in the rate of housing starts from April to May. The rest of that decline was the lagged result of the decline in mortgage lending which was under way in the second half of 1969 and which continued into the first quarter of 1970. But that decline in mortgage lending activity has already reversed itself, and had in fact done so before the May housing starts data became available.

Institutional mortgage lending under the National Housing Act reached its low point of a seasonally adjusted annual rate of some 21,400 units in March. That rate doubled in April to 42,800 units, and was at a rate of over 50,000 units a year in the month of May. Those are mortgage commitments, and they do not immediately, at once, result in starts. For conventional mortgage lending activity the data are a little less current because they do not come under the NHA statistical apparatus. But the data do show a reversal in trend in March, with the upturn continuing in April, bringing mortgage loan commitments from an annual rate of 33,700 units in February to 46,800 units in April, and I would expect that there have been further increases. I would also expect that these trends in mortgage lending activity will have a discernable effect on housing starts not later than July.

What of the rest of the year? First, as to starts of low income housing units, I expect these to be about double last year's level. In 1969 commitments were issued to provincial housing agencies and to non-profit and low-rental housing corporations for 27,000 housing units for low-income people. That is totally apart from a significant amount of hostel accommodation. So we were committed to 27,000 units in 1969. Construction actually got

under way on 16,000 units, because the commitment the previous year had been considerably less, and that left a carryover into this year of about 11,000 units.

This year, Mr. Speaker, as I have been and as I continue to be proud of, the capital budget of CMHC provides for about 35,000 units of this kind of accommodation for low-income people, again quite apart from the hostel accommodation provided for elderly people and university students. Assuming the same proportion of carryover—and I think that is a reasonable assumption—this year we should get actual starts of at least 30,000 low-income housing units and, as I said, we have actual commitments in excess of that, beyond the 35,000 limit.

As to the private housing market, which has been affected by monetary and fiscal policies, I have already indicated that there has been a decided upturn in institutional mortgage lending which will have an effect on housing starts. In light of the discussions that I have asked my officials of CMHC to conduct with the mortgage lenders as to their investment intentions or expectations, and certainly recognizing that in a period such as we are now going through there is some hesitation in the market, I believe that even a cautious view can anticipate some further improvement in mortgage lending activity for new house building. I expect, in fact, that that improvement will take us to a rate of housing starts in the fourth quarter of this year that will be close to at least 200,000 units.

• (3:00 p.m.)

It was on the basis of those expectations about a week or so ago that I gave a committee of the House an estimate based on current statistics of between 180,000 and 185,000 housing starts for the full year. I also said that I hoped that events would show me to have been unduly cautious in that projection. It must be obvious to hon. members that that estimate was made prior to my hearing about the low level of housing starts in May. But, having examined all the facts and the important statistics of May, for the reasons I have already given I must say that the forecast I referred to is unaffected by the particular circumstances of that one month. While I feel quite confident about these expectations, I have had enough experience here and in other places to take all forecasts, including my own, with a grain or two of salt.

Mr. Gilbert: So have we.

[Mr. Andras.]

Mr. Andras: Quite apart, therefore, from the discussions which I have had from time to time with my cabinet colleagues on these matters, I have, in concert with the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson), caused a committee of senior officials from the Department of Finance, the Bank of Canada and from Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation to be formed several weeks ago, and this is keeping a keen eye on the progress of house building and mortgage lending activity. And if for any reason things appear likely not to turn out the way I have been suggesting, the warning lights will flash and consideration will have to be given to remedial action.

The major component, Mr. Speaker, in the government's housing target for the year 1970 is to see that commitments are made for low income housing units for close to 35,000 dwelling units, together with a significant number of hostel units. That target is deliberately directed to where we believe the real need to be.

I have pointed out elsewhere that this target, together with the commitments for low income housing achieved in 1969, add up to more than 75 per cent of all such activity for low income people in the 20-odd years prior to the beginning of 1969; while that may not be enough and I should like to see more done, I doubt if it indicates that no start has been made in the solution of this significant problem.

The other part of the government's housing concern for 1970—

An hon. Member: Twice zero is still zero.

Mr. Andras: —is to see that the private market for new housing operates as effectively as possible, and contributes as much as it can to the production of new housing. Surely, in the circumstances the most effective contribution we can make to that is to see that inflationary forces are abated. I am confident that the combination of public action directed to the housing needs of low income people, together with an effectively operating private market, will yield the 1 million new housing units that this government is committed to over the five-year period. That does not mean, and never has meant, that there is a commitment to build a constant average of 200,000 housing units in each of those five years.

Mr. Gilbert: That is what we were given to understand.

Mr. Andras: The trend will be up, in line with the growth in householders, starting from a rate below 200,000 units per year and reaching above that by the end of the five-year period. I think it is only common sense to recognize that variations from any precise figure in any given year can be expected. Despite statements by some hon. members, there has never been a commitment to a target of 250,000 units per year. No responsible body, least of all the Economic Council, has ever suggested that 250,000 starts per year represents a feasible or in some sense absolutely "required" housing target for 1970, and I submit it is no contribution to the improvement of public policy relating to housing to suggest otherwise.

Mr. Orlikow: And what about Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation?

Mr. Andras: The same thing applies there. The objective of 250,000 housing starts per year is extremely desirable and represents a degree of perfection that no country in the world has attained in the short space of five years. I would love to do this; hon. members would love to do it and the government would love to do it, but it would mean the abandonment of other priorities which, perhaps on other emergency debates on other days, hon. members would say ought to be the current top priority of this government on that day.

Mr. Orlikow: That does not let the government off the hook.

Mr. Andras: I should like to close by saying that the government's housing policy and actions are set within a longer time frame than a month or statistical variations arising from month to month. While these variations are important in giving us trend information, and require examination, which we are giving them, this matter should really be looked at in a longer time frame, and I think all hon. members will in the end recognize that we will reach our objectives as indicated in the throne speech last fall.

Mr. Stanfield: And in the end we will all be dead.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I am glad I heard the comments of the minister in charge of housing on the motion the official opposition brought forward today.

We were expecting an answer offering a solution to the extremely serious housing problems of this country. We well recall that last year towards the same date the government brought forward in the House Bill C-192 on housing. The bill's purports were good, but to date it has not achieved the goal the government had set for it. For the past year, and this year more than ever, we have been aware that Canada's housing problems are still the same if not worse than last year.

The minister has again expressed the pious wishes we have been hearing since 1968. Two years have gone by and here is what the minister said in May 1969 in his statement on Bill C-192, which I have here:

> Quite simply, there are more families and non-family households in this country than there are dwellings, and too many dwellings are inadequate.

• (3:10 p.m.)

What a discovery!

> —and too many dwellings are inadequate.
>
> It also means that many people are living in substandard housing, and face the resulting threat to health, comfort and self-esteem. There are many families that are overcrowded because the accommodation is too small for their needs.
>
> The housing problem...is expressed in terms of deprivation, suffering, congestion and squalor... "families that do not keep their own household", "dwellings in need of major repairs", "dwellings lacking running water and flush toilets and without private bathing facilities"—

And the "litany" goes on that deplores the lot of thousands of Canadians who are without proper housing at this time.

We remember also quite well that at that time, the hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Hellyer), chairman of the task force that investigated housing problems in Canada and travelled about 25,000 miles to that effect, submitted a report to this House and eventually had to resign as minister in charge of housing.

And in the May 1969 issue of the newspaper *Le Travailleur Canadien,* one could read this:

> The hon. Paul Hellyer resigned at the end of April from his office as Minister of Transport—
>
> Just before he resigned, Mr. Hellyer disclosed a new surrender of the government before the powers of money.

A few moments ago, the hon. member for Trois-Rivières (Mr. Mongrain) said that housing problems in Canada today are everybody's responsibility except the federal government's.

Capital is scarce in Canada for housing projects. Who is responsible for putting money in circulation if not the federal government? It is its responsibility and the hon. member for

Trois-Rivières, who is no longer in his seat, said that the lack of capital in Canada was attributable to everybody, except to the government which is responsible for it.

He also said that the rise in interest rate is one of the reasons why there is a housing shortage in Canada and that everybody was to be blamed for it, except the present government.

He also mentioned that the 11 per cent tax on building materials constitutes one of the direct causes of the problem. He indicated that he was favouring its removal. However, I remember quite well that several proposals to remove this tax were brought before the House but the hon. member for Trois-Rivières always voted against them. Are the answers of the government side serious?

Last year, there appeared in the March 5, 1969 issue of *La Presse* an article, which reported the following, and I quote:

The CNTU of Montreal proposes that a vast public housing sector be set up in Quebec—

For that purpose, the CNTU set up a committee of tenants which it called for the occasion the Tenants' Association. That committee presented a report from which I would like to quote:

The report points out that estimated Canadian needs in housing units to be built per year vary between 170,000 and 200,000. In Montreal, between 35,000 and 40,000 would be needed. The Tenants' Association states that in its opinion, 100,000 low-price units would be needed in Montreal while governments have built less than 1,000 to replace the 14,332 which have been demolished.

It is estimated that the number of over-populated housing units in the Montreal area is 90,903.

The Tenants' Association also conducted a survey on housing costs in Canada as opposed to other countries of the world. It reported as follows:

Moreover, it is found that, in general, Quebecers on the whole pay more for housing...than in several other countries of the world, that is 13.3 per cent of the family budget as compared, for instance, to 9.9 per cent in Sweden, 7.4 per cent in Italy and 5.5 per cent in France.

Those figures were published by the Tenants' Association. Nonetheless, the hon. member for Trois-Rivières this afternoon would have us believe that the housing situation in Canada was one of the brightest compared to the conditions prevailing in other countries.

In its editorial of January 8, 1969, *Télévision de Québec (Canada) Ltée* had this to say about interest rates and housing:

It is surely not by increasing its interest rates on loans from 8½ to 9 per cent, as the Central Housing and Mortgage Corporation did on January 1, that the federal government will encourage Canadians to build. In addition, it is not by maintaining its 12 per cent tax on building materials that the government will encourage contractors to undertake building projects.

The following appeared in *La Presse* on January 4, 1969, and I quote:

The former president of the Housebuilders' Association, of the Montreal district, Mr. Albert Gagnon, expressed the hope that all builders will refuse, as he does, to build houses as long as the interest rate of 9⅜ per cent on mortgage loans will remain in force.

In a brief submitted to the Association, Mr. Gagnon said that the rate was prohibitive.

The spokesman of the Montreal builders before the Hellyer Commission points out, in his submission, six consequences which, according to him, would result from the increased interest rate.

It must be noted that the six effects mentioned have been felt in the past year in the Canadian economy, mostly in the housing field. The first effect of the increased rate was the following:

an increase in the rates now being charged by all loan companies.

This followed the increase in the mortgage interest rate by the federal government. I continue the quotation:

The rate of conventional loans could easily reach 11 per cent or more;

The rate is now 11 per cent in most Canadian areas.

Therefore, his prediction came true. He goes on to say:

—a sharp slowdown in new housing starts resulting in a housing shortage:

This effect has also been evident in the past year. I continue the quotation:

—a spiralling increase in unemployment, a situation quite opposite to a policy geared to the "just society";

A society "just for fun" has been advocated or, as the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said, a "just society." He did not say for whom! Two years after his coming to power and thanks to the publicity he has enjoyed so far, we realize that we now have a society "just for him". The quotation goes on:

—rent increases which will be reflected in a higher cost of living;

Everywhere, especially in the larger Canadian cities, rents have gone up.

I continue the quotation:

—more pressing claims from the unions for wages increases which will contribute to strengthen the inflationary trends—

But Mr. Gagnon had foreseen that following the increase in interest rates, the workers, as was seen last year, would go on strike in order to get pay increases, thus causing more inflation. The government would like to fight inflation, but they are responsible for it.

The sixth consequence pointed out by the former president of the Housebuilders' Association is the following, and I quote:

—the citizens will be deprived of their legitimate right to live in adequate housing or to own their homes.

• (3:20 p.m.)

The six effects mentioned on January 4, 1969 made themselves felt 15 months later.

And, Mr. Gagnon advocates the very thing that we, of the Ralliement créditiste, have asked on many occasions in this House. As a solution to this problem he recommends the following, and I quote:

—an immediate lowering of the interest rates on CMHC loans for people who earn less than $10,000 a year; also the elimination of the 11 per cent sales tax on building materials for housing purposes;

He also recommends the passage of a measure already in effect in the United States, and I quote:

That the Income Tax Act be amended so that small home-owners be able to deduct municipal and school taxes from their taxable income.

We know that in the United States a homeowner can deduct from his taxable income his municipal and school taxes in addition to the interest which he pays on his mortgage, which is prohibited in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I would have many more recommendations to make yet. I have before me a thick file on housing in Canada. It contains recommendations, study reports, statistics, and an analysis of the needs in the housing field. These studies have not been carried out by us by by the task force and experts who considered this problem even before the task force chaired by the hon. member for Trinity did so.

Ever since I have had the honour of sitting in this House, I have noticed that under the former administration as well as the present one, the cost of housing has continued to rise. Today, it is nearly twice what it was in 1960.

Inflation affects housing as well as all other segments of the economy. And the Ralliement créditiste is not responsible for it. We, of the Ralliement créditiste, claim that the Bank of Canada should put at the disposal of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation the credits required to enable it to lend to individuals, namely to young couples who want to own their homes, at a rate of interest of 3 per cent, which is quite normal.

Instead of going to the international money market to find the capital it needs to finance itself, Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation should go to the Bank of Canada; it could then offer loans for 20, 25 or 30 years to the young who want to marry, or any other Canadian who wants to marry or own his home, at 3 per cent interest. Then, we would not witness inflation in the field of housing.

In addition, we would not witness the current unemployment in the construction trades, and we could build within two or three years the million units Canada needs, according to the Minister without Portfolio. And even then, we would have some way to go to meet the needs of the population, in view of its increase.

We know there is a serious housing problem. Having a place to live, owning one's home is a vital need; it is the normal wish of every Canadian. Every Canadian has the right to own his home and as we do not lack anything else in Canada, the housing problem is surely an artificial one. This is an "artificial" problem as there is no shortage of materials, contractors, or labour. Indeed supply and demand exist. However, in order to balance supply and demand, we must first apply the recommendations made by the task force under the chairmanship of the hon. member for Trinity as well as the ones put forward by the Créditistes for many years in this House.

The housing problem in Canada is an "artificial" one, and it is impossible for the Parliament of Canada to solve it without solving first the problem concerning finance, which is the most important one. Should a war break out and should we need one million housing units for servicemen, we would not be talking in this House of the scarcity of money. We would not say that the housing shortage is due to the municipal or provincial governments but we would settle the problem. Indeed the Minister of Finance would solve the financial problem within a few hours so as to accommodate our servicemen in the one million housing units we would be able to build at the present time. We need them even though we are in peacetime.

I regret that the hon. member for Trinity who was in the House this morning cannot be here now for I would advise him if he wants to apply the recommendations made by his task force—recommendations which by the

way compelled him to resign, to side with the Créditistes to settle first the financial problem and then the problem of housing.

Mr. Speaker, our families are lacking accommodation. Our young people who want to marry have to crowd in unhealthy dwellings—

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

Does the House agree to allow the hon. member to carry on?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): The hon. member for Shefford.

Mr. Rondeau: I shall try to be brief, Mr. Speaker.

Our young people need homes. Hon. members have similar problems. People need homes while lumber piles up, rotting. The unemployed are living on unemployment insurance benefits instead of being put to work building homes. The people are tired of all the wishful thinking in which this House has been indulging for the past ten years.

[*English*]

Mr. Tom H. Goode (Burnaby-Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I should like to begin my remarks by saying I appreciate the job which the Minister without Portfolio responsible for housing (Mr. Andras) has done. His approach has been one of genuine concern for the people who make up urban Canada.

All too often we forget that our cities are made up of people, the people who work in them and the people who live in them. There is a tendency to think of our urban areas as consisting of so many houses, apartment buildings, offices, industries and freeways. The minister has avoided this pitfall and has attended admirably to the needs of those who, because their incomes are low, have despaired in the past of ever getting suitable accommodation at reasonable cost. Under the minister's guidance, the housing stock available to low-income families and to our senior citizens has grown significantly and will continue to grow.

However, the fact remains that overall the number of housing starts is down to an unforgiveable amount. This should really come as no surprise to some of us. It was painfully obvious months ago that this would be a bad year in terms of the number of housing units begun. The reasons for this are simple, even if the solutions are not: inflation, the tight financial situation and labour disputes. Yet even when it was clear that massive assistance would be required if we were to do our part this year to arrive at the goal of 1.1 million units which the Economic Council has set for the period 1970-1975, the government did not respond. I could understand this if money were not available. But when I see millions of dollars going into the Lift program, when I see the government making available to the provincial governments $300 million more than originally provided for in the current fiscal year, when I see vast amounts being spent on regional development projects, I know that money can be made available if the government deems it desirable.

We have here a question of priorities. The government must surely count housing and urban affairs as being deserving of very high priority. Yet it has not given this impression. Why? I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the finger of blame points in a number of directions. First, I have to admit that part of the blame must rest with those, such as myself, in the backbenches of this party who have not spoken out often enough or loudly enough on urban affairs and who have stood idly by while the frontbench has made housing the whipping-boy for inflation. There have been exceptions among the backbenchers, such as the hon. member for York West (Mr. Givens) and the hon. member for Calgary South (Mr. Mahoney), but by and large the backbenchers of this party have not put the case for the cities strongly enough.

• (3:30 p.m.)

Secondly, I blame the opposition parties. Every goverment needs to be prodded, and this government is no exception. But it seems the opposition contains more plodders than prodders. Certainly some members, such as the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) and the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave), have presented constructive suggestions to the government and tried to alert their colleagues to the importance of the housing crisis. But clearly these members have not been successful in converting their colleagues, because every day this chamber echoes to the cries of rapeseed and the ghost of the Newfie Bullet.

If the government is to be convinced of the importance of the housing problem, all interested parties must maximize their input

into the decision-making process. Where does the National Housebuilders' Association maintain its headquarters? In Toronto! It should be here in Ottawa where officers of the association could be in daily contact with government and its officials and be in a position to influence government policy rather than just react to it. Likewise, I charge the real estate fraternity of this country with not making its problems more apparent to the government. There can be no denying that some of the blame for the housing situation today lies with the real estate people themselves.

The housing crisis cannot be viewed in isolation from the sum of the problems plaguing our cities. It is an integral part of the urban dilemma which can be solved only within a unified framework. We must—I repeat, must—establish a department of urban affairs. For too long we have developed piecemeal programs with little or no understanding of how each would affect the other. We have failed to recognize the basic fact that our urban environment is a complex system constantly interacting with itself.

We have failed to come to grips with the concept of the urban unit and how that total unit will react to new programs and developments. We have, in fact, proceeded as if we were operating in a vacuum. Housing problems have been tackled as if the urban context were irrelevant. This kind of thinking, or perhaps I should say lack of thinking, cannot go on if we value our existence as an urban society. A department of urban affairs would serve to develop and co-ordinate urban policy, and the minister in charge of this department would then be in a position to see that programs affecting our urban areas produce harmony rather than conflict, gardens rather than ghettos.

Surely, if the problems of agriculture require the attention of two full-time ministers and the fiscal operation of this country demands the efforts of two cabinet members, then the problems of urban Canada in which 70 per cent of our people now live and in which 85 per cent will live in the year 2000 are worthy of the attention of a full ministry. And, Mr. Speaker, if I may make a suggestion to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), the Minister without Portfolio, the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Andras), would be an excellent choice for minister of urban affairs.

I have some further suggestions for government action now. I believe the government should announce for this fall a large mortgage commitment for medium and low priced houses and condominium development. This mortgage money should be made available at a rate of no more than 8 per cent. This action would have the effect of lowering competitive interest rates without subsidization and would at the same time reduce unemployment in the construction trades. As hon. members may know, 40 per cent of the cost of a house is on-site labour. The great rush of housing starts which would result from a program such as I am proposing would not only serve to improve the housing stock for middle income Canadians, but would have a very significant and beneficial effect on the unemployment situation.

Further, the government must bring extreme pressure on the banks of Canada to meet the challenge of the housing crisis. But how have these institutions responded to date? They have upped interest rates and they have tightened conditions borrowers must meet. The conventional insurance lenders have gone even further; they are demanding exorbitant equity positions, thus increasing their own profits. This is of no help in meeting the housing crisis. The government must demand that these offenders adjust their policies in order to meet the challenge.

The federal government must also consider offsetting the effects of the white paper on tax reform, which has created a marked decrease in large apartment projects. The white paper suggests the elimination of some depreciation benefits, has created uncertainty in the building profession and has retarded building construction. Provincial governments must also examine their programs; their restriction against large funds in estate trusts entering the mortgage market is unforgiveable. The third level of government in Canada, the cities and municipalities, continue to restrict construction by lack of planning, restrictive building by-laws and lack of adequate zoning.

At this point I should like to comment on the suggestion made earlier by the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert). He suggested that the government make available mortgage funds at an interest rate of 6 per cent. I point out that this is a 100 per cent increase over the figure used in the election platform of this party in 1968. At that time, NDP candidates went into the field and suggested a rate of 3 per cent for all Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation mortgages. I suggest to the hon. members of the New Democratic party that since their 1968

rate of 3 per cent has jumped to 6 per cent by 1970, by 1972 the NDP will be offering 12 per cent mortgages; I suggest this is not good enough.

Mr. Orlikow: We have those now.

Mr. Goode: These members are insisting on 6 per cent mortgages, but what are they going to do about those people who presently have mortgages at rates of interest between 7 and 10 per cent? Are they going to subsidize them as well? If so, where will they find the money?

They also talk of rent control. With great fanfare they tell the people of Canada that they are going to bring in rent controls. They know very well that the federal government cannot introduce rent controls. Furthermore, these rent controls would have to be enforced by the provincial governments, and certainly I have not seen the government of Manitoba showing any sign of moving into this field at an early date, as hon. members suggest. The provincial government of Manitoba is not entering this field, and I suggest that an NDP federal government would not either.

The urban challenge of the 1970's is with us. If we do not act quickly with courage and imagination, this challenge may well become a catastrophe from which Canada will never recover.

• (3:40 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to contribute, in a very modest way, to the debate on the motion proposed today on housing. I think the choice could not have been wiser in view of the sorry and desperate plight of the greater part of our population in this field.

We all agree that the proposals of this government have only brought inadequate results. Some will even say that the government has done nothing, but I will go even further. However, it is to be wondered whether the government has done enough and whether it might not do more. I think we can answer this question.

For the past year or year and a half, they have been talking about giving a new impetus to housing in the near future, and they are still talking about it. Since the unemployment rate is particularly alarming in Quebec, I think it is the duty of Quebec members to press the government to come up with suggestions, proposals and much more effective legislation than those put forward in the last years.

How can a new impetus be given to the housing industry in the short term? There has been a lack of realism, I think. The minister mentioned earlier that millions had been spent on housing. But we know very well that even those considerable amounts are not adequate considering the great number of people with a low income.

I am not in the habit of limiting myself to criticism. But I think that the pitiful failure of the government to provide housing for low-income groups should prompt us to press more strongly than ever for more effective measures on their behalf.

It was said that a number of housing units had been built, but the interest rate on mortgages, which can be most detrimental to the building industry, has always been glossed over.

I have already urged that loans at 5 or 6 per cent be made available to those earning $10,000 or less per year. I will be told: But who will pay the difference in interest? I will answer that it is obviously up to the government to make up the difference. However, I do not believe that easier loans, longer amortization periods up to 40 years will allow more Canadian citizens to purchase a house, for they will then have to pay for it three times over.

Reference is made to low-cost housing, and I think I am in a position to say a few words on this matter. This week, I got the happy news: in my constituency, more particularly in the city of Joliette, a $600,000 housing project will be built. Now those $600,000 can at the most allow the construction of 51 3 and 4 room dwellings and this is a 50-year loan bearing at 8 per cent interest. Therefore, the owners will have to pay a monthly rent of $136 for a 3-room dwelling and of $150 for a 4-room dwelling. I do not believe that this can be considered low-cost housing. Surely, this project is important for my area and this large city of my constituency. I appreciate the launching of the project, but I know very well that only professional people will benefit from it.

It is therefore our duty, as members of this House, to demand more realistic action for small wage-earners. We have the opportunity today to try again and ask the minister to be more compassionate and understanding and to make it possible for small wage-earners to live in adequate dwellings with suitable rents.

It is true that for several years, we have been asking the removal of that hateful 11 per cent tax on building materials. Reference

has been made to the possibility of granting loans to workers earning from $5,000 to $10,000 per year at an interest rate of 5 or 6 per cent. I venture to think that the government will react to those recommendations. We could be told that we are only criticizing. I think that our suggestions are acceptable. I am convinced that such a policy would likely give new life to the building industry in Quebec as elsewhere in Canada.

Indeed, the construction industry employs close to 30 per cent of the Canadian labour force. Somebody could say that there is the risk of inflation. Everything that is said about inflation makes me laugh, because the government policy to eliminate it made it worse. Inflation has never been so bad. Yet, the budgets of various departments were cut while more unemployment was created to eradicate inflation. The policy of the government in that regard did not produce the expected results.

Housing is not any better for all this. If the suggestions to get construction going again were implemented, thousands of new jobs would be created and industries would be more prosperous.

As for the 500,000 unemployed who receive from $53 to $60 a week, they could find work. They would pay small taxes on certain building materials. However, the general 11 per cent tax on building materials would have to be repealed.

Not wanting to deny my colleagues the opportunity of speaking—they probably have much to say—I conclude my remarks by saying that, like an important segment of the population, I am quite disappointed with the housing policy of this government. Of course, I have had the pleasure of approving the policy of the government in other fields, and I even made it a point to do so. As to the failure of the policy concerning housing and assistance to low wage earners, I feel it is my duty—and I do not think I am wrong in saying so—to hold the government responsible for it.

They can say all they want about establishing a department of urban affairs, about dialogue or co-operation between municipal, provincial and federal governments, but as long as we fail to reduce substantially the interest rate and to bring in legislation to lower the price of building materials, it will be completely ridiculous to talk about boosting the construction industry and the minister's wishes today will remain pious ones.

I dare hope that these few comments will incite the government to be more serious, more courageous and more sincere as regards the great number of people who need suitable housing at reasonable prices. It is the only way to offer them decent homes. That is the only way to put the building industry back on its feet. To speak at greater length on that subject would probably be a waste of time. I hope that the government will avail itself of these suggestions and that I will not be regarded as confining himself to destructive criticisms. On the contrary, while trying to make suggestions I keep hoping that the government will stop turning a deaf ear to the possibility of housing low income people in proper homes at reasonable prices.

Mr. Speaker, I think this would be a good show of humanitarianism, because we would then recognize that a homeowner is a precious asset for society, since the one who owns a home is always more interested in society than the tenant. The owners are more fully aware of their responsibilities, because they wish to protect their property. I suggest that to be able to afford an adequate home is an honor and something to be proud of. It would be within everybody's reach if reasonable interest rates were available and if materials were moderately priced. I do not see any other solution. I am not well versed in economics, but I think I can say that the economists who have come up with housing proposals so far have been way off the mark.

[*English*]

Mr. Robert P. Kaplan (Don Valley): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to be able to participate in the debate this afternoon. I think you might be interested to know there is a long list of members on this side of the House who would like to participate in this debate on urban policy. We are grateful to the opposition for raising the problem so often. I have waited now for three allotted days—they are not very good days, Fridays and Mondays—to have the opportunity to make a few comments, and I am glad to finally have this opportunity now. However, I find that almost everything I would have liked to have said has been said very well by other members who have spoken.

• (3:50 p.m.)

I appreciate fully the position which the government has taken. I agree with their assessment and with the proposed target of 1,100,000 homes to be constructed over a five

year period. I can certainly see that in an economy characterized by cycles, by periods of inflation and by periods of near recession it is appropriate that houses not be constructed in an even pattern. There ought to be years in which we should do better than one-fifth of 1,100,000, while there will be other years when one might not expect to reach this number of housing units.

Mr. Orlikow: There is no hurry whatsoever for houses in Don Valley.

Mr. Kaplan: I might say that I have not heard any member of the opposition today challenge the target of 1,100,000 as not being more or less the proper level to be reached in five years. What I would like to urge on the government is that it should perhaps have more confidence than it seems to have in the ability of the private sector to produce housing for Canadians at reasonable prices. It is the assumption that the private sector is unable to do this that has led to the emphasis the government has placed on the provision of public housing. I should like to quote from the remarks the minister made a few moments ago when he said: "The major component in the government housing target for the year 1970 is to see that commitments are made for low income housing for close to 35,000 dwelling units together with a significant number of hostel units."

These public housing projects are not developed by the private sector, they are developed and financed by the government. There will always be a need in our society for some element of housing subsidy or housing support by the government. However, I am glad to see signs in other places that the government is beginning to recognize the private sector is, perhaps with some assistance, capable of producing housing at lower prices than it has done in the past. I should like to deal with one of those signs, but before I do so I wish to emphasize the point I just made and to indicate to you, sir, that there is a very great danger that this strong emphasis on the aspect of public housing will lead us into a situation where the rest of society also is going to have great trouble in being able to afford adequate housing. By concentrating very heavily on public housing, we may find ourselves in a situation where the rest of society suffers from adequate attention.

Recently the Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs was presented with a brief from one of the largest residential developers in Canada. I took the trouble to obtain their financial statement. Perhaps legislators and tenants are not supposed to read these financial statements because they contain some very disturbing pieces of information that may enthuse shareholders but that are less promising for the rest of us. I should like to read from this statement. I think the passage I will read shows that increased attention is necessary to what the private sector is doing for those in our society who can afford houses at reasonable prices. It reads:

> Probably the most significant factor for our industry in 1969 was the increasing effect of high interest rates on the cost of providing residential rental accommodation. These high rates are likely to continue to hamper the industry for the better part of 1970.
>
> The residential rental market has not as yet reflected, through its rent levels, the extra costs imposed by these interest rates. Consequently buildings being built for absorption by the rental market in 1970 will be unable to produce a reasonable rate of return until rent levels properly reflect these increased costs.

That is very disturbing news for anyone who in the last two years has found his rent increasing. The message here is that, even with rents at their 1970 levels, it is not economic for developers to build apartments, for example. Rents must increase according to this financial statement to justify the construction that is taking place this year. This is a very disturbing statement. It tells us that if we allocate our government revenue to public housing to the extent that we overstress that aspect, we are tending to produce a situation where the rest of society may find itself unable to afford the only kind of housing that can be constructed at present costs. So, I think the government, in allocating its resources, has to turn its attention to the situation that exists generally in the housing market.

While public housing is important, and while there will always have to be some, the provision of it should be contrasted with some of the other things the government could do to stimulate housing. Let me illustrate this in one way. In public housing there is a multiplier effect for government expenditure of .95 to one, that is to say, whenever the government spends 95 cents toward public housing, $1 worth of public housing is produced because for every 90 cents that Ottawa puts up the provincial government puts up 10 cents. By an expenditure of 90 cents, therefore, the federal government can obtain the benefit of the multiplier effect and obtain a $1 worth of housing.

Let me contrast that, because the contrast is remarkable, with some of the other things that the government could do with its $1 for housing. I suggest that for every $1 the government spends in the servicing of land there would be $30 or $40 of benefit as a result of this multiplier effect. Around my own city, the principal block to the construction of a sufficient number of houses for the people who live in the Toronto area is the lack of available serviced land. A dollar of government activity in this area can go very much farther than a dollar of activity in the area of public housing. It is for this reason that I was greatly encouraged to see CMHC recently extend an invitation to the private sector to bring forward unconventional and innovative plans and new ideas for constructing homes for Canadians at reasonable prices. This is a project that I heartily endorse.

To the extent that the government is prepared to make investments in the servicing of land to bring this great multiplier effect to which I have referred into play, it is obvious that there are constitutional considerations which will require the co-operation of the province of Ontario. For this reason, as an elected member from Ontario, I can only hope that all other members of the House will urge the government of Ontario and all provincial governments to seriously consider the initiative that was taken by the minister the other day in recommending the establishment of an urban council to deal precisely with this type of problem where there is a great federal interest in stimulating activity, but where work on the ground can only come about with full provincial and municipal co-operation.

• (4:00 p.m.)

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, when the minister replied he said there was no justification for our dire projections. I sat listening to him, hoping he would say something positive to allay the fears of the House and the country over the serious housing crisis facing Canada. I heard nothing. In fact I heard words that more than justified the pessimism that is felt on all sides of this House, and right across the country, following the government's failure to come to grips with the housing crisis.

I was hoping that the hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Hellyer) would be in the House. I noticed he was here today and I hoped he would participate in this debate. It is well to recall the famous task force on housing and urban development which was headed by the minister's predecessor, the member for Trinity, just over a year ago. We remember that task force going all across the country, holding public hearings and seeing first hand the ugly picture of urban and rural poverty.

We read with interest its report. The hon. member for Trinity was so impressed with what he saw in his pilgrimage across the country that he came back to Ottawa firmly resolved that something had to be done, and done immediately. Unfortunately, the government of which he was a member did not agree with the urgency that he felt, and the minister resigned. That was the last positive word we had from the government on housing. It was the last indication of hope, of any suggestion of the government coming to grips with the housing problem and the attendant problems of poverty and unemployment.

It would be well for the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Andras), who is sincere in his intentions, to retrace the steps of his predecessor, to go into the poverty ghettos in our cities and see the way that the poor of Canada live. Oh yes, we hear a great deal from hon. members who represent the large cities about the urban problems of pollution, transportation and recreation. But, Mr. Speaker, what about the more serious problem of the lack of adequate housing?

Today in this proud land of ours there are people living in the most abject poverty, with children who have to be watched constantly for fear of their being bitten by rats. There are people living in our cities who do not have the ordinarily accepted convenience of adequate plumbing facilities. The hon. member for Trinity saw this. He saw it in my city; he saw it in other cities; he saw it in the rural areas of Canada. He was so impressed, or should I say depressed, with what he saw that he felt if the government's just society was to mean anything, something had to be done for Canadians living in substandard housing.

In the declaration of principles that formed the preamble to his report he mentioned that every Canadian should be entitled to clean, warm shelter as a matter of basic human right. I ask the minister how long can the thousands of Canadians who live in urban poverty wait to enjoy what should be this basic Canadian right? As the minister well knows, there are areas in my own city without plumbing facilities, without adequate facilities of any kind. I refer to the area

known as the Battery, which has been a political football for years, bounced back and forth between provincial, municipal and federal governments with nobody wanting to claim the responsibility for it. The poor who are forced to live in this area continue to suffer the consequences and the inconveniences. Another such area is Munday Pond, which will be referred to by my colleague, the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Carter), and which is now the subject of further urban renewal. But I ask the minister, why did he not announce today a real list of priorities covering specific problems in the various specific areas of the country?

These problems exist all across Canada, perhaps more glaringly in the major cities, but they exist in the rural areas as well. Notwithstanding what the minister said, or any of the pious hopes he enunciated, the fact remains that housing today is failing to keep pace with the demands of a just society, and has failed to keep pace with the demands of our growing urban environment. As compared with May last year, it is an undeniable fact that housing starts in May this year were down 50 per cent. Accompanying this decline is a related growth in unemployment. The two usually go hand in hand. In my own province, unemployment figures have reached the astonishing level of 15 per cent. Indeed, it has been suggested the actual unemployment figure is in excess of 20 per cent. I understand that the figure for the Atlantic provinces as a whole is in excess of 10 per cent. The unemployment figure for the province of Quebec is approaching or is in excess of 9 per cent.

These are areas in which housing starts have been declining. But the largest decline in housing starts has been in the urban areas, with Windsor, Ontario, down 80 per cent; Halifax, Nova Scotia, down 69 per cent; Calgary down 57 per cent; Toronto down 53 per cent; Edmonton down 45 per cent, and Montreal down 40 per cent. That is the kind of fact we should contend with, not the pious plans of the government or of the minister to deal with the problem over a long-term period. The problem is so acute that it needs immediate attention here and now.

• (4:10 p.m.)

In the first quarter of 1970 housing starts were down in all provinces of Canada. The decline in housing starts right across the country ranged from the amazing figure of 90.4 per cent in Saskatchewan to 61.5 per cent in my province, Newfoundland. In Ontario, the decline was 48 per cent, with British Columbia experiencing the smallest decline. This shows how serious is this problem, Mr. Speaker. It is the most serious problem facing the country. Yes, we are concerned, because the government has failed to come to grips with it. I believe it is fair to say that the hon. member for Trinity resigned from the cabinet because of the failure of the government to realize the urgency of the housing crisis and the urban problem in Canada today. By accepting the minister's resignation, the government automatically placed this problem well down on its list of priorities. I do not think the present minister can deny that.

I sympathize with the minister. He faces problems in the cabinet; he knows that his predecessor was forced to resign because the government failed to deal with the housing problem. The minister is concerned because he has seen many areas of Canada in which the housing problem is really acute. I suggest that unless he can obtain action soon by his cabinet colleagues, he will have no alternative except to follow the course of his predecessor in office and resign. That will be the only honourable course for him to take.

A few days ago in my home town, St. John's, I received a call from a constituent who was on the verge of being placed on the street, and I did something I rarely do. I called the housing authority and said, "I am not trying to interfere politically or influence your decision in any way, but I happen to know the circumstances of this particular case. This man, his wife and children are on the verge of being put out on the street. Can you do something for them?" I described the circumstances and gave them the man's name. The official pulled out the file and said, "He is so far down the list that I doubt whether it will be possible to do anything for him within the next year." That man was far down the list; 900 families ahead of him, were waiting, to be allocated a public housing unit, each one of them hoping to get out of inadequate slum housing they were forced to live in, often as a result of circumstances over which they had little or no control.

I hope that the minister will bring some specific solution to these specific problems in my city. I hope, for example, that he will announce a gigantic public housing scheme which will be wholly financed by the federal government, because this is a special case. He knows full well this is a special case and the reason for it. It is because the government of Newfoundland is strapped financially, to the point where it is unable to undertake any

more public housing projects. My city is the creature of that government. The housing crisis in my city is grave. People are being forced to live in temporary shelters that were put up over 70 years ago as a consequence of the fire that destroyed a great part of the city. They still live in those shelters and often do not enjoy adequate facilities. I therefore plead with the government and the minister, Mr. Speaker, to come up with some sort of special arrangement in order to cope with the special areas of the country where the need is greatest. There is ample precedent for the government to take such initiatives in areas where the need is greatest.

In conclusion, I wish to say that I support the recommendations of those who preceded me and who urged the government to act on this problem. It could begin by eliminating the 11 per cent sales tax on building materials and by lifting the freeze on urban renewal, so that certain areas could receive attention. It could also announce a policy whereby it would be prepared to enter into special agreements with those provinces where the need is greatest. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the minister has more success with his cabinet colleagues than he has had to date in bringing this problem to the successful conclusion that is necessary if this serious crisis in Canada is to be dealt with expeditiously.

Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the motion that has been moved by the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander). I am happy to support this motion because, as my colleague for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) said a moment ago, the city we have the honour to represent faces many problems in housing and urban renewal. Certainly, neither the agencies coming under the minister responsible for housing nor the government are paying to this problem the necessary attention. Little hope is therefore held out to those people who are suffering as a result of inadequate housing conditions that their problems will be solved in the foreseeable future.

As my colleague said a few moments ago, we sympathize with the minister responsible for housing. He realizes that he is filling the office once occupied by the man who had to resign because the government was unwilling to go along with his recommendations based on the report of the task force on housing. One of the recommendations of the former minister, now the hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Hellyer), was that the government should remove the 11 per cent sales tax on building materials, a worth-while recommendation which would have brought tremendous benefits to people in the middle and low income groups who might wish to buy or build a home. That 11 per cent sales tax probably represents $600 or $700 in the price of a house, an amount which often makes the difference in a person's ability to buy or build a home.

The minister is in an awkward position, because he must try to run with the hares and hunt with the hounds. On the one hand, he must support the anti-inflation policies of the government which are having a ruinous affect on housing and urban renewal in Canada as well as on the economy generally; on the other hand, he must put on a brave front of showing concern for the many thousands of Canadians who are forced to live in substandard conditions and for those with families who are on the waiting lists for public housing. In one breath the minister supports the government's anti-inflation policies, which are probably the greatest enemy of housing and urban renewal in this country, and in the next breath he must address various associations interested in housing, associations such as the Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities and the Canadian Homeowners Association, and go through the motions of showing he is interested in the affairs of the average Canadian who is trying to acquire a decent home.

Before my time expires, may I refer to something that is very, very serious in my riding of St. John's West. I am referring to the Mundy Pond urban renewal scheme. The present scheme was probably presented to the people in the early 1960's and a grandiose plan was prepared by the planners on instructions from the federal government, the province and the municipality of St. John's. A great deal of fuss was made. The people of Mundy Pond were to be given a new lease on life; their neighbourhood was to look like the Eutopia of St. John's, and their hopes were built up to the skies. Unfortunately, they have been kept dangling for at least ten years. At least three municipal elections have been fought on the issue and several federal elections, not to mention a number of provincial elections. But the people of Mundy Pond are still suffering. No more has been done up to now than was done ten years ago. The plan to redevelop that area is still on the drawing board. From what I understand there is very little likelihood of any start being

made on the project this year. This is trying the patience of those people too much. It shows a complete and utter disregard for their feelings.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Canadians have been suffering too long from the shortage of suitable homes for the people in the low and middle income brackets. The solutions to these two problems should be fundamentally different. The first problem is essentially that of poverty, and the second is the inability of the market system to function. This problem prevails not only in my province, but right across Canada. A large number of Canadians are desperately in need of homes who are not earning salaries that qualify them for a National Housing Act mortgage. I understand that a person must be earning $8,000 or more a year to qualify for such a mortgage. In a large number of areas in Canada, including Newfoundland, that regulation eliminates approximately 90 per cent of the people wishing to buy or build a new home.

The government should encourage municipalities to avail themselves of the limited dividend section of the National Housing Act. They should be encouraged to build co-operative housing. This also applies to the building societies, as mentioned this morning by my colleague, the hon. member for Hamilton West. The municipalities should be encouraged to become involved in housing on a much larger scale with, of course, financial assistance from the government. A large number of communities could take advantage of section 16 of the National Housing Act, dealing with the limited dividend aspect. The federal government should encourage the municipalities in order that decent low cost homes will be available.

Public housing is a must in most urban areas of Canada. In the city of St. John's, Newfoundland, we have far too few public housing units. As my colleague pointed out, there are waiting lists of 400 to 1,000 people in this city with a population of less than 100,000 people. We should give serious consideration to providing more low cost public housing. A new concept should be adopted with regard to public housing, with funds being made available to the middle income group so that they could build small homes on land developed by the municipality with the co-operation of the federal government. This land would be given to the people on a lease basis. This would enable them to acquire title to a piece of land on a lease back basis with a very small down payment. With CMHC financing, they could erect a home suitable for themselves and their families. This avenue should be explored by the minister in charge of housing and the government in conjunction with the provincial governments and municipalities. The middle income people would derive great benefits. In some respects this could also assist the low income group.

I understand that 100,000 families in Canada are on waiting lists for public housing. The minister's statement this afternoon will be of little consolation to those people desperately in need of better accommodation. The government is sadly lacking in its approach to housing. The number of starts made this year is far below that projected a year ago. It is a sad commentary in this day and age, when we are putting men on the moon and satellites in the sky, that a large number of Canadians in all parts of this country, especially in the economically depressed areas, do not even have proper toilet facilities. It is a sad commentary on the policies of this government. As was pointed out by the hon. member for St. John's East, every effort should be made to bring forth a bold new approach to the problem of housing in Canada.

[*Translation*]

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

I wish to point out that we do not have a quorum and therefore I would ask you to count the members.

[*English*]

Mr. McGrath: That reflects the attitude of the government to this whole problem.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Badanai): Order. I shall instruct the clerk to count the members in the House.

On the count being made, 20 members were declared to be present.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Badanai): There is a quorum.

Mr. Carter: I wish to impress upon this House, the government and the minister responsible, the need for immediate assistance to those people on the bottom half of the income ladder in Canada. I think the minister would be well advised to read the statements

by Dr. Albert Rose of the University of Toronto. He said:

> The most important change that could be made in our national housing policy would be a formal declaration that the federal and provincial governments intended, during the balance of this century, to discriminate in favour of families and individuals at the bottom half of the income ladder.

I think this is very good advice for the minister in charge of housing as well as the government. I urge the minister to get on the ball and get the Mundy Pond urban renewal scheme under way in order to fulfil the promises that have been made for the past ten years. The government should show that it cares about these people, is aware of their problems and will do everything possible to alleviate this situation.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, just over a year ago when the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) was chided about the housing emergency, he flourished a set of figures purporting to show that in the year 1969, 225,000 housing units would be built. He stated that was within the target set by the Economic Council of Canada for the five-year period 1969 to 1973, and that in fact there was no housing crisis.

The Toronto *Star*, certainly not an anti-Liberal newspaper, on May 10, 1969, ran an editorial commenting on that view expressed by the Prime Minister. The editorial was headed "But Pierre Baby, There is a Crisis". What was said in that editorial is essentially true today. There is no housing crisis in the constituency of Mount Royal which the Prime Minister represents. There is no housing crisis in the constituency of Westmount, which is represented by the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury). There is no pressing need in the constituency represented by the hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Kaplan) who suggested there was no need to hit the target of 250,000 homes in any particular year to reach the objective set by the Economic Council; there is no housing crisis in the constituency of Winnipeg South, particularly on Wellington Crescent which the minister knows so well. So I was not surprised when I did not hear very much from the Prime Minister about the housing crisis.

• (4:30 p.m.)

But I was disappointed in the speech made by the Minister without Portfolio in charge of housing (Mr. Andras). He told us that while starts were running at only 160,000 units for the year, he expected we would do better than that and build between 180,000 and 185,000 units. That figure falls far short of what the Economic Council said we needed. I give the government credit; the minister told us we would build 35,000 public housing units this year, and this is better than we have done for many years. But the number is still small in comparison to the need. There are 100,000 families or more waiting for accommodation and it is obvious we are falling further behind in meeting our housing needs every year. I say this bearing in mind the need, not of 210,000 units a year but of the 250,000 units mentioned by the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, and I say it without going into all the catastrophic effects of increased housing prices on the ordinary person.

A few years ago, ten years ago, when we talked about people in the lower income brackets, we were talking about people who were making less than $60 a week. Now, we are talking about people who are making less than $100 a week. But these are not the only people who are in trouble. Eighty-five per cent of the people of this country are in trouble if they do not have their own homes. In cities like Toronto, unless a man earns between $8,000 or $9,000 a year he cannot even qualify to get a house under the provisions governing the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. The interest rate on mortgages is now running at more than 10 per cent, which means that the vast majority are locked out of the possibility of house purchase, or else they are buying houses by cutting back on the most essential needs such as food and clothing.

I have a great deal of respect for this minister, for the job he tried to do when he was concerned with Indian Affairs and for the job he is trying to do now. For this reason, I was particularly sorry to hear him adopt the complacent view he took today. Those of us who are interested in the problems of housing, and in ordinary people, know that this minister is probably more interested in these questions than are all the other cabinet ministers put together. When he takes a complacent view, I can only say we are in real trouble. We in this party have consistently taken the view that the estimate of 250,000 units a year is a conservative one. And we are failing to meet that objective by 25 per cent this year. If the housing needs of the people are to be met, then housing must be given a much higher priority both federally and provincially within the economy. We agree with the con-

clusion of the Canadian Conference on Housing held in 1968, that housing is just as socially necessary as is education. The need for the construction of all types of housing in this country far exceeds the money which is, or will be, available even if we could bring interest rates down.

There are demands in this country for high rise office buildings with air conditioning and carpeting from wall to wall; there are demands for factories, for larger filling stations or service stations—service centres as they are now called; for high priced apartment buildings, for public housing and for houses for ordinary citizens. The total demand is far greater than the amount of money, labour and materials which we can accumulate in any one year. It is not surprising that banks and the finance companies are not doing more in the private housing field. After all, they are primarily interested in making profits for their shareholders. I am not being critical of them, bearing in mind the kind of society in which we live. I refer the hon. member for Don Valley to the announcement yesterday or today that bank profits were up by more than 25 per cent in the first six months of this year as compared to last year. It is no wonder the banks are much more interested in putting their money into shopping centres, filling stations, office buildings and luxury hotels than they are in ordinary housing.

As I say, I cannot blame them. They are there to make a profit for their shareholders. But we can blame governments of Canada, both federal and provincial, for permitting this state of affairs to continue and for failing to establish, through consultation, a system of priorities. I submit there is much more need in Ottawa for 2,000 moderately priced homes than there is for the third building which the Campeau Construction Company is putting up very near here at the present time.

• (4:40 p.m.)

I submit there is much more need for three or four thousand housing units, public or private, in the city of Toronto than for another Toronto-Dominion Centre in the city of Toronto. I submit there is more need for 2,000 homes in Winnipeg than for the Richardson building that was opened some months ago. But until governments in this country look at the problem in this way, and people tell the governments in Canada that housing is the number one priority, we will continue to do what we have been doing until now and build 180,000 housing units when we need 250,000. We will continue to encourage the building of more office buildings in Ottawa so that civil servants can move from temporary buildings, which are old but habitable, into high rise buildings that are air conditioned and all the rest. We will continue to permit oil companies to build more filling stations and permit the building of more shopping centres, the cost of which is borne by the consumer in the price of the groceries she has to buy in order to live.

In closing, I hope the minister will stop being so complacent, which is the only way I can describe the speech that he made today. I hope that even though we do not know who are members of this task force, what subject it will be studying and at what cost, the minister will put it to work to examine some of the housing problems facing this country. When this work is completed I hope the federal government will tell the provinces and municipalities that those things which need doing the most should be done. This is not the building of fancy office buildings or high rise luxury apartment buildings, but rather the kind of homes that the ordinary people of this country who earn $60, $70, $80 or $100 a week need so desperately at this time.

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

Mr. Orlikow: Certainly.

Mr. Kaplan: What evidence has the hon. member for thinking that the banks and trust companies earn a greater return on loans for office buildings and shopping centres than on loans for apartment buildings?

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, I think the answer is very simple. It is obvious where the money is going and that that is where the action is. Apart from making more money, I am sure the hon. member will agree it is much simpler for a bank or a mortgage or trust company to lend $5 million, if I may use that figure as an example, to just one company so there is one transaction, to build one building, rather than to lend the same amount to a couple of thousand individual prospective homeowners. As I say, the answer is simple; the evidence is that the homes we need are not being built. Instead, office buildings, hotels, shopping centres and filling stations are being constructed.

Mr. Chas. L. Caccia (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, hon. members opposite who have

contributed to this debate today have made comments on the present situation and described the various aspects of the problems in connection with housing. Some members have taken the trouble to put forward proposals; some, like the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert), have put forward a lengthy list of proposals in an endeavour to provide some alternatives. But by and large, we have had a recitation of statistics and generalizations of the sort that have been made in this House in years past about a very complex and difficult subject.

However, one thing has emerged from this debate today, and it is that practically every hon. member opposite, with rare exception, has deplored inflation and indicated that inflation has had a negative effect on housing. I could not think of a better compliment in recognition of the efforts that are presently being made by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) to break the back of inflation than this common theme that has been followed in the debate today. Even hon. members opposite seem to recognize the importance of this aspect.

A look at housing policy over the past two years indicates a gradual reduction in the size of the housing problem. The problem is being approached area by area, beginning with housing for Canadians who are at the bottom of the income scale. Before this task could be initiated, the federal government ordered a document produced by a task force which, perhaps for the first time, provided a clear indication of the complexity of the problem of supplying Canadians with housing.

As far as federal responsibility is concerned, except for four or five, the major recommendations of the report have been implemented. It is true some of the recommendations have not. Some of them had to wait until the right time. One recommendation saw the light of day last Wednesday when the Minister without Portfolio in charge of housing (Mr. Andras) announced in Halifax a three-level council. This announcement was made possible as the result of a radical change of attitude on the part of a major province in this country, Quebec. This announcement having been made, one hopes that other provinces will follow suit and endorse the idea of a three-level council, including, of course, the province of Ontario.

In his speech this morning, the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (Mr. Allmand) gave examples of the complexity of this problem by reading advertisements published in a Montreal newspaper which showed that the situation in Montreal is quite different from the situation, for example, in Toronto. He quoted advertisements offering houses for sale in Montreal at a price of $14,500, with a $500 down payment. So that in fairness, one cannot generalize and describe the housing situation as a national crisis. There are variations from region to region, from province to province; and in each area the components of the variations differ.

The next aspect that has been given attention during these years has been the priority given by the government to producing housing for Canadians with low incomes. Figures to this effect have been cited by previous speakers. In other words, considering the resources available, it has been possible to give precedence to that portion of the total housing problem which is of a most urgent nature; that is, the provision of decent housing for Canadians who cannot afford a roof.

• (4:50 p.m.)

Within this general policy, last April we saw a new development when new rental fees and new regulations were announced for people occupying low income housing. Also there was a very important inclusion in the National Housing Act to permit something which was not possible before. I refer to the inclusion of social and recreational facilities in future projects in recognition of the necessity for these in projects of any size. Another step within this area was the provision of $27 million this year for loans for limited dividend housing. This again is for that spectrum of the population in Canada which is in need.

Another measure for low income Canadians is the provision of $200 million. This is an encouragement and an invitation to Canadians to produce new ideas, new approaches and new designs, I would assume, for the government to produce houses for middle income Canadians. This measure is an indication that today we are at least approaching the question of housing within the limitation of the resources available, rather than approaching it on a gigantic universal scale as proposed by some opposition members. Probably the effect of these measures will be felt during the second half of 1970. Therefore, today we are debating statistics and figures that really do not present the picture for the entire year 1970. Whatever the total figure may be—and we do have reason to hope it will be a fairly encouraging one—certainly, we all agree

there is no room for complacency on this question. Housing policies in any nation are the subject of criticism, and quite rightly so, because everyone is entitled to increasing standards of fine housing.

In Canada we must strive for higher standards. But, a look at what has been done so far from 1968 up until now would indicate that all the signs are there and that, once having assessed the entirety of the problem, the minister has approached the problem initially here the urgency is greatest. He is gradually moving into the areas of lesser urgency, keeping in mind the total picture. Therefore, members on this side of the House are convinced that the minister is doing well and we have the utmost confidence in him.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Five o'clock.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. It being five o'clock, it is my duty to inform the House that pursuant to Section 11 of Standing Order 58, the proceedings on the motion before the House are deemed to have expired.

This House stands adjourned until Monday, June 15, 1970 at two o'clock p.m.

At five o'clock the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, June 15, 1970

The House met at 2 p.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. HOWARD (SKEENA)—DISCLOSURE TO PRESS OF INFORMATION IN INTERIM REPORT ON NON-MEDICAL USE OF DRUGS

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege relating particularly to an announcement over the CBC on the 11 o'clock news on Friday night and to other news items which were carried over the weekend dealing with the interim report of the LeDain commission on the non-medical use of drugs.

It was obvious from watching the newscast and listening to Capital Report and other news items that certain members of the press have inside information as to the contents of the report. Reference was made to the number of pages in the report—

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Seven hundred.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): —and to the legal difficulties which might arise if certain aspects of the report were adopted, the awkward position in which the courts might be placed when imposing sentences dealing with infractions of the current laws, the matter of diet pills, marijuana, a cabinet committee and other things. This clearly indicates that certain individuals within the news media have received information with respect to the report in question.

It is my contention, since government is the element of Parliament which has possession of this interim report and has so far not tabled it, that the contents thereof, or part of them, have been revealed to certain persons in the news field contrary to proper practice and to the requirement that such reports be tabled in Parliament. It is an affront to the people of Canada and to Parliament for someone in government to leak certain information, as is obviously the case here, to the press while at the same time denying full information in the form of the report itself.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Howard (Skeena): After much prodding and questioning on Friday morning last, the Prime Minister said the report would be tabled in the House. I believe that it smacks of arrogance and manipulation for someone in his cabinet to contravene the spirit of that commitment.

If Your Honour finds that a prima facie case of privilege does exist, I intend to found upon it the following motion, seconded by my hon. friend from Winnipeg North:

This House expresses the opinion that the government should forthwith table the interim report of the commission of inquiry into the non-medical use of drugs.

Mr. Speaker: I suggest to the hon. member for Skeena and to other hon. members that there should not be a debate on the proposed motion. A motion in similar terms was proposed late last week by the hon. member for Peace River. After much thought and consideration and after hearing argument on the subject, the Chair ruled that though there might have been a grievance no question of privilege arose. I therefore have to say that, even in the light of the circumstances to which the hon. member has alluded, this cannot be considered a proper question of privilege and I have to rule that the hon. member's proposed motion cannot be put to the House.

• (2:10 p.m.)

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

COMMUNICATIONS

TABLING REPORT ON PARTICIPATION BY TELECOMMUNICATIONS CARRIERS IN PUBLIC DATA-PROCESSING

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 41(2) I wish to table two copies in both official languages of a report on "Participation by Telecommunications Carriers in Public Data-Processing". This report has been prepared by the Department of Communications within the framework of the telecommission studies. It should not, however, be regarded as a final telecommission report.

Oil Spill into Athabasca River

As the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications may well wish to study this report I suggest, if the House agrees, that the report be referred to the committee today.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member for Winnipeg North rising on motions?

Mr. Orlikow: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: My understanding of the proposed motion of the Postmaster General is that it referred to the tabling of a document and this, of course, is not subject to debate. I have to rule that there is no debate on the statement or on the action proposed by the Postmaster General.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, I have another motion I should like to move.

[*Later:*]

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the Minister of Communications suggested that the subject matter of the report tabled by him today might, with unanimous consent of the House, be referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications. I wonder if we might ascertain whether there would be unanimous consent to such an order?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Is this under Standing Order 43?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): No.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I gather it is not under the provisions of Standing Order 43. The President of the Privy Council as Government House Leader seeks the unanimous consent of the House to proceed as suggested by the Minister of Communications. Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Apparently there is not unanimity. The motion cannot be proceeded with as suggested by the minister.

POLLUTION

OIL SPILL INTO ATHABASCA RIVER—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I should like to move a motion of a type with which Your Honour is now familiar. My proposal motion is made pursuant to Standing Order 43 and I ask unanimous consent to move the motion under these circumstances.

The oil spill into the Athabasca River has now reached epic and dangerous proportions. It is now backing up into the Peace River, will be entering the Slave River and may well go into Great Slave Lake. At this time of year the flood waters in the area of the confluence of these rivers are very substantial.

In view of what has happened and the fears that have arisen, and in view of the fact that additional pipelines to be constructed in the north are now under contemplation, I think this matter should be one for immediate inquiry. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken), the following motion, to which I ask for the unanimous consent of the House:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government of Canada and the government of Alberta should immediately discuss the establishment of a commission of inquiry into the question of the oil spill in the Athabasca River; the adequacy of the means taken to deal with the damage and the establishment of proper safeguards and precautions against any repetition of this disastrous pollution.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members have heard the motion proposed by the hon. member for Peace River. By the terms of Standing Order 43 this motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Therefore the Chair has to inquire whether there is such unanimity.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Since there is not unanimity the motion cannot be moved at this time.

COMMUNICATIONS

RATE INCREASE REQUESTED BY BELL CANADA —REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to ask the House to agree to a motion regarding Bell Canada. Bell Canada has made a request to the Canadian Transport Commission for a new increase in telephone rates of 6¼ per cent. This follows the increase of last fall which gave Bell increased revenues of $27.5 million.

Bell Canada has surpassed the 6.8 per cent maximum rate of return permitted by the Canadian Transport Commission and is now averaging over 7 per cent return on its investment. Bell has been working closely

with the Prices and Incomes Commission in circulating its material. This request for an increase is completely uncalled for.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43 I ask leave to move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), that:

The Standing Committee on Transport and Communications be authorized to meet forthwith and proceed as quickly as possible to investigate the latest proposed increase of Bell Canada, and the relationship between Bell Canada and the Canadian Transport Commission.

Mr. Speaker: Again hon. members have heard the motion proposed by the hon. member, which requires unanimous consent. Is there unanimity?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Since there is no unanimity the motion cannot be put.

DEUTERIUM OF CANADA ASSISTANCE BILL

AUTHORIZATION AND PAYMENT OF GRANT

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-222, to authorize the making of a grant to the province of Nova Scotia for the purpose of providing assistance to Deuterium of Canada Limited.

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

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

SCIENCE POLICY—STATEMENTS BY DR. R. J. UFFEN

Question No. 161—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. Did Dr. R. J. Uffen, Director of the Science Secretariat, at the conference of Canadian scientists and engineers held at Carleton University from July 31 to August 1, 1969 say that, "I speak to the President of the Treasury Board, Mr. Drury, regarding science policy for two hours each week."?

2. Did Dr. R. J. Uffen, also say at that meeting that, "The Committee of the Privy Council on Scientific and Industrial Research meet one hour each week"?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): 1. Dr. Robert J. Uffen, Chief Science Adviser to the Cabinet, in his capacity as Secretary of the Privy Council Committee on Scientific and Industrial Research, regularly meets with the Hon. C. M. Drury, who is Chairman of the Committee.

2. The Privy Council Committee on Scientific and Industrial Research has a scheduled weekly meeting.

STATEMENT ON SCIENCE POLICY

Question No. 173—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. When will the Government of Canada issue a full statement on Canada's National Science Policy?

2. When will the Government of Canada issue a comment on the recommendations of the Science Council of Canada?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): 1. The Government is at present receiving advice from many sources regarding science and technology in Canada. It is yet to be determined if it would be useful to endeavour to articulate a statement comprehending all science policy. There may evolve a series of policy statements covering specific areas of Canadian activity.

2. The Privy Council Committee on Scientific and Industrial Research meets weekly and does give consideration to the various recommendations of the Science Council of Canada. The Government acts upon those recommendations which it deems timely and makes announcements where appropriate.

PRIVY COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON SCIENTIFIC AND INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH

Question No. 480—**Mr. Broadbent:**

Does the Privy Council Committee on scientific and industrial research meet regularly once a week?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): See reply to Question No. 161 answered this day.

EMPLOYMENT AND CONTRACTS, AIRCRAFT DIVISION, ENAMEL AND HEATING PRODUCTS LIMITED

Question No. 1,457—**Mr. Coates:**

1. What is the total employment of the Aircraft Division of Enamel & Heating Products Limited?

2. What is the total amount of contracts awarded to Enamel & Heating Products Limited, Aircraft Division, through the Department of Supply and Services and through sub-contractors involved in work with the Department of Supply and Services?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of Supply and Services): 1. The only authoritative source of information is the company.

Questions

2. The total amount contracts and subcontracts awarded for fiscal years 1968/69 and 1969/70 were as follows:

Fiscal Year	Price Contracts	Subcontracts	Total
1968-1969	$363,013	$ 731,594	$1,094,607
1969-1970 (estimated)	$320,982	$1,327,272	$1,648,254

ELIMINATION OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN

Question No. 1,628—**Mr. Broadbent:**

Has the government given any consideration to the problem of discrimination against women in the labour market during its meetings with representatives of the provincial governments and, if so, has the federal government discussed with the representatives of the provincial governments the matter of provincial legislation which would accord with the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of Discrimination against women so that Canada might ratify this Declaration?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): The United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women is not open to ratification. The matter of discrimination against women in employment has been the subject of federal-provincial discussions. Canada ratified International Labour Convention number 111, dealing with discrimination in employment, in 1964, following consultation with the provinces.

FEDERAL PROGRAM TO EMPLOY WOMEN AS ECONOMISTS, LIBRARIANS AND STATISTICIANS

Question No. 1,629—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. How many women are currently employed in the federal public service program to employ economists, librarians and statisticians on a part-time basis?

2. Has this program proved successful and (a) if so, is the government planning to extend this program to other job categories (b) if not, for what reason?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Public Service Commission as follows: 1. Eight.

2. The program was launched as a pilot project to determine the availability of women with skills in the fields of economics, statistics and library science to work on a part-time basis and the capability of government departments to utilize these skills on a part-time basis. Relatively few women with skills at the levels required were identified as a result of the program. The program did demonstrate that employment of part-time workers in some professional fields is feasible in some government departments. The special regulation under which the program was established has not been renewed as it was found the program could be carried out under the provisions for part-time work which apply generally across the Public Service. It is therefore possible to continue to employ women with professional skills on a part-time basis.

[*English*]

MANPOWER AND IMMIGRATION CONSULTANTS

Question No. 1,677—**Mr. Robinson:**

How many consultants have been engaged by the Department of Manpower and Immigration during each year 1950 to 1970 inclusive (a) what was the cost of the consultants (b) how were the consultants utilized (c) for what reasons were the consultants necessary?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Since its establishment in 1966 to 1970, the Department of Manpower and Immigration has engaged 125 consultants. (a) The cost was approximately $669,841; (b) The consultants were utilized to carry out analysis, planning, organization, and evaluation studies for the Department; (c) The consultants were necessary because the work was beyond the capabilities of departmental resources.

REMOVAL OF REFUSE FROM HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT

Question No. 1,721—**Mr. Mather:**

1 Approximately how many tons of papers, left-over or waste, are removed from the Houses of Parliament each month?

2. On what basis is this removal carried out?

3. What revenue does the waste paper bring to the public?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of Supply and Services): In so far as Crown Assets Disposal Corporation is concerned: 1. Approximately 10 tons.

2. By contract government buildings are scheduled for a regular pickup of all left over and waste paper.

3. $12,000 per annum.

CBC—"THE NATION'S BUSINESS"

Question No. 1,727—**Mr. Paproski:**

Was the film shown on Sunday, April 19, 1970, on the CBC program, Channel 4, "The Nation's Business", sponsored and paid for entirely by the Liberal Party?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Yes.

ONTARIO—EXPENDITURES BY NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE

Question No. 1,750—**Mr. Serré:**

1. What were the expenditures in the Province of Ontario by the Department of National Health and Welfare for its various programs, Family Allowances, Old Age Security, medical services, research etc., during the fiscal year 1968-69?

2. What are the estimated expenditures for the year 1969-1970?

[*Translation*]

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1 and 2. The table below lists the expenditures of the Department of National Health and Welfare in the Province of Ontario for the fiscal years 1968-69, 1969-70. It excludes the payments made to the Province of Ontario under the various shared-cost programs administered by this Department.

Program	1968-69 $	1969-70[1] $
Fitness and Amateur Sport Research Grants	126,645	73,710
Welfare Grants	658,546	572,655
Medical Services	6,660,569	7,209,700
Family Allowances	189,231,474	190,556,271
Youth Allowances	25,343,412	26,693,008
Family Assistance	1,831,600	1,494,715
Old Age Security[2]	550,610,467	618,514,190
Total	774,462,713	845,114,249

[1]Figures still subject to adjustments.

[2]Includes the Guaranteed Income Supplement.

[*English*]

INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT—POSITIONS EXEMPTED FROM P.S.E.A.

Question No. 1,753—**Mr. Barnett:**

1. What are the descriptive particulars of each of the twenty-five positions in the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development which, by P.C. 1970-120, dated January 21, 1970, are excluded from the operation of section 10 of the Public Service Employment Act and to which the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development may make appointments during the period January 21, 1970 to March 31, 1971?

2. For what reasons has the Public Service Commission decided that it is not practicable nor in the best interests of the Public Service to apply section 10 of the Public Service Employment Act, as stated in the preamble of P.C. 1970-120?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and by the Public Service Commission as follows: 1. All 25 positions which, by P.C. 1970-120, are excluded from the operation of Section 10 of the Public Service Employment Act are training positions to which only Indians and Eskimos may be appointed. It is expected that the positions to which the 25 Indians and Eskimos are being appointed will provide an opportunity for them to learn the administrative skills required to operate effectively at middle management positions within the Department and in provincial and Band administrations. By March 31, 1971 the 25 employees selected will move into full-time positions within the Department or in Band administration. The 25 positions are being filled by competition among Indians and Eskimos and the Public Service Commission Selection Standards apply in all cases. The salary levels are within the range $6,294-$10,162 depending upon the person and his qualifications.

2. The Public Service Commission is in full sympathy with the Government's objective of providing developmental experience to enable Indians and Eskimos to assume managerial responsibilities in the Department that has primary responsibility for native peoples, and the exclusion was made to facilitate this objective.

Questions

INFLATION—ISSUANCE OF DIRECTIVES TO PROPRIETARY CROWN CORPORATIONS

Question No. 1,833—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. Has the government issued directives to proprietary Crown corporations to participate in the governmental anti-inflationary policy and, if so, what were the directives?

2. What steps have proprietary Crown corporations taken to fight inflation?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): 1. Yes. The directives issued by Treasury Board requested proprietary Crown Corporations to comply with the government's policy as outlined by the Prime Minister in the House of Commons on February 18, 1970, at the close of the Federal-Provincial Conference on Price Stability. Compliance was requested in respect of all domestic prices other than charges determined by statute or international agreement; charges for recovery of actual costs under existing agreements; and interest rates for the lending of money. In the case of these three items, other controls exist and are being employed selectively, where possible, to achieve the government's policy.

2. In accordance with the directives mentioned in the answer to the first part of the question and with the guidelines established for private business by the Prices and Incomes Commission, proprietary Crown Corporations are now requested to submit any proposals for essential price increases to the Prices and Incomes Commission for review under the procedure established after the Federal-Provincial Conference in February 1970.

COST OF CRTC HEARING IN OTTAWA APRIL 13 TO 22

Question No. 1,855—**Mr. Hees:**

1. What was the direct expense to the government of the Canadian Radio Television Commission hearing in Ottawa on April 13 to 22 inclusive—hotel, transportation, etc.?

2. For what reasons was a hotel selected instead of a government building, such as the new facilities at the old Union Station?

3. What were the other costs to the taxpayer for the same meeting such as travel costs, *per diem* of the part-time members, and an estimate of the cost of keeping the full-time members and staffs there for this period of time?

4. How many staff members were directly involved in the hearing to the extent of spending most of their time at it during the period involved?

5. What was the CRTC telephone, telegraph and telex bill for the period March 1 to April 30, 1970?

[Mr. Forest.]

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Radio-Television Commission as follows: 1.

Rental of halls and rooms for hearing		$9,870.00
Advertising as per Broadcasting Act		9,425.00
Simultaneous translation		
Equipment	$4,256.00	
Interpreters	3,937.00	8,193.00
Court reporters		4,500.00
		$31,988.00

2. The space at the old Union Station was considered for public hearings and ruled out because it was too small and because it was already committed to some other use.

3. Travel costs and fees—part-time members $12,615.00.

4. 14.

5.

Cost of telephone March 1 to April 30/70	$4,484.54
Cost of telegraph March 1 to April 30/70	778.12
Cost of telex March 1 to April 30/70	402.73
Total	$5,665.39

[*English*]

OLD AGE PENSIONS—ADJUSTMENT TO COST OF LIVING

Question No. 1,863—**Mr. Robinson:**

Will the federal government consider increases in the Old Age Pension in accordance with the increases in the Consumer Price Index and the 1.5% rate of inflation?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Yes.

EFFECT OF BUDGET CREDIT RESTRICTION PROVISIONS ON CONSUMER DEBT

Question No. 1,873—**Mr. Robinson:**

To what extent is it anticipated that the consumer debt will be reduced by the budget credit restriction provision?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): I announced in the House of Commons on June 1, 1970 that the government would not be proceeding with the measures proposed in the last budget to control consumer credit.

CBC COVERAGE OF OLYMPIC COMMITTEE

Question No. 1,899—**Mr. Matte:**

Did CBC cover the meeting of the Olympic Committee held recently in Amsterdam, and, if so, did the technical crew responsible for the film sequence come from Toronto or from Montreal and for what reasons?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: Yes. As a matter of convenience, European-based technical crews were used by CBC French and English services. In addition to a local Dutch crew, technical crews were sent to Amsterdam from CBC offices in London and Paris.

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE—DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT

Question No. 1,905—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of National Defence have data processing equipment (automatic) and, if so, for how long?

2. What was the initial cost of the equipment?

3. What yearly costs are anticipated for data processing in the Department?

Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): 1. Yes, data processing equipment has been used since 1942; in Defence Research Board since 1956.

2. The initial equipment was rented. Defence Research Board's records for 1956 no longer exist.

3. In the fiscal year 1970-71 the forecast cost for data processing is estimated to be $3.287 million.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—COMPUTERS USED IN OPERATIONS

Question No. 1,917—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of National Defence have the use of a computer in its operations and, if so, to what extent is it utilized?

2. Is the computer programmed 24 hours per day and, if not, for what reason?

3. What is the number of hours planned for utilization of the computer?

4. What has been the annual cost of computer services for each year 1960 to 1970 inclusive?

5. How many programmes are in preparation for the computer at the present time and how will each affect the efficiency of the Department?

Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): 1. The Canadian Armed Forces have many computers in operations ranging from the SAGE facility at North Bay to guidance systems in individual weapons. The Defence Research Board also has a number of computers of varying capacity in its establishments to carry out research programs.

2, 3, 4 and 5. Since the computers used by the Canadian Armed Forces are considered to be integral parts of the systems to which they belong, their use, measured in hours per day, varies with the training programs, operations, etc. involved. Those used by Defence Research Board are considered to be tools in the research activity and are selected and used to maximize the efficiency of the research program. The costs of computer services are allotted as part of the costs of the scientific program and are not maintained as separate items.

REPAYMENT OF LOAN BY GREAT BRITAIN

Question No. 1,920—**Mr. Matte:**

Has Great Britain repaid the money borrowed from Canada during the last war and, if so, how were the repayments made?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): In 1942 Canada made an interest-free loan of $700 million to the United Kingdom. The loan represented the funding of advances made to the government of the United Kingdom in 1941 and 1942, prior to the establishment of the wartime Mutual Aid arrangements. Repayment was deferred until the end of the war, though the total outstanding was reduced both during the war and after by crediting against it the Canadian dollar proceeds of Canadian securities sold, or surrendered for redemption, by U.K. residents. After this provision came to an end in 1953, the outstanding balance of $150 million was repaid in 20 equal quarterly instalments, ending on December 1, 1958.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS—SEMINAR "ACCESS TO INFORMATION"

Question No. 1,954—**Mr. Coates:**

1. Was the Department of Communications involved in the arrangements for a seminar called "Access to Information" held at Carleton University on May 15?

2. What was the purpose of the seminar, how many invitations were issued and how many attended the seminar?

3. Was the reception associated with the seminar held before or after the actual seminar or was there a reception both before and after and, if so, what was the cost of the reception and what portion of this cost was the responsibility of the Department of Communications?

4. What was the total cost to the Department of Communications for its involvement in this seminar?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): 1. Yes.

2. The purpose of the seminar, taking special account of regional disparities was: a) consider ways by which telecommunications technology, systems, concepts and institutions can be developed and applied so as to approach the ideal of the optimum amount of information being made available to the maximum number of individuals, groups and institutions; b) assess the costs and benefits (economic, social) of providing such information, and the costs (economic, social) of failing to do so. 90 invitations were issued. 77 people attended.

3. A reception was held before the seminar. There was no cost to the Department of Communications for this reception.

4. Approximately $5,600.

[*English*]

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

INCENTIVE GRANTS TO DOMINION TEXTILE LIMITED

Question No. 1,765—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion under the Regional Development Incentives Act authorized or provided an incentive grant or grants to Dominion Textile Limited, Magog, Quebec, and, if so, what is the amount of each grant?

2. Who are the directors and executive officers of Dominion Textile Limited, Magog, Quebec, and what is the address of each?

3. To what extent is this company non-resident or foreign-owned or controlled?

. What is the name and country of the known non-resident ownership in this company?

Return tabled.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I should like to inquire about starred question No. 1,907 standing in my name. The question is starred because of the urgency in acquiring the information. It relates to meetings the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development may have had with certain Indian bands. Having been in touch with some Indian people I know they would like to have the information before Parliament rises presumably at the end of this month. Could this question not be answered with some expedition?

[Mr. Coates.]

Mr. Chrétien: Soon.

Mr. Coates: Mr. Speaker, like the hon. member for Skeena, I also have a starred question, No. 1,203, about which I am concerned. It has to do with the Prime Minister's use of the Jet Star. In view of the fact that he now uses a Boeing 707 and since it has been most difficult to obtain information regarding the Jet Star, I am afraid that if consideration is not given to answering the question soon I will never be able to catch up on his use of the 707.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, may I refer to question No. 1,530 of March 18 in my name requesting the simple information as to the fees paid to people who have been hired by the present administration in the province of Nova Scotia since June 25, 1968. It would be most interesting to have the answer to this question. Certainly I cannot see any reason for the government not wanting to disclose how much money was received by people who possibly formerly have been Liberal candidates and by others.

Mr. Macquarrie: I should like to refer to an ancient question of January 21 regarding the *SS Prince Edward Island.* Now that the boat has been towed away I wonder whether someone could give us the information as to the number of tenders that were received.

Mr. Orlikow: I should like to refer to my question No. 1,002 of January 28, asking for the names of outside consultants, etc., hired by the Prime Minister's office or the Privy Council office, what they are doing and how much they are being paid. It is almost five months since I filed my question and I would hope that an answer could come down before the House adjourns.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—POSITION OF SIX PER CENT WAGE INCREASE GUIDELINE—MEASURES TO PROMOTE ACCEPTANCE

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to ask a question of the Acting Prime Minister in the absence of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate

Affairs and the Minister of Finance. What is happening to the government's guideline program of 6 per cent with regard to wage and salary increases? Has this program been abandoned or modified or is everything going according to plan?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): The Prices and Incomes Commission is continuing to seek co-operation in wages as well as in prices and incomes. I hope that it has the support of my hon. friend.

Mr. Baldwin: Sir Galahad.

Mr. Stanfield: I do not think the Acting Prime Minister, in his own embarrassment, should provoke me. Does the government, instead of simply passing this off as something devised by the Prices and Incomes Commission, propose to take any measures toward encouraging the acceptance of this program which I understand it has accepted as its own?

Mr. Sharp: The government has accepted the recommendations of the Prices and Incomes Commission. It established it, it encourages it, it gives it all the support that it can, and I hope it has the support of my hon. friend.

Mr. Stanfield: Is it the position of the Acting Prime Minister and of the government that this program in its present form, with the exceptions that seem to have developed, carries conviction?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I would not think that this question is in order.

INFLATION—APPLICATION OF SIX PER CENT WAGE INCREASE GUIDELINE TO POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): My question is directed to the Acting Prime Minister. In view of the wage increases announced in the past few days for teachers, firemen, iron workers and towboat workers in British Columbia, all of whom have received substantially more than 6 per cent, is it the government's intention to continue to insist that the postal workers get no more than 6 per cent?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): The Prices and Incomes Commission this morning issued a statement in which it said that it is undertaking a preliminary inquiry into wage settlements ratified yesterday by Toronto construction workers, that it is proceeding to gather the facts and, after it has done so but not before, it will be making appropriate comments.

PRICES AND INCOMES COMMISSION

SALARY INCREASES OF STAFF MEMBERS

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Solicitor General who I understand is Acting Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. I would like to ask him a question regarding the policy of the Prices and Incomes Commission with respect to the salaries of its own staff. Is it correct that those joining the staff of the Prices and Incomes Commission are guaranteed a 15 per cent increase over the salaries they were making prior to joining that staff and are guaranteed an annual increase in excess of the 6 per cent which the commission has laid down for others?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Acting Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I would be very glad to have the hon. member's allegation looked into and have an answer brought forward by the minister on his return to the House.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Will the minister undertake to have a statement made on motions by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, the Minister of Finance or the President of the Treasury Board some time this week so that we may have all the facts with respect to the income policy applying to the staff of the Prices and Incomes Commission?

Mr. McIlraith: No, Mr. Speaker, because it must be readily apparent to hon. members that any answer given should be given by way of answer to the parts of the hon. member's allegation that can be considered to be a question.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Under those circumstances, will the minister undertake that an answer will be forthcoming to my question this week?

Mr. McIlraith: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will try to have that done.

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*Translation*]

NATURAL RESOURCES

GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTION TO PROSPECTING IN NORTHWESTERN QUEBEC AND NORTHEASTERN ONTARIO

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion.

Does the Canadian government make any contribution to prospection of new mining resources in northwestern Quebec and northeastern Ontario?

Mr. Speaker: I feel the hon. member's question should normally be placed on the order paper, but if the House agrees the minister might perhaps reply.

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I shall have to inquire from the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, and perhaps also from the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce as to such prospection as might be carried out, and probably the minister under whose jurisdiction the matter comes will be able to reply to the hon. member.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. Has SOQUEN, the Quebec agency, already applied for government aid for specific development.

Mr. Speaker: The supplementary question could be placed on the order paper or dealt with at the time of adjournment.

[*English*]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—SUGGESTED REIMPOSITION OF CEILING ON BANK INTEREST RATES

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting Prime Minister. As the statement by Dr. Young during the weekend about the 6 per cent wage guideline makes it clear that the government intends to keep the cost of labour as low as possible in its fight against inflation, is it the intention of the government to take similar steps to keep another very important cost of production, the cost of working capital, as low as possible by reimposing a ceiling on the interest rates charged on commercial loans at a level considerably below the levels of today, which are permitting the chartered banks to register record profits since the 6 per cent ceiling was removed?

[Mr. McIlraith.]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member's question contains a number of statements. He knows that a question should be a question and not a statement, but to the limited extent that the hon. member's intervention is a question perhaps it might be replied to by the minister.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I think the question that was originally put to me by the hon. member was whether the government was taking steps to bring down the cost of interest on working capital. As a result of the government's success in dealing with inflation there has been a notable reduction in interest rates, and if we continue to be successful interest rates will continue to come down, but if the hon. member wants to encourage inflation on the one hand and hopes for low interest rates on the other he will be disappointed.

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, as the Minister knows, I have been pressing the government for a long time to keep costs down, and I would simply—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Hees: —I would ask him—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Would the hon. member ask a question?

Mr. Hees: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Thank you. I would ask him why it is that the government feels perfectly well satisfied to impose very stringent guidelines or restrictions on the earnings of labour when it refuses to impose any restrictions whatever on the earnings of capital?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member's question is argumentative.

INFLATION—INVESTIGATION OF BANK PROFITS BY PRICES AND INCOMES COMMISSION

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Acting Prime Minister who has been speaking about the necessity for maintaining guidelines. In view of the fact revealed in Friday's reports that the chartered banks have chalked up an increase in their profits of 27.7 per cent for the first six months of this year, following a 26.5 per cent increase last year over the previous year, is the Prices and Incomes Commission taking any steps to investigate these high profits particularly in view of the fact that the criteria the commission established do not deal with the profits of banks?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Can the Acting Prime Minister tell us how soon we can expect the results of this investigation?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I was talking to the chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission this morning and he is looking into the matter immediately.

INFLATION—OPINION OF PRICES AND INCOMES COMMISSION CHAIRMAN ON CERTAIN WAGE SETTLEMENTS

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): In his conversation with the chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission this morning did the Acting Prime Minister ask his opinion on these very large raises that have been put through during the weekend and what does the chairman say about them?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I do not think the hon. gentleman could have been listening to my earlier answer.

Mr. Hees: Oh yes, he was. He didn't hear any answer.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Young said it would be inappropriate to comment on the settlements until the commission has had time to examine the situation, and this advice I offer to my hon. friend.

POLLUTION

ATHABASCA RIVER—PROPOSED COMMISSION OF INQUIRY INTO OIL SPILL, CONTROL AND PREVENTION

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Minister for Indian Affairs and Northern Development in respect of a matter which I have already raised. In view of the fact that the oil spill in the Athabasca River is moving with tremendous rapidity hundreds of miles north through the Peace and Slave Rivers and threatening the water supply of Fort Smith, will the minister get in contact with the proper authorities in the province of Alberta to arrange for a commission of inquiry as to the nature of this spill, how it happened, whether proper steps were taken to control it and what can be done to prevent a repetition of this very dangerous form of pollution?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, the problem has been looked into by the officials of my department. As early as Saturday morning, I communicated with Mr. Ross, Minister of the Alberta Department of Lands and Forests, to seek the co-operation of his department, and we have set up a task force headed by Mr. Stephens of the Wildlife Service to study the problem. In addition, 23 officials of the Department of National Defence have been sent on the spot, not to mention officials of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. We have obtained the co-operation of the Alberta government and hope to repair the damage as soon as possible.

With regard to the possibility of preventing the recurrence of such incidents, of course the officials concerned have been asked to look fully into the cause of that pollution and to try to give the necessary instructions to prevent a recurrence.

[*English*]

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister mind explaining to the House and the country why, in as much as I raised this question two weeks ago and was told by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources that the oil spill would be investigated and that experts would be sent there to find out the cause and to do something to prevent such spills, there has been two weeks' delay and nothing has been done to this date?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I must point out to the hon. member that the pipeline was damaged in Alberta, within the territory administered by the province. As soon as the oil reached the national park and I felt I was involved, I immediately dealt with this problem.

As far as the officials of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources are concerned, I cannot say what they did, but I shall inquire into the matter and report to the House.

[*English*]

Mr. Woolliams: Is it because the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources has got himself into so much difficulty with the cabinet that there has been no conversation between that minister and—

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. the hon. member for Athabasca.

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Could the minister indicate in what way the government is co-operating with the provincial government and Great Canadian Oil Sands to handle the pollution that is occuring in view of the fact that it has been going on for nearly two weeks, outside of sending officials to the area?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It seems to me that, essentially, the hon. member has reiterated the question asked by the hon. member for Peace River.

ATHABASCA RIVER—POWERS OF INQUIRY TASK FORCE

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, in light of the answer given earlier about the appointment of a task force with which the province of Alberta has agreed to co-operate, will this task force have the power to subpoena witnesses and call evidence, and if that has not been arranged will the government be requesting the government of Alberta to agree to such a procedure?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, we have been directly in touch with the company responsible for that pipeline to inform them that they would be held responsible for the incurred damage as far as legally possible.

I wish to point out to the hon. member for Calgary North that there are over there not only government employees, but additional employees who are trying to control the damage, and we have acted as soon as it happened.

[*English*]

ATHABASCA RIVER—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON DAMAGE TO WILDLIFE

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister whether he would be prepared to make a statement on motions, after his officials have reported, with reference to the damage done to wildlife such as waterfowl, fish and furbearing animals in the area?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, it does not seem so far that any great damage has been caused to the animals

of the area. It remains possible that the damage caused to fisheries might be quite serious, but I have received no report in that respect. As soon as I have one, I will gladly submit it to the House.

[*English*]

ATHABASCA RIVER—SCOPE OF TASK FORCE INQUIRY—ESTABLISHMENT OF PERMANENT BODY

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): I should like to ask a supplementary question concerning the task force that has been assigned, Mr. Speaker. Is this an ad hoc task force appointed just to look into this particular problem? If so, does the government have plans for the establishment of a more permanent and satisfactory group to deal with oil pollution problems?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I know that following other similar incidents, the Department of Transport conducted extensive studies of methods used to clean up damage caused by oil.

As far as the pipeline itself is concerned, I wish to inform the hon. member that in Inuvik, some very important experiments are going on in order to make sure that in the future pipelines will be constructed so as to make such accidents impossible.

[*English*]

Mr. Aiken: May I ask a further supplementary to clarify the matter, Mr. Speaker. Does the government intend to set up a body which would deal with oil pollution problems both on land and on water and not just through the Department of Transport's special task force?

Mr. Baldwin: You had better amend your legislation; you had better change your bill pretty soon. It is out of date even before it has been applied.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I think a joint study of the problem by the various departments would certainly be appropriate, and I take due note of the recommendation of my hon. friend.

[*English*]

HEALTH AND WELFARE

SAFETY OF DRUG, TOLBUTAMIDE, USED BY DIABETICS

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Wel-

fare. In view of the great concern felt by diabetic patients in Canada as a result of reports to the effect that the drug tolbutamide, under the trade name "Orinase", has dangerous properties, is the minister yet in a position to make a statement to the House about the use of this drug in Canada?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, this matter has been checked into by my officers in the Food and Drug Directorate. This was a conclusion of one paper submitted at a recent conference of scientists but there are other scientists who disagree with the findings. Scientific papers on investigations conducted especially in the United Kingdom and Scandinavia would indicate contrary conclusions. We are continuing to examine all the data, but in the meantime we are far from satisfied that there is anything harmful here which would require action at this particular time. We have also been in consultation with the Canadian Diabetic Association and they feel that the protective elements of this drug are very necessary for many diabetics in this country. Until we have greater clarification on what the research is, and because it is so contradictory, we feel that it is not appropriate to take action now.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): May I ask the minister whether the government of Canada is doing any monitoring of patients in Canada who are using this drug in order to determine statistics for our own use?

Mr. Munro: As far as all the scientific research that is being carried on is concerned, Mr. Speaker, we are aware of what is going on in other countries. We are not conducting research ourselves, but are relying on studies carried on in other countries. This does not mean we do not regard it as important but we do not want to duplicate the work. We are carrying on extensive research in other areas. That is the situation at the present time.

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): A supplementary question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Are we to understand from the minister's remarks that the government does not plan to restrict or control the use of Orinase in Canada until further studies take place?

Mr. Munro: That is correct, Mr. Speaker. Several studies that have been conducted indicate quite the contrary of the adverse findings mentioned, in terms of conclusions. Until we can adequately assess the contradictions, we do not feel that action is warranted. Many benefits are derived from the use of this particular drug.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

DISCUSSIONS WITH U.S. OFFICIALS CONCERNING FINANCIAL POSITION OF ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): My question is for the Acting Prime Minister in his position as Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the fact that the federal government has not lent more than $500 million to the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority and the Seaway Authority is unable even to pay the interest charges on this government loan, has the government or the minister been involved in any recent discussions with United States officials concerning any joint action that might be taken to put the seaway on a sound financial footing?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest to the hon. member that this question, although it is important and may be urgent, is the type of question that should normally be placed on the Order Paper. If there is urgency the hon. member might wish to give the Chair notice and I will see that it is given priority for consideration at the time of adjournment.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

RAE—INDIAN DEATHS ALLEGEDLY CAUSED BY SEWAGE PLANT WATER

Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): My question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Is the minister in a position to answer the questions I directed to him on May 4 and May 20? On June 3 the minister indicated he expected an answer shortly. I refer to the allegations by Mr. Roy Daniels with respect to the Indian people who are alleged to have died because of water pollution in the community of Rae in the Northwest Territories.

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Wefare): Yes, Mr. Speaker. The nature of that particular situation was due to the fact that there was no top soil. The environment was such that the pollution could not be corrected. Measures have been implemented for that particular community to be moved to another area some miles away from its present location where they will not be subject to this type of risk.

Inquiries of the Ministry

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

DEPORTATION OF DESERTERS FROM U.S. ARMED FORCES—TABLING OF REPORT ON INVESTIGATION

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): My question is for the Solicitor General. Has the government completed its investigation with respect to complaints made against the Royal Canadian Mounted Police concerning the alleged handing over of three United States deserters to the American authorities? If so, can the minister indicate to the House in general terms the result of that investigation?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): As the hon. member knows, Mr. Speaker, a commissioner was appointed pursuant to the Inquiries Act by the three departments directly concerned, the Department of the Solicitor General, the Department of Manpower and Immigration and the customs department. The commissioner presented a report on Friday. I hope to consult with my colleagues who participated in the appointment regarding this report. The report will be translated and copies made available to the House.

Mr. Nesbitt: In view of the fact there is considerable interest in this matter, can the minister indicate when the report might be tabled? The second part of my original question was whether the minister could give the House an idea as to the result of the investigation?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I do not think it would be fair to reveal any of the contents of the investigation until the report is tabled in the House. One of the difficulties is that each minister has only one copy of the report. Additional copies will have to be made and the report translated before it can be tabled in the House. I hope that can be done very quickly.

DRUGS

AVAILABILITY OF INTERIM REPORT OF LE DAIN COMMISSION TO OPPOSITION PARTIES ON CONFIDENTIAL BASIS

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): My question is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. It is prompted in part by the commitment on Friday morning by the Prime Minister to table the interim report of the LeDain Commission and also the Prime Minister's statement that he hoped the opposition parties will be in a position to make a declaration of their position on the interim report as quickly as the government. In light of that, is the minister prepared, in the period until the report is tabled, to make the interim report available on a confidential basis to the opposition parties so that we will have the same amount of time to examine the report?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I think the government's position with respect to the LeDain Commission report is well known. As stated by the Prime Minister and earlier by myself, the decision as to when the document will be made public, if indeed it is to be made public will be made by cabinet as soon as possible.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Hees: Trudeau said it would. You are starting to weasel already.

Mr. Munro: I am not starting to weasel. I am indicating that as of this moment the government has not made a decision to table the report. I estimate that the matter will be taken under consideration this week. With regard to the cabinet's decision I am referring more to the timing of the tabling of the report. I believe the Prime Minister indicated it would quite probably be made public.

An hon. Member: Be made public?

Mr. Munro: I think the preoccupation of the opposition is that it be made public as soon as possible. That type of decision has not yet been officially made.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): A supplementary question. Is the Minister of National Health and Welfare aware of what the Prime Minister said on Friday, namely, "I can give the House the assurance that the report will be tabled?"

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): We are aware of everything that the minister has said and I again ask whether he is prepared to make the report available to the opposition parties on a confidential basis so that the opposition parties will have a similar amount of time to examine the report and make their positions known at the time the report is tabled?

Mr. Munro: I think it is fair to say that when the Prime Minister made that statement he hoped and expected that the opposition would take a position on the paper as quickly

as the government does. I judge that would be very soon indeed, judging from the attitude of the opposition.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Munro: The government certainly has had very little time indeed to study the report.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

MARIJUANA—INSTRUCTIONS TO CROWN PROSECUTORS RESPECTING CHARGES IN LIGHT OF LE DAIN COMMISSION INTERIM REPORT

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): I wish to direct my supplementary question to a minister who will give an answer we can understand, namely, the Solicitor General.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Woolliams: In view of the minister's knowledge of what is in the LeDain Commission report, are special instructions being given to those Crown prosecutors who look after prosecutions under the federal jurisdiction with regard to young men and women involved in marijuana charges, in light of the recommendations of the LeDain Commission and in light of the bill the Minister of Justice has introduced with regard to bail, because many of these young people will remain in jail over the holidays?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): I am sure the hon. member does not want me to give him indirectly the contents of the LeDain Commission report in answer to a question phrased in that manner.

Mr. Woolliams: I guess the Solicitor General has fallen into the same habit as the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Possibly I can make my question a little clearer. Will the Solicitor General issue special instructions to the Crown prosecutors who receive their instructions from his office on charges involving marijuana, particularly with reference to those people who cannot raise the money for bail?

Mr. McIlraith: I find it a little difficult to answer the hon. member's question. He is suggesting that I give instructions to Crown prosecutors in some way, by inference, contrary to the law. First, the Solicitor General does not give instructions to Crown prosecutors at any time. Second, even if I were the minister with authority to instruct them I would not give instructions that are, if I am correct in the inference I have drawn, contrary to the law.

Mr. Woolliams: A further supplementary. Can the minister explain why some of the special Crown prosecutors in Calgary allege to defence counsel that they get that kind of instruction?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

PROVINCIAL ASSURANCES OF ACTION TO CURB INFLATION—IMPOSITION OF CONTROLS

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): My question is for the Acting Prime Minister. In view of the statement made by the Minister of Labour on Saturday to the effect that the provincial premiers have apparently given assurances that they will take whatever steps are necessary to curb inflation, including rent control, will the Acting Prime Minister say whether assurances have been received from all provincial premiers that this will be done?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): The hon. member's question is based on a very truncated version of what the Minister of Labour said. I obtained a transcript of what he said on the air and it was not as alleged by the hon. member. He said: "I presume—I wasn't there; I don't know what Dr. Young discussed but I am sure he came away satisfied." He made it quite clear that he was not there, that he was just talking from a presumption, and he did not know.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): May I ask the Acting Prime Minister, who is undoubtedly in communication with Dr. Young, whether all the premiers said that they might take such steps and, if so, when might this take place?

Mr. Sharp: I would have to take the question as notice and ask Dr. Young or someone who was there. I was not there myself.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Can the hon. gentleman say whether it is now government policy to press for rent controls and other controls on a nationwide basis as part of its war against inflation?

Mr. Sharp: I am sure it is the view of all members of this House that if a prices and incomes policy is to be put into effect successfully there must be restraint in all directions.

Therefore the government does support in general the idea that all forms of income and prices and so on should be restrained. To this extent we support the Prices and Incomes Commission. If the hon. member asks me directly whether the provinces have agreed to apply a certain kind of restraint in the areas over which they have control, I would have to take the question as notice.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

CANCELLATION OF APPOINTMENT OF CLAIMS COMMISSION

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): I have a question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. In view of the statement the Prime Minister made to Indian leaders recently in Ottawa that the government would not force the white paper policy on the Indian people, has a decision been taken to cancel the appointment of the Indian claims commissioner appointed to inquire into certain matters affecting Indian claims?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, the policy we suggested a year ago was based on proposals. We do not intend to force anything on the Indians.

I wish to point out to the hon. member that this commissioner was appointed after the Indians had set up their own inquiry committee headed by Chief Délisle of Caughnawaga which is responsible to the Indians although it is financed by the government. On the other hand, Mr. Barber is responsible to the government. His contribution is aimed at clearing up the matter, so that the discussion will be more open when each party knows whether or not the contracts have been adhered to.

[*English*]

ACTION TO DEAL WITH CLAIMS OF NON-TREATY INDIANS

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): I should like to ask the minister whether the government intends to do anything at all to deal with the legitimate and real claims of the Indian and Eskimo people in northern Quebec, in the Northwest Territories and in British Columbia with regard to resources and lands which they claim to be theirs?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, as far as New Quebec is concerned, I had the opportunity to discuss this matter personally with the provincial authorities. A tripartite committee, composed of representatives of the federal government, the provincial government and the Indians, was set up to look into this problem.

As regards the Northwest Territories, those are obligations now being studied by Commissioner Barber.

With respect to the rights of non-treaty British-Columbia Indians, they brought their troubles themselves before the Supreme Court of Canada.

[*English*]

POST OFFICE

RESTORATION OF NORMAL SERVICE IN WINDSOR, ONT.

Mr. Mark MacGuigan (Windsor-Walkerville): My question is for the Minister of Communications. In light of the fact that residents of the city of Windsor have received mail only once since the current postal negotiations began, can the minister advise the House when normal postal service will be restored in Windsor?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Minister of Communications and Postmaster General): I am extremely sorry that there is not normal postal service in Windsor. At the present time the unions are attempting to dictate to the Post Office the terms under which casual employees will be engaged. We regret that we cannot accept this kind of dictation. We realize that the service is diminishing—in fact it is bleeding to death in Windsor—but until the unions accept the fact that the Post Office will itself determine who is needed to sort and carry the mail there is nothing that can be done.

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): May I ask the minister when, in his opinion, mail delivery service was normal in any part of Canada?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: I have the impression that the question is argumentative.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

INQUIRY AS TO WHITE PAPER

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Can he tell us

whether we can expect the white paper on foreign affairs to be tabled within the next week or so? I am advised that the gestation period of the document outstrips even that of an elephant.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): The period of gestation is over now and we are only waiting for delivery from the Queen's Printer.

Mr. Fairweather: That, of course, does not answer my question. Will the delivery date be within the next few days? We want the report for light summer reading.

Mr. Sharp: Present plans are to provide copies for light summer reading. We expect to be able to table the review before the House rises.

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

LONG-TERM DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM PROPOSED BY NEWFOUNDLAND GOVERNMENT

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. Has he received a proposal from the government of Newfoundland for a $1 billion long-term development program based on a white paper recently presented by that government to the Newfoundland legislature?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker. I can inquire of the department whether we have received such a request.

Mr. McGrath: May I ask what additional initiatives his department is taking to bring about regional economic expansion in light of the government's new policy and the new finances available?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I suggest to the hon. member that this information would normally be given by way of a general statement to the House on motions. I do not think it would be in order for the minister to give this kind of information now.

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): My question is for the Acting Prime Minister. Was the Prime Minister stating government policy in Vancouver yesterday when he was asked whether he would introduce more liberal abortion laws if the opposition agreed to it, and he replied that he would?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Inquiries of the Ministry

PENITENTIARIES

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL—INVESTIGATION OF SUICIDE OF JACQUES BOUCHER

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): My question is for the Solicitor General. May I ask whether he has caused to be completed the inquiry into the death of a 16-year old boy by suicide at St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary as promised by him on May 27 and as reported in *Hansard* at page 7388, and will he report to the House thereon?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): I regret that the inquiry or investigation I was making into that case is not yet completed. I will see that an answer is brought forward.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

POSSIBLE CONFERENCE ON CARIBBEAN POLICY—SCOPE OF AGENDA

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): My question is addressed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of Canada's deteriorating position in the Caribbean, will the government give consideration to calling a full-scale conference on Caribbean policy this summer?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): No, Mr. Speaker, there is no intention of calling a conference this summer but we have in mind calling one at an appropriate time.

Mr. Paproski: In addition to dealing with the sugar rebate issue, will the agenda of such a conference deal with tourism, development assistance and immigration?

Mr. Sharp: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I should think that a conference of this kind would have a very broad agenda including the items mentioned by the hon. member.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

BANK SALARIES IN RELATION TO PROFITS

Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey): I have a question related to one which was asked a little earlier, Mr. Speaker, in connection with the very high profits of the chartered banks. I would direct it to either the Minister of Labour or to his Parliamentary Secretary. Considering the multi-million dollar profits being made by the banks and the fact that an estimated 8,000 bank employees have been working for less than the newly established minimum rate of $1.65 an hour, will the department concerned look into what appears to be a reprehensible situation?

Suggested Interest-free Loans

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

RIGHTS RESPECTING CONTINENTAL SHELF OFF ISLAND OF ST. PIERRE

Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Has the government taken a decision yet to go to the International Court of Justice to determine our rights over the continental shelf off the French island of St. Pierre?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): No decision has yet been taken, Mr. Speaker. The matter of the conflict between the French government and ourselves is still under discussion.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

EXTENSION OF TAB BENEFITS FOR AUTO WORKERS

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Would the minister inform the House whether or not the TAB benefits for the auto workers, due to expire at the end of this month, have been extended?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I will have to check whether an announcement has been made or not during my absence.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

[*Translation*]

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 58—FINANCING OF PUBLIC DEBTS THROUGH INTEREST-FREE LOANS FROM BANK OF CANADA

Mr. René Matte (Champlain) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, in view of the government's inability to effectively combat the frightening increase in the public debt, the public sector of the Canadian economy, including the federal government, the provinces, the municipalities and the school boards should be financed by direct interest-free loans from the Bank of Canada, repayable at the rate of the depreciation on the assets thus created.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is a principle universally accepted by orthodox economists and applied by all governments that government expenditures can only be financed by charges and taxes or, still, by means of loans which finally turn into taxes when it comes to paying the interest on the amounts borrowed and paying back the capital.

The federal government, the provincial governments, the municipal administrations and the school boards need money to administer themselves, to pay their civil servants, to finance public works, public services, to build roads and bridges, schools, universities and hospitals. Now, since governments have no money, they must get it somewhere, in the taxpayer's pocket, by imposing sales taxes, excise duties, through the delivery of licences to individuals; they must also get money from the public by selling natural resources, by making a profit in Crown corporations such as the liquor boards, for instance.

The profits of public undertakings do not amount to much in terms of income for the governments, because most of them lose money instead of making profits.

The sale of natural resources is only a temporary source of revenue: it is a source of income only at the time of the sale or as long as those natural resources exist.

As for the royalties paid to the governments which concede certain rights to industries or individuals, they are nothing but deferred taxes, taxes paid to the government by the companies and the individuals which are then passed on to the buyers of the products when the transactions are made within the country.

Government loans are deferred taxes which will be paid by the taxpayers in five or ten years. They are taxes other generations will have to pay. And to pay the interest on those loans, taxes will have to be levied which, in many cases, will be greater than the value of the goods and services purchased through the loans.

To give you some idea of the amounts the taxpayers must pay in interest only on public debts, I will quote you statistics on certain elements of the public debt in Quebec.

As of March 31, 1969, the public debt in the province of Quebec amounted to $2,022,858,854. The interest on that debt was $120,507,300 or $330,157 per day.

The Quebec Hydro, as at December 31, 1967, had a debt of $2,213,263,653; the interest amounted to $120,538,440 or a daily interest of $330,242. The figures for 1968 reveal the equivalent of a daily interest payment of $700,000.

In 1969-70, the Quebec government borrowed $318 million at a 9 per cent interest

rate, which means an annual interest of $28,620,000, or $78,411 per day.

The 1,652 Quebec municipalities, with a $2,083 million debt, pay $232,470,000 in interest, or $636,904 per day.

According to the Union of the county councils, school boards, including the CEGEPs and regional schools, hospitals and universities have an overall debt of $4 billion. Therefore those organizations must pay an interest of $250 million, or $684,931 per day.

• (3:10 p.m.)

Thus, Mr. Speaker, the overall debt of the province of Quebec amounts to $10,637,122,507, on which the Quebec taxpayers pay an interest of $2,060,645 per day.

I do not intend to linger unduly on the debt problem in Canada. I will merely point out that since 1867, the gross debt as well as the net debt have steadily increased in Canada.

Here are a few examples of the total debt of the federal administration for a few given years. In 1867, Canada's total debt was $93,046,051. In 1900, it went up to about $346 million. In 1933, it had already reached some $3 billion; it increased to $9,228 million in 1943 to finally reach $32,924,170,000 in 1968.

But these loans, as I mentioned, are but differed taxes which some day the taxpayers will have to pay. If we succeed in decreasing the public debt, it will be because the government will go and get that money in the taxpayers' pockets. And if the government does not succeed in decreasing the public debt, the taxpayers will be called upon to pay taxes all through their lifetime just to pay the interest.

Taxes, taxes and more taxes. We have personal income tax, corporate income tax, taxes on dividends, federal taxes, provincial taxes, municipal taxes, school taxes.

Any manufactured item carries a 12 per cent federal tax. The Ontario government adds a five per cent tax while the Quebec government adds an 8 per cent tax. Thus, for a simple item which costs $1.35 at the manufacturing level, if the seller adds 30 per cent for his profit, the sales price will be $1.98 including the federal tax.

In Quebec, if you add the 8 per cent sales tax, the item will cost $2.14 to the consumer.

Every province, except Alberta, applies a direct sales tax. The hidden tax on the sale represents on the average about 7 per cent of the retail value of the products to which it applies. Since the provincial tax is added on to the federal sales tax, we are having tax over tax to which other surcharges are often added.

There are also many other taxes: tax on land, tax on meals, tax on cigarettes, tax on alcoholic beverages, tax on estates, taxes on entertainment, crop insurance premiums, medicare premiums, unemployment insurance contributions, taxes on airplane tickets. Taxes, Mr. Speaker, taxes everywhere.

And taxes keep rising. Here is how taxes and other revenues of the Canadian government have increased during certain years.

In 1926, with a gross national product of $5,146 million, government revenues totalled $867 million or 16.8 per cent of the GNP.

In 1950, for instance, with a GNP of $17,955 million, government revenues amounted to $4,634 million or 25.8 per cent of the GNP.

In 1968, with a GNP of $71,454 million total government revenues at all levels reached $24,727 million or 34.6 per cent of the GNP.

And that is just the beginning because, according to the white paper on tax reform, the federal government intends to draw another $630 million annually from the pockets of Canadian taxpayers, five years after the new tax system has been implemented.

Such is the situation today and such will it be tomorrow if Canadian citizens do not require from their governments to find other sources for the financing of social capital. Such a situation will last for ever unless the government should finance without interest social capital used for the development of the social projects of the federal government and the financing of the activities of provincial governments, municipal services and school boards.

People will say that taxes are necessary. Indeed, they are, as long as we yield to the financial rules which keep them necessary. However, these rules are no part of the Decalogue nor of God's commandments. They were established by men, and other men may change them, if they decide to do so.

We, from the Ralliement Créditiste, state positively that we can do without running into public debts and without taxes, without giving up developments and public services, without inflation or deflation, while providing an adequate distribution of the purchasing power among the members of the community. But to realize that, a certain condition has to be fulfilled first: a change in the operation of the financial system.

What sort of change do we have in mind? A very simple one, and nobody could possibly deny its worth: let finance reflect hard facts; let finance be a servant, not a master; let finance be a flexible and useful tool, instead of a tyrannical one which can only paralyze.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I have had the honour to move this motion which has been read at the beginning of my remarks, and which I want to read again:

> That, in the opinion of this house, in view of the government's inability to effectively combat the frightening increase in the public debt, the public sector of the Canadian economy, including the federal government, the provinces, the municipalities and the school boards should be financed by direct interest-free loans from the Bank of Canada, repayable at the rate of the depreciation on the assets thus created.

Mr. Speaker, before concluding my remarks, I wish to remind the House that the present inflation and rising interest rates actually make even still heavier for the taxpayers the burden of taxes and public debts, due to the higher interests the governments and public bodies have to pay.

In this respect, let me recall what Mr. Louis Rasminsky, Governor of the Bank of Canada, said in the brief he submitted to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs on July 3 last. I shall quote from page 2749 of No. 55 of the minutes of proceedings and evidence of the said committee:

> One of the casualties of a prolonged period of inflation is the market for long-term debt obligations. This is because investors become increasingly reluctant to commit their funds in such a form even at progressively higher interest rate levels. Private corporations who wish to raise long-term funds can try to combat this trend by offering equity participation, often in the form of convertible debentures, but this option is not open to government—federal, provincial or municipal—or to buyers or to publicly-owned utilities who must rely on debt financing to cover their borrowing requirements. It is social capital formation rather than private capital formation which must bear the brunt of the harm done to the long-term capital market by inflation.

In his evidence before the Committee on Banking and Credit of the United States House of Representatives on June 21, 1969, during hearings on the increase of the prime rate by the banks, the governor of Maryland, the hon. Marvin Mandell, after having listed the requirements of cities and education, the housing needs of small wage-earners, the need for health care, prisons, rehabilitation of criminals, transportation and roads, pollution control, etc. stated that the Maryland government was forced to give up some plans needed by the people.

He referred at that time to an article published in the June 21, 1969 issue of the *Washington Post* pointing out that several states and cities of the United States were no longer able to sell their bonds, and that certain issues had to be cancelled. Among others he gave the example of the cities of Pittsburgh and Dallas, which had received no offer for school bond issues, while the state of Maryland had cancelled the floating of $59.8 million worth of bonds.

Mr. Speaker, this is also happening in Canada, and that is why, for instance, the Union of Mayors and Municipalities is proposing that a bank be set up to provide for municipal bonds.

It can thus be rightfully implied that it is the social capital, in short, the social projects of all governments which are being scrapped due to the shortage of credit and high interest rates.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, we think that we are justified in proposing that the sums required for the public projects of the federal and provincial governments, of school boards, be financed through interest-free loans granted by the Bank of Canada.

• (3:20 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): I should like to congratulate my friends in the Social Credit Party. Although I cannot support their motion I can sympathize with their sentiments and it is for this reason I rise now to discuss the present financial system. In a way they have a very understandable grievance because anyone who has been an objective observer over the years and who has observed our financial institutions as well as our way of financing public works over the years, surely has been appalled at the stupidity of the conventional method of financing. This type of financing causes the cry against the establishment, and it is one that has a long history. The cry arises from seeing poverty in the midst of plenty, and seeing waste when there are so many things that are needed by the people. I recall that during the depression years there were many people who wanted to work and there were all sorts of needs that had to be fulfilled, yet the government was not able to match the two together. Later, when the war started it suddenly became possible for this nation to make an enormous expenditure.

I can recall during the war meeting a fellow who had not volunteered but had been conscripted into the Canadian army. In those days of great patriotism there was a tendency to look askance at conscripts. I remember asking him why he felt the way he did. He said: "There was a time when I needed a job, when I needed help from my government, but they could not solve the problem of depression or find me a job; they could not help me support my family. Now, when the war breaks out, they suddenly have all kinds of money to get me killed. I do not like that kind of stance, and that is why I have taken the position I have". It was rather an extreme position, and it certainly was not the position I took, but in some ways it was understandable.

To get back to what I said earlier, this man's attitude was a reflection of the grievance that exists in our society against the traditional methods of finance. To some extent, our banks are already subsiding certain public programs. During the hearings before the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs we had the opportunity to raise some questions with the banks' representatives when they appeared. The point was made that about 15 per cent of the banks' fund creating facilities are now established for government purposes. Whether it be for student loans, farm loans, fishermen's loans, small businessmen's loans or NHA mortgages, the banks already set aside 15 per cent of their funds for loans to be made at the direction of the government. They do not always make these loans at low interest rates, but I am sure the interest rates are lower than they would have been had there been no insistence on government direction.

At any rate, the government does ensure that a certain percentage of the available capital in our society is used for what they have set up as social priorities. Some cross-subsidization arises from this sort of arrangement. Quite obviously, if the banks charge a lower interest rate to some groups, this will be reflected in a higher interest rate to other groups. It is quite clear to me that the banks do exactly as they are told in our society; they have not had any choice to do otherwise. When we criticize the banks, our criticism is somewhat misdirected because it should be aimed at the government. Whether it is the Bank of Canada, or the chartered banks of this country, they respond to government policies. I think it has been clearly established in the last number of years that the government wishes the banks to undertake a certain policy. If they wish the Bank of Canada to undertake a certain policy, no other option is open to this institution. Therefore, my criticism will not be directed against the Bank of Canada or other banks but rather against the government policy which encourages and sustains what is going on today.

At present the banks' profits are the highest in recent history. They make fabulous profits year after year, and the returns for this year indicate that these profits will be maintained at the previous high level. One cannot escape the conclusion that the government wants these high bank profits to exist because if they wished otherwise they could say to the banks: "You will restrain your profits; you will limit the spread between what you pay for money and what you charge for it". If the banks' profits are at the level at which they are now it is because the government of Canada wishes it to be so.

We may ask why it is that at a time when the government of Canada is calling for restraint in other sectors of the economy, particularly among the wage and salary earners, they want to see these high bank profits. I think the government has a number of reasons for wanting this condition to exist. They want the banks to make money for some reasons which are very obvious, to me at least. First of all, they have the policy of keeping interest rates high, and they want them to be high. Second, this prevents the destruction of many of the financial institutions of our society.

• (3:30 p.m.)

Canadian banks are not totally efficient. There are a lot of flaws in their operations. Nevertheless, considering the powers they have under the Bank Act, if they lowered their profits they would be efficient enough to drive virtually every other financial institution out of business. High profits in the banking sector enable their competitors to survive. This is a developing characteristic of our society. It is taking place under the guise of a market system, or a free enterprise system. More and more we see certain institutions supporting lesser institutions rather than developing into monopolies or near-monopolies and therefore becoming subject to the scrutiny of government.

I believe we can do something with the banks to help in the formation of social capital at low interest rates. We have an obligation to establish social priorities, whether

they be for municipal financing or for low cost housing, and have the banks work in the direction of this policy. This could be done by the government imposing a profit level on the banks, restricting the spread between what they pay for money and what they charge for money. The interest rate could continue at its present level for those areas of low priority but for the things which we think are fundamental and important to an intelligent, humane civilization, the banks would have to provide funds at low interest rates. This is not as far out as it sounds and that it why, as I said, although I cannot support the Social Credit motion—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Saltsman: —I sympathize very much with my hon. friends' sense of injustice, with what they want to do. However, I cannot give them anything more than sympathy until they see things a little more clearly. I understand what they are trying to do, and I appreciate what they are trying to do, but they think you can have something for nothing.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Saltsman: What always disturbs me is that the Social Credit party postures as the great defender of the little businessman, and at the same time it wants interest-free money. But there is a mechanism involved. They cannot have both. They cannot have low interest rates for the private sector, and interest free money in the public sector.

Mr. Gauthier: You are all mixed up.

Mr. Saltsman: There appears to be a difference of opinion, Mr. Speaker, and that is why I cannot support their motion. I have listened very carefully to the Social Credit party spokesmen but after all these years of listening to them I remain unconvinced. Perhaps their advocates are not as persuasive as they might be. Perhaps some day they will have an advocate who will be persuasive. I think there is an inherent flaw in their theory. They try to walk on both sides of the fence and the result is that what starts off as a laudable outlook with regard to some of the problems in our society, becomes discredited because of the lack of thought attached to it.

Let us take a look at the smart boys in government, the people who deride Social Credit theory, who cannot see the germ of truth that exists in it, and who try to dismiss it. The exception, of course, was Hon. Walter Gordon, the former finance minister, who turned out to be a supporter of the Social Credit party when he voted with them on one occasion. Let us look at how intelligently these smart boys are approaching this problem. They start off by saying, "We have a great problem in this country. Inflation is a terrible problem. We are going to pull out all the stops and do something about inflation. The way to tackle this problem of inflation is to create unemployment." They all sat there in great, solemn convocation, and reached this earth-shattering conclusion, despite all the evidence that the causes of inflation are external to Canada. Virtually all of our inflation is inherited because of our close association with the United States and, in fact there is very little we can do about it The most draconian methods will only create a marginal effect on inflation in Canada so long as the United States pursues its insane policies in Viet Nam. Despite this evidence which is coming from virtually every major economist in the country, the great and solemn conclave over there creates unemployment.

Unemployment is not a costless thing. I would not mind them having a little fun, a little pleasure in playing games, if it did not cost the nation too much. But it is a very expensive little game that they are playing with the lives of the Canadian people and with the future of our economy, because we have over 500,000 unemployed people now. I made inquiry of the ministry as to what unemployment was costing Canada. I wish to quote from a return that was given me on March 2, 1970. I asked this question:

1. In its economic planning, does the government attempt to assess the cost to the economy of different amounts of unemployment and of different degrees of inflation and, if so, what techniques are used in calculating these costs?

2. Does the government compare the cost of inflation and unemployment in deciding what fiscal and monetary policies to use?

3. What is the cost of having an additional one per cent of the labour force unemployed?

The great geniuses on the other side of the House, who are charged with the responsibility of running the government, thought about this for a considerable time, and then in the great parliamentary tradition answered my question as follows:

1. The Department of Finance maintains a continuing analysis of the economic situation and outlook with a view to assessing likely trends in the economy, including movements in prices and unemployment. A wide variety of techniques is used, including surveys, statistical and econometric anal-

ysis and qualitative appraisal. The results of these various studies are brought together in formulating judgments as to likely developments.

I wonder whether the ghost of a former secretary of state for external affairs walked through the walls while that was being typed.

2. In deciding upon fiscal and monetary policies, the government and the Bank of Canada consider many objectives such as those pertaining to economic growth, stability, regional disparities as well as employment and prices.

I must apologize, Mr. Speaker, if I am just too dense to understand what they meant by that.

3. It is not possible to give a definitive reply to this hypothetical question without detailing the underlying economic environment, including *inter alia*, the level and distribution of unemployment by region and occupation, movements of prices, the distribution of the national income, the phase of the business cycle, developments in capital markets and trends in savings and investment. There are available publicly a number of studies which relate changes in the rate of unemployment to changes in GNP. These studies have been based largely upon observations of past events, especially during periods of relative price stability. They show varying results depending on the time period chosen and other assumptions.

• (3:40 p.m.)

In that last bit they used a little Latin, which is very impressive. It is easy to see why the opposition is so enlightened when it gets replies of this kind from the government. Other people have been working on this problem and they are inclined to be a little less obtuse than the bright boys in government. The studies I have seen would seem to indicate that with the present rate of unemployment we are losing over 8 per cent of our gross national product. This is not an insignificant percentage when one calculates that we are talking about $7 billion a year lost in terms of potential output in this economy. I wonder how the government balances this against their marginal joy at the slight decline in the cost of living.

What does this amount of unemployment mean in terms of revenue? It represents a 15 per cent shortfall in government revenues, and here we are talking about close to $2 billion At a time when people are concerned about rising taxation, at a time when there is such a need in our society to help old age pensioners, to do something for war veterans, to stimulate housing, it is shameful and criminal to have a government act in this way and to virtually destroy the economy.

The only thing that saves us, Mr. Speaker, is that this country is so rich, so resilient that even the worst attempts of the government cannot destroy an essentially buoyant nation and a buoyant people. If it were not for that, we would be suffering even more.

What have they accomplished? We have been through periods of national crisis before. We have been asked to tighten our belts and do without things. When there is some purpose in adopting these methods and they can be shown to be necessary and effective, then even these terrible figures that I have quoted would have some justification. But this cannot be shown in the present case. They have not succeeded in even denting the problem of inflation. They were told time and time again that they would not succeed, so their little game has been played out and has given fantastic hardship to the people; it has held back the economy. It has prevented us from creating the housing we need and from giving some social justice to pensioners whose condition worsens as the years go by. While the government is preoccupied with fighting inflation the pensioner's standard of living is declining.

Things do not have to be this way, Mr. Speaker. With full employment, government revenues would have been more than adequate to take care of the problems of the poor and the needy in our society. But the just society has been aborted by policies which are senseless and which cannot be justified.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member but I am informed his time has expired. He can continue with the agreement of the House, however. Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: There is unanimous agreement, so the hon. member can continue his interesting remarks.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Well put, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Saltsman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I just need a few moments to conclude. The government is now coming to the conclusion that the policy has been a failure, that the policy has not been working and probably will not work. Like the characters in the old film serial, The Perils of Pauline, they have escaped from one cliff only to be found hanging from another. They have decided to bring in a policy of wage restraint which is to apply only to the wage and salary earners of this country. As in the case of their previous

policy, they are now being told by everyone who is concerned about the problem, that it will not work and that it is unfair. If it is unfair it will not work in our society because it will not be accepted. The government has been told repeatedly that any policy of restraint must apply equally to all sectors of the economy. In a democracy, unless something is accepted as fair and workable, it will eventually have to be withdrawn.

I welcome the opportunity provided by the members of the Social Credit Party to put before this House some ideas for change, Mr. Speaker. I am glad to join with my friends in the Social Credit Party in denouncing what we think has been an insane financial attitude on the part of the bright boys of this country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, the motion now before the House, introduced by my colleague the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Matte), clearly lays down a basic creditiste tenet, which is to make financially possible what is physically attainable, in a country like ours.

Recently, the provincial Ministers of Finance met in Winnipeg to discuss taxation and monetary matters, but within the framework of our present financial system.

When we ask to make financially possible what is physically attainable, we are making no crazy suggestion, since, in the past, such a principle has been applied. I am referring to wartime or national emergency periods, as they were called. In wartime, when they were told about national emergency, people never asked whether the necessary credits existed.

When we had to manufacture guns and other deadly weapons, to enlist young people 18 years old or over, to withdraw from the consumer goods production sector 800,000 young workers during the Second World War, to provide them with clothing, food and adequate housing, we never wondered whether Canada could make financially possible what was physically attainable.

• (3:50 p.m.)

And as soon as it is peacetime, it usually takes 10, 15 or 20 years to reach a situation as the one we are experiencing now, when every province is near exhaustion, when municipalities are impotent, when several school boards can no longer pay their teachers, with the federal government suggesting as a solution: Tighten your belts, stop spending your money, even though the number of unemployed may increase considerably.

Mr. Speaker, because of the present financial policy, there are a total of 545,000 unemployed in Canada. In addition, more than 600,000 students are looking for summer jobs and we cannot give them any. The federal government may very well say: We are going to use 35,000 or 40,000 of them, but what about the remaining 550,000 or 600,000?

Mr. Speaker, the Finance ministers, particularly that of Quebec—that is the new Quebec Prime Minister—got back to their respective provinces saying: Ottawa has granted us $100 million, $50 million of which should have been turned over only next year. But what does represent $100 million for the administration of the province of Quebec? A drop in the ocean! You could not even pay the annual interest on the provincial debt with it! And the Prime Minister was pleased to announce that he had come back to Quebec with his hands full. But the unemployed are still "filling the frame" of Quebec's economic activity.

Mr. Speaker, the financial question is of prime importance. We suggest that interest-free loans should be granted to the public sector in Canada, namely to municipalities, school boards, provincial governments as well as to the federal government which does not have the necessary funds, even if it has the necessary authority to enact the monetary reform or the mobilization of the whole monetary system for the benefit of the Canadian people, in order to liberate Canada, the provinces and the municipalities.

As soon as we say this we are accused of wanting inflation. But when we granted interest-free credit to other countries, did this create inflation in this country? When, quite recently, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) offered Malaysia $50 million in interest-free Canadian investments for the development of a power plant, did the Malaysians complain that this would create inflation in their country? And if the same thing were done for Quebec, Ontario or any other province, this would create inflation.

When, because of the system, the former premier of Quebec had to borrow $50 million from the United States, these $50 million did not exist in the province of Quebec before the loan. They were borrowed from the United States at a 10 per cent interest rate for 25 years. In 25 years, we will have payed out $125 million in interests and we will still owe $50 million in capital, i.e. $175 million in all!

The hon. member for Waterloo (Mr. Saltsman) does not understand that. No one has mentioned that it caused inflation. We will have to pay $175 million for $50 million received. Neither the Prime Minister nor any other federal cabinet minister have protested against this shameful abuse, nobody mentioned that it was causing inflation in the province of Quebec. If the province, instead of borrowing from the United States, had used the services of the Bank of Canada to produce the same amount of $50 million, interest-free, would that have caused inflation? Of course not. Some members of the federal Parliament have no gray matter between their ears. We hear a lot about inflation, but is the Bank of Canada short of ink or pens? Does not Mr. Rasminsky know how to count anymore? We are afraid of creating inflation by calling upon the Bank of Canada, while the fear of inflation miraculously disappears when we borrow money from our friends, the Americans.

As private enterprise is profit-earning, it can put up with our financial structures, pay interest while making profits, which is normal. But that public institutions such as the federal, provincial and municipal governments as well as the school boards should have to pay interests when they do not operate on profit, that is a mathematical impossibility. It is illogical on the part of the central government to allow such a situation with regard to provinces, municipalities and school boards.

Quebec or Ontario, in order to build low cost houses—not at $150 a month for a worker who earns $5,000 a year or at $135 or $125 a month for people who earn from 4,000 to 5,000 a year, which they cannot afford—needs from $50 to $500 million. Houses are built and then families are told: regardless of the size of your family, take this house.

Instead of building houses according to the needs of families, an attempt is made to cut families down to the size of the house. It is quite sensible. Four-room houses are built for families with ten children. A fine sight!

My friend, the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Isabelle), smiles when I talk about that, but he knows. In Hull, we see it every day. Large families are living in small houses. That is why the federal government and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) work at bringing in abortion bills so as to control the birth-rate, to prevent human beings from coming into the world and to cut down families to the size of houses built by the government. Those are the logical consequences of the present system.

I understand the position of the Minister of Justice. Families must be cut down because it is impossible to enlarge houses. Lumber and other materials are lacking. Contractors and workers are lacking. The minister is smiling. And he is right. That system is so stupid. They do nothing to change it, smiling all the while, as the Minister of Justice is doing. They smile, put they stand pat.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Caouette: If the province of Quebec needs $500 million at once to build dwellings, the Bank of Canada does not issue that amount on the spot, by putting that money in circulation, but according to the work done, at the rate the work is completed. If during one month $500,000 worth of dwellings have been erected, the Bank of Canada issues a credit of $500,000 to be paid back in "x" years according to the depreciation of those dwellings. Then a man would not have to pay twice or three times for his house. As regards my small house in Hull, the Mutual Life agreed to underwrite my mortgage and in six years I have not yet managed to reduce the capital debt by $1,000. My payments amount to $1,500 a year, most of it in interests. In one year, I pay $90 or $100 on the capital, the rest goes for interests and insurance.

I am forced to pay for three houses. The Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation has published official figures concerning payments on a $22,000 house with a 9 or 9¼ per cent mortgage over 35 or 40 years. In the end, the $22,000 house will cost $99,000.

• (4:00 p.m.)

And that is inflation. It is not just an ajustment, it is not the true reflection of our opportunities.

So, the provincial government—to come back to my example—would refund the loan in so many years following the fall in value of the houses which have been built and we could give accommodation to our people. We could have houses to sell, thus allowing the small wage earners to have their own homes which is simply impossible in the present circumstances, under the system now prevailing.

The government has to come to grips with this system. It expresses wishes for it is anxious to see an end to inflation. However, those who are at the roots of inflation are

encouraged in every way. In fact, under the present financial system we have to pay two or three times whatever we achieve, as for instance Hydro-Quebec.

In Manitoba, under the New Democratic Party, they have done the same thing. They have borrowed $50 million from the United States on behalf of a Hydro project. I remember hearing on television my good friend, the leader of the New Democratic Party in Winnipeg, and his colleague from York South (Mr. Lewis) who, with fists clenched above his head, was saying that if the Americans could be expelled from Canada we could recover the control of our economy and have Canada all to ourselves.

And he was right. The next day, however, the Minister of Finance of the New Democratic party in Manitoba was telling us on the waves of the same television station about the wonderful trip he had just made to the United States where they had rolled out the red carpet and where, thanks to the confidence of the Americans in Manitoba and its new government, he had been able to borrow the huge sum of $50 million at an interest rate of 9¼ per cent. This was just a little less than what in the province of Quebec had had to pay: 9¼ instead of 10 per cent. They were bragging about it.

Mr. Speaker, the only condition on which we can regain control of our economy, is to start with regaining control of our finance. When we can create our own credit in order to build our roads, to enable our provinces to develop normally, then we might say that we control our economy. Canada belongs to us. But as long as this financial issue has not been settled, I challenge the New Democratic party, as well as any other party, to tell me that some day we will own Canada. We will never own her as long as we are obliged to borrow from the United States.

But this is the reply given to us: Will the credit supplied by the Bank of Canada not cause our money to depreciate on the American or the international markets? They have not understood yet, Mr. Speaker, that our Canadian dollars is not in circulation in these countries.

I have been to Russia, Czechoslovakia, France, everywhere! And let someone show me in those countries one single dollar bearing the likeness of the queen. No one has ever seen any. No one wants to accept our dollar. Go to the United States, across from Cornwall, and try with a Canadian quarter to get a package of cigarettes from a vending machine. It will immediately reject the coin. Some will say: How much will our money be worth in the United States? At the present time it has no value.

Do you imagine that the Americans are wondering what kind of roads we are now building to James Bay? Are they wondering what kind of schools we are building in Charlevoix and in Carleton, or anywhere else in Canada? Are they going to see what kind of wheat is stored in our grain elevators in northern Saskatchewan? What concerns the Americans at the present time is to lend money to the idiots that we are because this way they can triple their profits.

Great care is taken not to alter those interest rates. We would rather let them go up. However, bills are submitted to the provinces in which they are told: Try to control the small employees' salaries, not to increase them by more than 6 per cent a year. But for the "big shot", a 30 per cent increase is not excessive.

No minister has taken exception to that. To the small wage-earner, the mailman, the miner in Noranda or the worker in Toronto, a 6 per cent increase only is granted in order to check inflation, but a 30 per cent one is granted to the "big shot". To fight against whom? To fight against those who check inflation, this is exactly what it is.

Why would the creation of credit by the Bank of Canada have any influence in the United States? We wish to create credit in order to develop our country, and make financially possible what is physically feasible. At present, there are 200,000 unemployed in the province of Quebec; Those Canadian citizens do not want to be unemployed, they want to work. However the Quebec government, is promising them 100,000 jobs. Our friend, Mr. Samson, the leader of the Ralliement créditiste in Québec said to Mr. Bourassa: Hurry up, because we are going to count them one by one, those 100,000 jobs, if they are not provided by the end of 1970.

Even if 100,000 jobs were created, there would still be 100,000 others to create, in addition to summer months for students, jobs for future graduates. The situation is serious.

In Quebec and elsewhere, everything is to be done. There is some talk of hydroelectric projects at James Bay, of about $2 or $3 billion. But they think of dollars instead of thinking of the waterfalls of the natural wealth they represent. Instead of adjusting the financial system to the resources to be

developed, they do the opposite: they try to adjust the resources to be developed to the financial system.

That is against common sense. This is walking on one's head instead of using one's feet. There are some who do not yet realize that.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Will the hon. member allow me to interrupt him to remind the House that his time has expired? He can keep on with his remarks with the unanimous assent of the House.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed. The hon. member for Témiscamingue.

Mr. Caouette: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I congratulate my very good friends of all parties for allowing me to continue. They doubtless want to better understand Social credit, and if that could happen, I should have helped not only the members present but also the whole population. Indeed, applying our principles would improve precisely the situation the government would like to improve. It is impossible for them to do so, because their hands and feet are tied. The government cannot go ahead. The system commands that it stop. That is paralysis.

A while ago, I spoke of interest free loans to the provinces. I have here a copy of *Hansard* for Thursday, March 12, 1970, where, at page 210, is given the amount of loans granted to foreign governments as at March 31, 1970: $1,333 million, at very low interest rates. A few loans were granted at 3 per cent but most have lower interests rates.

We grant those loans to the United Kingdom, for instance, and to France. These are interim credits, special assistance loans to underdeveloped countries. According to the United Kingdom Financial Agreement Act, 1946, on deferred interest, the interest is added to the debt, for a total amount to $1,038 million.

Yet, the Canadian government makes loans, pays for the issue of unamortized loans, and pays rates of interest of 7 per cent, 7¼ per cent, 8 per cent for a total amount of $181 million. The federal government pays interest and asks the Canadian people to do without things to help others.

I have no objection to our helping others, but I do object to our not helping our own to the same extent. That the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Trudeau), our very own Prime Minister, should go touring the Pacific to meet Australians, New Zealanders, Malaysians, that he should flaunt the Canadian wealth in those countries, we have no objection to that. However, we do object to our Prime Minister telling Canadians that they must submit to certain restrictions, while allowing himself to tell the New Zealanders: To help you as much as possible, we will try, in Canada, to decrease the subsidies to the dairy industry. We will ask our farmers to stop producing milk so that you may export your dairy products to Canada.

• (4:10 p.m.)

If subsidies to Canadian farmers were abolished, this would enable us to import more products from New Zealand. Moreover, we are already importing butter and powdered milk from New Zealand when we have more than required in Quebec to meet the demand of all Canadians.

I understand that the international market must be balanced. However, we must at the same time dispose of our own products instead of telling our people: In order to promote international trade, starve at home, sit back and do not produce, your subsidies will be cut off in order to encourage New Zealand.

Since the government is paralyzed and his policy ineffective, what will have become of Canada five or ten years from now? On March 9, the hon. member for York South asked the following question in the house:

1. For the fiscal year 1968-69, what were the total Canadian parliamentary appropriations for foreign aid programs?

2. For the fiscal year 1968-69, what were the total actual expenditures by the government of Canada on foreign aid programs?

The appropriations allowed amounted to $219 million. Up to now, the expenditures have been $153 million. Then, the Secretary of State for External Affairs replied as follows:

1. For the fiscal year 1968-69, the Canadian Parliamentary appropriations and authorizations for foreign aid totalled $289,476,000.

Foreign countries get more than Canadian provinces; the latter have to pay taxes, while the former do not even have to pay interest. This is where the system goes wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that hon. members are listening very carefully, but as questions are raised everyday on inflation, unemployment and distress in this country, why does the government impose restrictions? Why does the Prime Minister do this instead of that?

For instance, both the minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board (Mr. Lang)

and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) are taken to task, and both have the same reply: No money.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to say again what I said at the opening of my remarks: If war broke out tomorrow, there would not be any shortage of money: we would find some, even to buy the wheat of the western farmers. Indeed there would be some to buy everything.

But is it not also a national urgency when you have close to 700,000 or 800,000 unemployed in Canada? Is it not urgent to find a solution when our kids are uprising against a society in which they are not able to integrate themselves?

Mr. Speaker, the young people who are uprising are blamed and the society which prevents their integration is tolerated. Instead of blaming the youngsters who are uprising, one should begin by blaming the society and by improving it, and begin by effecting improvements in the House of Commons so that it could set an example for the rest of Canada. But instead, the blame is put on the youth. It is true that there are some hot-headed among the youngsters, but if we were in their situation, would we not have our hot-headed too? After all, these young people of today are our children.

I met recently a few federal members with 18 or 19 years old kids who are blamed in their own home by young separatists, rebels or revolutionists who cannot find a job in their own country. And we are told that the middle class is responsible for this situation, when everyone wants to become part of it. Today's young people who rebel against the middle class want to become part of it tomorrow. However, the financial system does not see to it that these young people are integrated in society, because it refuses them the right to work. If all these young people were actually employed in the development of the vast riches of Canada, would not that create new riches? Would it not allow them the opportunity to contribute directly to the administration of their country?

What solution does the Government offer? None. It does what it can; it spends $27 million to create 33,000 jobs. $27 million is a large sum! However, 600,000 young people are watching us. They are not happy about what is happening. That should not worry us. As long as our leaders will give more attention to the financial system than to the Canadian nation, and in particular to the young, there will still be trouble in Canada.

[Mr. Caouette.]

Things will go from bad to worse and necessarily Canadians as a whole will pay for the consequences. That is why we should assume our responsibility. We are reasonable and in earnest, we are seeking solutions. The government finds none. The Progressive Conservatives offer no alternative solutions. They tell the government: Put us in your place and we will do the same as you do. The proof thereof is that they already were in power, and acted in the same way.

The New Democratic party has never been in power. What better results would they obtain within the same system? None at all. If we were in the government's place within the same system, we would do no better. We must get out of the system, improve it, change it. Instead of changing the people and putting them through the system, let us put the system to work for the people. Then we will be able to guarantee that each and every citizen enjoys economic security as well as personal freedom.

Canadians are entitled to their freedom and security. Freedom without security is impossible. Security without freedom is quite easy. Every socialist country in the world has brought security at the expense of freedom. If you do not believe me, try it. Suppose that ten members go to Frieman's and break all the windows of that department store. I am convinced that within 15 minutes the Minister of Justice will have his security, just like me. We would all be behind bars with three meals a day guaranteed, and clothes that might not fit. But we will be clothed and fed and if we get sick, medicare will look after us, all of this at the government's expense. There, we would all enjoy security but not freedom. That is not a system we want for our citizens.

We want a system that would allow the minister, as well as all Canadians, to be free, to enjoy security from birth to death. That is exactly the purpose of the motion introduced by my colleague for Champlain. That is also advocated by the Creditiste doctrine of Major C. H. Douglas. Instead of laughing at it, let it be seriously considered. Everybody agrees that changes are necessary if we are not to end up in chaos as so many other countries did.

A country to which we provided millions of dollars in assistance, I mean Ceylon, became communist a few hours ago. We gave help, but was it the citizens or the businessmen of Ceylon we helped? If we used Canadian credit to make a few businessmen richer

and left the poor in destitution, it is not surprising to see communism taking hold of that country.

Besides, even in India, a country on which we are lavishing assistance, what Indians are benefiting by it directly? None. There again, businessmen who make profits at the expense of human lives.

I went to India just two years ago. I have seen what is happening over there. I did not see any 25-cent Canadian coins in Bombay, where two million people sleep outside at night. None at all! We have not helped the people, we have helped some businessmen.

I believe it is time, if it is not too late, to think of helping the individual. We will then prevent the communist catastrophe, the revolution growing in Quebec and elsewhere in Canada.

In our capacity as responsible members of a sovereign Parliament, it is time we bring order in our finances, so as to free the human being. Then, as I said before, we will ensure the security and the freedom of every citizen.

• (4:20 p.m.)

[*English*]

Hon. J. W. Monteith (Perth): Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the last speaker who participated in this debate, because at least two-thirds of what he said was right. His speech was entertaining and forceful, but unconvincing. He suggested that if he were given some additional time he would be able to convince the members of the House, and Canadians as a whole, of the correctness of Social Credit theory, but I am afraid he left me unconvinced. I do not expect to be lengthy in my remarks. I merely wish to show that the Conservative party is at least consistent. On November 6, 1962 we opposed a motion to this effect—

Mr. Francis: I think I remember it.

Mr. Bell: A lot of people remember it.

Mr. Monteith: Yes, a lot of people remember it. The motion called for debt free money. The Conservative party at that time opposed this particular motion and they are opposing it today. It is interesting to note that on November 6, 1962 the Liberals voted for debt-free money.

Mr. Bell: Shame.

Mr. Monteith: The motion itself reads:

> That, in the opinion of this House, in view of the Government's inability to effectively combat the frightening increase in the public debt—

So far I agree. I think it should be stressed that this situation is one of the government's own creation. The huge increase in debt in the last few years, the huge increase in taxation and the increase in inflation have been caused by government mismanagement. World-wide conditions have been difficult to combat. I admit that. Since 1965, this government has been heading into the situation in which we find ourselves now. Today, we have a situation in which the government is at least suggesting controls. There are implied guidelines. Presumably, the government is on an austerity kick, although expenditures for the year ending March 31, 1971 are some 9 per cent higher than for the last fiscal year. I call this irresponsibility on the part of the government. When this debate on debt free money came up today, I recalled the debate which took place in November, 1962. I should like to point out that the following appears in *Hansard* of that year at page 1331:

> The tight money policy which was introduced as part of the austerity program, and by this I mean restrictive credit and high interest rates, was bound to slow down business activity. High interest rates were bound to make it difficult for municipalities to proceed with badly needed works and services. This, in turn, could not fail to slow down construction and this is bound to mean fewer jobs this winter.
>
> But instead of worrying about a program which would lead to the employment of more people in this coming winter, the government seemed much more anxious to placate those who had moved their money out of Canada and to beg them, in the form of high interest rates on their investments, to bring it back. The effects of the government's tight money policy are bound to fall most heavily on small businessmen and on those parts of the country such as the maritimes and the Minister of Finance's own province of Nova Scotia where capital is especially hard to come by. Why we should go on punishing our own people in this way is beyond my comprehension. But that is what we are doing under this emergency tight money policy.

Those are the words of the Hon. Walter Gordon. I suggest that those words apply today. I feel convinced that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), who listened intently to the last speaker, will probably vote for this motion again today. Since the members of the Liberal party voted for a similar proposition in 1962 they will probably be quite ready to support it today.

Mr. Bell: They have nothing to gain today.

Mr. Monteith: My purpose in speaking today is to point out that I feel this is the wrong approach. I admit that an approach should have been made back around 1965, but

it is not too late yet for this government, which does not know restraint, to start showing some restraint. I should like to mention in passing that the last speaker was entertaining. I recall a member of the Social Credit Party, the hon. member for Lethbridge of that day, who always participated in the debate on the estimates of the Department of Finance. In those days the estimates were considered in the House, as any hon. members who were where here will recall. This particular hon. member always spoke three times on the estimates of the Department of Finance He spoke once on the estimates themselves. Then, he spoke on Social Credit theory and, finally, on the Turkish-Mongolian conspiracy. This was always most entertaining.

The hon. member for Temiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) was as entertaining today, if not more so, but at the same time he failed to convince us that the use of debt free money is the way to cure the situation. The government, during free time for Political broadcasts on t.v. last August, came out with a big hullabaloo about what it was going to do under the austerity program. This was a lot of nonsense. The government has not done anything. A few commissionaires employed at various places may have been laid off and some other people on the lower income bracket may have been laid off, but actually the government is building up the hierarchy. A power house is being built up around the Prime Minister's (Mr. Trudeau) office. This is enough to frighten anyone. We are approaching what I would suggest very definitely is a socialistic dictatorship. I know of a country in the Middle East which suggests it has a constituional monarchy form of government. I call it a benevolent dictatorship. This is not even a benevolent dictatorship.

This government, for instance, a few months ago renewed the 3 per cent surcharge. In addition, this government changed the constitution under which our system of government operates. In February, 1968 they were defeated on a money bill and refused to resign, so, in effect they changed our whole system of constitutional authority.

• (4:30 p.m.)

Now, they have renewed that 3 per cent surcharge which replaced the 5 per cent on which they were defeated, and if, as, and when the white paper should become legislation—pray God it never does—this temporary tax will be melded into one tax rate which the people of Canada will have to face forever.

[Mr. Monteith.]

I suggested earlier, Mr. Speaker, that I would not go over my time so you do not have to point out to me that my time has expired. I propose to sit down now, but before doing that I want to point out, something to the hon. member for Temiscamingue (Mr. Caouette). He suggested that the Conservatives would only do the same as the Liberals, that we would be very concerned about the situation. We have proven our ability to be concerned about the situation which has existed here in Canada since 1965. I cannot support this motion no matter how well intentioned it may be.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, we listened a few minutes ago to the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Matte) who introduced with great eloquence a motion to establish a new method of financing public capital in Canada.

We also listened to the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) who gave us examples intended to cast some light on this motion.

One would have to be blind, to be totally deprived of financial knowledge or to accept to be a accomplice of this administration not to recognize the merits of this motion. The Canadian financial system piles up on the federal government, the municipalities, the provincial governments and the school boards and all the public agencies, a pyramid of debts which mathematically speaking can never be repaid and which paralyses all these bodies.

If, because of ignorance or collusion, we refuse to recognize that banks alone, with practically nothing, in the form of credit, create more than 95 per cent of the money in circulation in Canada, we will look everywhere as the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Monteith) just attempted to do, for some justification for that pyramid of debts, the causes of which I should like now to summarize. When banks through credit created out of nothing lend to all public bodies, governments and school boards, $10 billion per year, at a 10 per cent rate of interest and then request a year later for the repayment of $11 billion in capital and interest, that represents the basis of a pyramidal system of debts that we will never manage to pay, if we keep that same indebtedness system.

How can we believe that all public bodies can repay $11 billion when they received in fact only $10 billion?

Put $5 billion next to another $5 billion, Mr. Speaker, and let them sleep together for a year, and as there is no such thing as male or female dollars, bringing together those two amounts of $5 billion for a year will never generate little ones twelve months later.

Whenever the banks lend $10 billion and request to be repaid $11 billion, they create in a year a billion dollar debt at the expense of all public bodies, a debt mathematically impossible to repay over a short or long term period.

However the banks will accept part payments and will refinance the balance under the same conditions. If you owe $11 billion on a $10 billion loan and pay back $5 billion, you still owe a balance of $6 billion. Yet, you only have in fact $5 billion of the original amount borrowed.

So you borrow again, at every government level, you borrow again to pay back part of your old debts; you borrow let us say another $14 billion for the following year. You then owe $20 billion, for the banks will refinance the first $6 billion you owe them. Total loans then amount to $20 billion, at 10 per cent, which means that in another year you will again owe $22 billion while having received only $20 billion.

Because money does not make little ones, because it has neither hair nor life, it cannot multiply itself.

Banks, by creating credit out of nothing, ask that more money be paid back to them than they have put in circulation through loans, create a system of perpetual and pyramidal debts which society cannot possibly pay. That is what crushes public bodies.

Today, more than 50 per cent of all public income is absorbed by taxes of all kinds: municipal taxes, school taxes, federal and provincial taxes, to pay the interest on unpayable debts. Indeed, fifty per cent of all our taxes are spent solely on paying the interest on the public debts.

That is why it is stupid, archaic, obsolete and criminal, not to accept the motion of the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Matte), so that the federal government, through its own financial institution, the Bank of Canada, would issue credit instead of the banks, and put it interest free, at the disposal of all public bodies.

With your leave, Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a chart of the public debts, including those of the federal government, the provinces, the municipalities, and the school boards.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I must point out again that although there may be precedents for this it is a practice against which I have felt obliged to caution. It seems to me that the practice of hon. members seeking to include tables in *Hansard* might be open to abuse. Having said that, I am prepared to put the question to the House. Is there unanimous consent?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rondeau: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I thank the—

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval): There was no unanimous consent.

[*English*]

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Apparently there is no unanimous consent.

• (4:40 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rondeau: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues seem to be afraid of hearing about the debts we are facing, because those figures were supplied to me by the Minister of Finance of each of the ten provinces of Canada.

I would like to put on record the official documents in my possession from each of the provinces. According to this chart, which gives a frightful picture of our public debts, the provinces owe $9,299,409,860. The municipalities with a population of over 5,000 people owe $6,502,696,257. The school boards owe $3,744,760,945. The total debt for the municipalities, the provinces and the school boards is $19,546,830,062.

According to the latest statistics in the budgetary papers dated March 12, 1970, the federal debt totals $38,018 million, for a grand total of $57,564,830,062 for the federal government, the provinces, the municipalities and the school boards, without mentioning the debts owed by municipalities with less than 5,000 population.

A look at the budget of Quebec municipalities for 1967-1968 and at the statistics reveals that several municipalities must earmark over 65 per cent of their budget for the payment of interest on the debt.

Suggested Interest-free Loans

The town of Saint-Hubert, for instance, which has a municipal budget of $2,274,400, must pay $1,015,866 in interest only on its debt. The municipality of Ville d'Anjou, which has a $4,976,081 budget, must earmark 64.9 per cent of its budget for the repayment of interests only. It actually has to pay $3,229,623 in interests.

And so it goes for most municipalities in Quebec.

For instance, on a budget of $690 million, the city of Trois-Rivières-Ouest must pay 57.4 per cent in interest alone, that is $396,385. The story is much the same for all municipalities in Canada.

I would have liked to table in the House a list of borrowings by the Quebec Hydro last year, a very important list. In a single year, the Quebec Hydro borrowed $282 million, including $50 million in the United States on July 15, 1969, $27 million in Germany on September 1, 1969, $25 million in Canada on October 15, 1969, $20 million in Europe on October 15, 1969, $50 million in the United States on December 15, 1969, $50 million on February 1, 1970 and $60 million on March 15, 1970.

A look at those figures shows that every 15 days, Quebec Hydro gets into debt to the tune of approximately $25 million.

When we consider those figures, we realize that a very large part of the budget of some municipalities goes in interests on their debts.

For example, in the city of Châteauguay only, one bank makes an annual profit of $315,000 in interests on three bank accounts. The two cities of Châteauguay owe the same bank the amount of $1 million at 9½ per cent interest. The Youville Regional School Board, in the riding of Châteauguay, owes $1,700,000 at 8¾ per cent interest. As for the Châteauguay School Board, it has a $881,000 debt at 9½ per cent, for a total of $3,581,000 on which the bank makes $315,000 a year. It does not take a large personnel to enter three different figures in the three bank accounts.

Three hundred and fifteen thousand dollars have been earned by entering three figures in the bank books for three accounts. This contributes to get the Châteauguay taxpayers into debt.

The same conditions prevail in all cities and school boards of Quebec and other Canadian provinces.

The creation of credit money by banks is the finest legal racket in the world stifling every public body.

[Mr. Rondeau.]

In India people starve and worship sacred cows instead of eating them. In Canada, we are crushed under the burden of public debts while worshipping the golden calf and Mammon.

Even though we believe that our civilization is much more modern and superior to that of India, we are strangely like the Indians when we worship the golden calf and Mammon.

Our financial system of running into debt is a bottomless barrel which the provinces, the municipalities and the school boards are trying to fill up, but which is used to make richer all those who create money out of nothing and exploit the people. In Canada, the total public debt amounts to $57,564 million. We therefore pay on average $5 billion in interests per year, which means that each Canadian pays $250 and each family $1,000 yearly.

If we passed the motion put by the hon. member for Champlain, we would avoid all those payments and Canadians would save $5 billion per year in interest, the price of entering figures in bank books.

A few months ago the Quebec Autoroutes Authority said in its report that in the province of Quebec, after 400 years, there are only 155 miles of highways which have cost the province over $400 million, an average cost of $2.5 million per mile. This includes the Eastern Townships highway, 70 miles long, the Northern highway, the Laurentides highway as well as the highway connecting Montreal to Joliette.

Last year the Autoroutes Authority gave the following figures: tolls brought in $7 million while only $2 million in capital and $19 million in interest were paid back. The revenue totalled $7 million, which leaves a deficit of $14 million for 1969 to be added to the already existing deficit of $70 million, even after the $400 million are paid.

But, if we could take advantage of the credits of the Bank of Canada for the highways of Quebec or of any other province, we would be able to pay for them once and for all whereas presently, we have to pay for them at least five times as it is the case for our schools. Why? Because we have no public financing system and, for that reason, we freeze the private capital in the public one. But if the Bank of Canada financed our public capital, it would allow us to use our savings to build sidewalks, bridges, highways

and water systems. We could invest our savings in the private sector, in order to increase our national wealth.

The Ralliement créditiste is convinced that if the financing policy of the public capital that it has now been advocating for many years in this House is not applied, the federal government, the municipalities and the school boards will have budgets that will barely pay the interest rates and they will have practically nothing left to pay for services needed by municipalities.

All we have to do is consider the balance sheets of our municipalities and school boards to find that a financial cancer is eating our public bodies, and that only the federal government can cure it, by agreeing to the motion moved by the hon. member for Champlain.

• (4:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Prior to recognizing the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Beaudoin) perhaps I might alert the House as to the subjects to be raised at the time of adjournment: The hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis)—Criminal Code—Abortion—Removal of provisions from law; the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Harding)—Pollution—Monitoring of waters receiving effluent discharges from plants using mercury.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY S.O. 58—FINANCING OF PUBLIC DEBTS THROUGH INTEREST FREE LOANS FROM BANK OF CANADA

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

That, in the opinion of this House, in view of the Government's inability to effectively combat the frightening increase in the public debt, the public sector of the Canadian economy, including the federal government, the provinces, the municipalities and the school boards should be financed by direct interest-free loans from the Bank of Canada, repayable at the rate of the depreciation on the assets thus created.

Suggested Interest-free Loans

[*Translation*]

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Matte) referred earlier to the unfortunate consequences of our present financial system and showed that governments, at all levels, are new facing almost insoluble financial problems.

Besides, the hon. members for Shefford and Témiscamingue (Messrs. Rondeau and Caouette) quoted many statistics to the effect that governments, federal, provincial or municipal, and school boards could only provide the necessary services to the Canadian people only by involving all communities into debt.

Such a situation, that I would readily term disastrous, is the result of past performance. The Canadian people in 1970 are paying for blunders made in the past; yet our governments still believe in the principles that brought them about. We are in debt for things of the past. Bridges, highways, schools and hospitals built ten or 20 years ago have not yet been paid and all Canadians must pay each year a very high tribute in return for the permission granted by bankers to carry out those works.

But, Mr. Speaker, some thought should also be given to the present and of the future. At this time, governments are hard-pressed. The federal government wanted to take $630 million more in the taxpayers' pockets, according to the proposals of the white paper on tax reform.

The provincial governments have money problems. They want to build schools, universities, hospitals, roads, health facilities. They have no money or the money available is beyond their means because its cost is prohibitive.

Therefore, we must look into those problems and ask ourselves what we can do as members of Parliament to settle the present financial problems and bring about the results the people expect of us.

The Ralliement Creditiste has always maintained that the human person is the most valuable creation of society and that all existing facilities should be at his disposal. We therefore say that material things, i.e. money and credit, should be put at the service of the human person rather than the opposite, as has been and is now the case. That is the first principle of the Social Credit philosophy.

The second one is as follows: government must be at the service of man. The role of

an elected and responsible government is to run the public affairs to suit the people, as long as this is desirable and physically possible.

In addition, what is physically workable must be made financially feasible. This means that if schools are a must to house young Canadian students, and if workers and materials are available to build them, the financial world must then bring itself in line with facts. I suggest that finance must be a reflection of the state of the economy. If money is needed to build those schools, then the necessary credits must be released automatically.

I would like to tell hon. members once more that as money is a creation of man, it should serve him and not enslave him, being only an element of exchange between human beings, for which purpose it was created. It has no other justification.

Mr. Speaker, the needs of the Canadian people are constantly increasing in various fields of economic and social life.

If you examine the housing problem, you realize that in spite of the population's urgent needs the rate of construction is increasingly slower, which will certainly not help to solve the housing problem in Canada.

The Hellyer Commission, for instance, and all recent reports on housing show that Canada should devote more funds to housing. Referring to working papers submitted at the provincial conference on housing and urban development in 1967, I see that of all the major sections of the economy, housing is the one where it will be most necessary to increase productivity, at least into the seventies, and perhaps even to the end of the decade. It is a major problem for the country as a whole since it involves seeing to it that the increasing shortage of housing does not become a real national problem. It will therefore be imperative to considerably increase present available resources, including skilled manpower and capital in the field of residential construction. It will be necessary to provide a considerable and sustained volume of mortgage loans.

• (5:00 p.m.)

That is what the report suggests, Mr. Speaker. Now what do we find? We find that residential construction decreases, that mortgage loans are almost unavailable, or if they are available, their interest rates are very high, and thus prohibitive. Construction decreases, and the problem worsens from day to day.

Another problem is directly facing municipalities; urbanization. We now witness a concentration of population in the great urban centres, which is an almost insuperable challenge for municipal governments.

Municipalities have to meet the new requirements of the people, of traffic, transportation, water and sewage facilities, control of water and air pollution, and land use.

This implies, in a given area, an effort in respect of synthesis, co-ordination and planning at the urban, metropolitan, regional, provincial and national levels.

Because of those needs, cities have to resort increasingly to experts in all fields able to attack the complicated problems created by that urbanization. Therefore education is involved. In order to train such experts, specialists, technicians and engineers, educational systems are in need of reform. School boards also need more financial resources to build modern and well equipped schools; they must have better trained teachers and be able to pay them.

Now, all Canadian cities are faced with financial problems. For municipalities, there is an ever increasing gap between revenues and expenditures. They can no longer balance their budget and must always resort to borrowing. Their most important budget item is usually the debt service.

At this stage of my speech, I would like to quote a few statistics so that the House will know the percentage of municipal budget earmarked for interest payments. I have here the 1967-68 financial statement covering about 200 municipalities in Quebec. Checking these figures, one can easily see that the older the city the higher the percentage of its budget allocated to the payment of interests on its debt.

Thus, the municipality of Bagotville in the Saguenay-Lac Saint-Jean area, during the fiscal year 1967-68, paid $49,633 in interest charges on its debt, that is 8.9 per cent of its total budget of $557,250.

As for the relatively new municipalities, they earmark not more than 20 per cent of their total budget to the payment of the interest costs. The cities of Roberval, La Tuque, Rouyn, Aylmer, Touraine, Westmount and many others are in this situation.

Mr. Speaker, I find it rather strange to consider as fortunate the municipalities which

do not earmark more than 20 per cent of their annual budget to the payment of the interests on their debts. The noxious fumes of the present economic system are slowly poisoning us and I find it very disturbing.

However, many municipalities in Quebec earmark more than 50 per cent of their annual budget only for the repayment of interest on their debt. Thus, the municipality of Trois-Rivières-Ouest in the St. Maurice region earmarked 57.4 per cent of its budget for the fiscal year 1967-1968 for interest payments on its debt, or about $62.98 per citizen.

The municipality of Ville d'Anjou earmarked $3,229,623 in 1968 out of a total budget of $4,976,081 for the payment of interest on its debt, or 64.9 per cent of its total budget. The Chambly municipality in the Richelieu region allocated 53.6 per cent of its budget during the fiscal year 1967-1968 to the payment of interest on its debt.

What are we to make of such figures, if not to feel that our economic system is completely obsolete and that all we can do now in order to live decently within such a system is to get our children and our children's children into debt.

The older a municipality is, the harder it is for it to balance its budget. Simple logic proves, without the shadow of a doubt, that there is something really wrong with our economy. Why persist in increasing taxes, reducing expenses, getting into debt with neighbouring countries, while in reality we are only putting bandaids on a wooden leg. Why not solve the problem at the source, and change the system?

I have only quoted a few figures concerning the municipalities, but we all know that the same goes in every field in the public sector, and that it is much more so in the private sector. Indeed, the situation is the same with regard to the budgets of school boards, community centres, the provinces as well as the Canadian government. Must we wait till the nation goes bankrupt to finally wake up? Unfortunately, I am afraid so, Mr. Speaker.

Another problem, that is ever growing, and which, unless it is solved in the near future, will cause us much trouble, is that of air and water pollution.

At the present time, our rivers, our lakes, are filled with waste to the extent where government authorities have had to forbid commercial fishing because the fish has become unfit for consumption.

I have sat for two years on the National Resources and Public Works Committee, and I am convinced that the present situation urgently requires the attention of the central government. Last Wednesday, I attended with my colleagues of the committee the showing of a few short films on the quality of our waters in various parts of the country. Things are far from rosy, even though the films were in colour. We talk of saving the lives of our fish, but what about the lives of human beings, of Canadians!

In several municipalities, tap water is no longer drinkable. Many doctors have forbidden their patients to drink the water in some Quebec municipalities, on the other side of the Ottawa river, for instance, where cases of typhoid and paratyphoid fever have been recorded.

Meanwhile, the municipal councils are doing nothing and they cannot do anything because they do not have enough funds to purify the water, to filter it so that people may safely drink it. These are very serious problems since the health of the people is at stake as well as our industrial development.

It is time that the federal government should develop some kind of machinery for regulating financial participation in order to help the municipalities together with the administrations of the various provinces.

We should try to devise financing methods more rational and more just than those we have now if we do not want to run the risk of entirely destroying private ownership and if we do not want to jeopardize house ownership as a result of high taxes.

Municipalities as well as industrial organizations are facing financing problems when they try to fight water pollution in an efficient way. Provided it is willing to take the necessary steps, the federal government is in a position to solve these financial problems.

That is why the Ralliement créditiste has raised today this question and is asking the federal government, through the Bank of Canada, to grant interest-free loans to the provinces and to the municipalities in order to build and develop social projects which are a vital necessity if the community is to survive.

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, we must admit that the members of the Ralliement créditiste who spoke before me, seem convinced and sincere, but me must also admit that they are not very convincing. In fact, accord-

ing to the members of other parties who also spoke in this debate, the Créditistes seem to have convinced no one.

It is not an easy task to follow the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) through a speech such as he alone can make. He told us how nice it would be to get interest free money. He complained that he is paying a 7½ or 7¾ per cent interest on a house that he bought, but he did not tell us how much interest he draws from his savings at the bank because it is rather easy, nowadays, to invest these savings perhaps at a even higher rate.

• (5:10 p.m.)

It was also pointed out that we are paying now for the bridges, roads and schools which have been built perhaps 20, 25 or 30 years ago, or more, but I find this normal, since we are using these roads, these schools and these bridges.

The true injustice would have been to have the taxpayers, 25, 30 or 40 years ago, pay for buildings, roads or bridges which would be used perhaps for the next 50, 75 or 100 years. And it is only fair that the next generation pay also a portion of the cost of what we build today.

Of course taxes were mentioned and it was suggested that all the taxes which are raised, are mainly used to repay loans or our public debt. One must not exaggerate. We must admit that the taxes we collect help most of the time to pay for expenditures and that most of that money goes back to the taxpayers in the form of social benefits such as old age pensions, family allowances, medicare, hospitalization insurance. They also help to finance education and to pay for public buildings and services.

Mr. Speaker, the Créditiste motion before us is based upon the false assumption that there was a tremendous increase of the public debt. Indeed, the public debt at all levels of government increased only in a moderate way during the last 15 years or so as against the gross national product. If we merely quote figures, such amounts seem astronomical, of course, but compared to the gross national product, such an increase seems rather a moderate one.

Last February, the Committee on Taxation reported to the federal-provincial conference of prime ministers that the present debt at all government levels had increased from 95.9 per cent of the gross national product in 1952 to 101.4 per cent only in 1968.

[Mr. Côté (Longueuil).]

During the same period, the federal government's debt decreased from 75.7 per cent of the gross national product in 1952 to 61.4 per cent in 1968. The debt of the provinces had increased from 14 per cent to 26.6 per cent of the gross national product and that of the municipalities, from 7.4 to 13.3 per cent.

On this account, I must point out that the Economic Council of Canada indicated in their last annual review that as a proportion of total government expenditures, interest on the debt had decreased from 20.8 per cent in 1939 to 6.8 per cent in 1967. The Council's figures also show that proportionately to the to the gross national product, interest on the debt at all government levels had decreased from 4.7 per cent in 1939 to 2.1 per cent in 1967.

Both groups of figures are another proof that the Créditistes motion is based uniquely on assumptions but allows them to claim that the public debt is frightening.

If we read the motion carefully, we see that it is predicated on the idea of a federal responsibility as regards the loans of other provinces or other governments. In fact, the motion reads as follows:

> That, in view of the Government's inability to effectively combat the frightening increase in the public debt, the public sector of the Canadian economy, including the federal government, the provinces, the municipalities and the school boards—

The motion assumes that it is the government's responsibility to limit the amounts of money borrowed by the other levels of government. It is a matter that obviously overrides its jurisdiction.

Let us deal now with the impact of the financing of these loans by the Bank of Canada. During 1969, the net total of borrowings made by all levels of government was well over $2 billion. If the Bank of Canada was making available unlimited amounts of money to all levels of government, and that, without interest, as is proposed by the créditiste motion, inflation would be greatly accelerated. This tremendous increase in the money supply would start a large increase in expenditures and would give a great impulse to price increases, which would seriously jeopardize the stability of our economy.

Governments and school boards must borrow on the money markets as to all other enterprises. In a free enterprise system, public administrations must compete to attract the money lenders. One must pay for the use of money; this is a truth as old as money itself which Social Credit should recognize.

Mr. Speaker, when hearing the speeches of the members from the Ralliement créditiste, we were wondering if that party which seems to be so far from socialism is not quite close to it sometimes.

The Ralliement créditiste often cites as an example—and the member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) mentioned it a moment ago—the loans which Canada grants to other countries on easy terms.

It is true that Canada, as other countries granting loans to under-developed countries, do so on quite easy terms. But this is not a reason to ask the same terms in some entirely different situations in Canada.

The federal government recognizes that there are joint responsibilities at the international level to devote some financial resources to the development of poorer countries. However, all countries recognize that such funds cannot always be loaned on commercial terms. The poorer countries simply cannot obtain the necessary exchange funds to pay commercial interest rates.

Therefore, Canada grants loans on easy terms, while abiding by criteria ensuring worthwhile development projects. Such loans do not apply to non-profitable enterprises. They apply to construction and development projects providing a good return.

Mr. Speaker, the Ralliement créditiste motion reflects their old theory according to which our economic system is defective since it fails to produce an adequate increase in the money supply.

The federal government believes that our present monetary system is efficient and flexible enough to meet the changing needs of the economy, including the need for expansion of the available credit. And a while ago, a striking example of the situation was provided by the hon. member of Temiscamingue when he referred to credits avaialble in wartime.

• (5:20 p.m.)

True, available credit was enormous during the war, but it is equally true that there were a great many restrictions, particularly on coffee, tea, butter, sugar, and even manpower mobility. In fact, one could not change jobs without permission. There were restrictions on the purchase of luxury items. One could not even buy a car, a fact which even now would surely affect the hon. member for Témiscamingue.

There was also a control on salaries and prices. The results of that increase in credit are that the national debt more than trebled, because the credit allowed was financed from war loans. New money was not created, it was just a matter of borrowing more money in order to spend more.

In the report which he presented to the Commons last Thursday on the provincial Finance Ministers and Treasurers conference, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) did mention that the basic goal of the government is to put an end to the inflationary spiral of prices, while maintaining a firm economic balance.

The budget tabled by the Minister of Finance last March considerably eased federal tax restrictions. Since then, monetary restrictions have also been eased, which was reflected in a decrease of the bank rate from 8½ to 7½ per cent.

In the meantime, the government has also decided not to implement the budget proposal to establish controls on consumer credit. Furthermore, the increase of $300 million in payments to provinces during the fiscal year, which was announced in the House last Monday by the Minister of Finance, is another important measure to ease the fiscal policy of the federal government.

The continuous increase in costs and prices remains a main matter of concern to the government. Since the beginning of 1970 some progress has been made with regard to checking price increases, which has made it possible to reduce somewhat fiscal and monetary restrictions.

I would emphasize that the government is quite anxious to have the Canadian economy back on a strong but steady rate of increase. We are looking forward to reducing the surplus capacity now existing in our economy so that it may develop more in harmony with its potential.

I am in a position to inform the House that the government is now intensively studying the adoption of specific measures aimed at increasing still more our economical activities.

Before taking further significant action to ease present restraints, it is essential however to ascertain that the inflationary pressures on our economy have begun to slacken.

As I have indicated, through various undertakings we have been able to slow down price increases in Canada for the first months of 1970. Until now, no corresponding progress has been noted as regards costs. Moreover, salaries have kept on increasing rapidly.

Suggested Interest-free Loans

The house realizes that this is the factor which has caused the Price and Incomes Commission to recommend the establishment of guidelines for salaries and wages at the federal-provincial conference of ministers of Finance and provincial treasurers which took place in Winnipeg recently.

These guidelines, which would correspond to the criteria on price controls adopted at the national conference on price stability held last february in Ottawa, were fully endorsed by the federal government. They were also approved by most of the provincial ministers present at the Winnipeg conference.

If those guidelines manage to hold costs down as they have done already with prices, the government could go ahead through a new policy aimed at a more rapid rate of growth, a higher rate of employment and a higher increase in the actual income of all Canadians.

Unemployment has been referred to. The very high rate of unemployment in Canada is a matter of concern. However, the opposition seems concerned with unemployment only when the rate reaches 5 or 6 per cent. But the government, I can say that, becomes involved right away as soon as there is one man out of work. We try by every means to give him a hand.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to say to conclude that, even though Créditistes may seem convinced, they are not quite convincing. Having heard the NDP members and the Conservatives decline to support their motion, I can say that the government will not support it either and it seems that the Créditistes are quite isolated.

Mr. Speaker, between you and me who does not understand?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. C.-A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, I believe we have today a special day, called the opposition's day. We, of the Ralliement créditiste had to propose a motion and it seems to me that the motion which has been proposed by the member for Champlain (Mr. Matte) concerns the whole population.

The Liberal, Conservative and New Democratic members say they are not concerned by the motion. In fact only three of them have spoken up to now. They are afraid or are not authorized to speak about this matter. However this matter is nowadays a very important one.

[Mr. Côté (Longueuil).]

I was pleased when the hon. Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Côté) rose a while ago, because I thought: at last, here is someone who might try to disregard the high finance. However I did not recognize his usual style and at times I wondered whether his speeches are not written by the financiers themselves.

He has claimed that others have said that we would not convince them. Our aim is not to convince members. Indeed, I have always believed this saying: Tell me who pays you and I will tell you who you are. In my opinion, the three parties are well paid by big finance and it is strictly forbidden to speak against it these days. People suffer so much because their true representatives are not in the House.

We do criticize the government at times, but we do more than that, we make suggestions. For years we have been suggesting monetary reform, asking the government to try to find new credit through the Bank of Canada and to stop having private interests create public credit. That is the flaw in the system. We take over public property and put it back on the market through individuals, that is, chartered banks.

• (5:30 p.m.)

And I was not surprised to hear the Minister of National Revenue say that he was satisfied with our indebtedness. As far as he is concerned it is normal to get into debt. The more the people work, the more they have to get into debt. This is normal. But I say that it is abnormal. And if some argue differently, they are also abnormal.

I have never seen a man who works in earnest and receives an income, getting deeper into debt year after year if he has a sound accounting system. However, this is what we tolerate from the government. If at the end of the year the government has not received a sufficient income to pay its expenditures, it goes into debt.

Of course, in underdeveloped countries this is logical. But in a country such as Canada which shows surpluses every year—if we compare the gross national income to the national output—this is unconceivable. However, we note that Canada is not a poor country but a country which is robbed by high finance which we want to denounce.

After listening to some of the speeches made by members from other parties, I am more convinced than ever that it is impossible, even with a ton of water, to get a duck wet. According to an old saying, there is none so deaf as those who will not hear.

We are trying to see our way clear through this maze of ideas from other parties trying to convince the people that they are right. But I am convinced that they know for sure that they are wrong. Here is the proof of it: Last week I was attending a meeting of the Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, where I heard the president of Imperial Oil, who appeared as a witness, tell us that today no one could explain the system. He challenged everyone, economists as well as other people. However, I think that he is an intelligent man. And today they would have us believe that they can explain the present system. No, that is impossible. At least if they said: We shall try to think of something else, because after all, the monetary system is supposed to reflect what our economy is worth, but it does not at present. If only they took the trouble of looking into the question. But no. They persist in their opinion, or they promised, in order to win their election, never to raise that issue.

Our words are intended for the public and that is why I speak today. Everyone must read in *Hansard* what was said in the House so as to know at least about this tremendous indebtedness which is only beginning under the present system.

Previous speakers emphasized the bad effects of the present policy, due to the bank financing of the various governments' social projects, which leads to public indebtedness and, through tax increases, relentlessly erodes the low income of factory workers, farmers, white collars, civil servants, in short all classes of society.

Other spokesmen for the Ralliement créditiste have suggested a financing formula, a sound, logical one which could only be beneficial to all taxpayers through the application of the principles embodied in the motion introduced by the hon. member for Champlain.

First of all, the social needs of all Canadians could be met if the brains are available, the hands are ready to work and the materials are plentiful. Education, public health, urban development, public services and social security would benefit from it.

Since education comes under provincial jurisdiction, educational systems should be financed and administered by the provinces. They are the ones who, with the co-operation of the school boards, should administer the colleges and the universities.

The provinces are the ones which, by way of consultations with the parents, the teachers and the Church, should be made responsible for developing programs while making allowance for the objectives and the needs of the community. Those educational needs, whether it be school facilities, teacher training, the physical comfort of the students, cost money. We feel that a formula such as the one we advocate would enable us, not to solve everything, but to remove the worst stumbling block that now paralyzes all the goodwill, and practically kills the best initiatives.

The same applies in the field of health. To cure the sick, to prevent disease, to maintain good health, we must first of all have enough institutions. There must be enough hospital beds to accommodate those in need of hospital treatment. We need enough doctors, and specialists to meet the needs of the sick and physically disabled.

• (5:40 p.m.)

At the present time, in all Canadian provinces, there are medical insurance plans and soon, these will be replaced everywhere by medicare. Without discussing the merits of those programs or the methods for implementing them, the fact remains that they are all experiencing the same financial difficulty.

The difficulties are such that the federal government has practically called upon the provinces to limit the ever increasing cost of those insurances. We must not forget however that the provinces must meet the cost of hospital construction, of training a competent personnel, and that they must bargain wages and working conditions with unions.

The provinces are the ones who bear the brunt of the expense of those medicare programs and strive to find the necessary funds to improve health services, considering the high interest rates on loans on the open market.

We believe that the financing formula in the public sector, through the Bank of Canada, would help to solve health problems in Canada.

Social security measures could be improved through the setting up of a realistic financial system which would not discourage goodwill or effort, but would provide all Canadians with the bare minimum, thanks to the wealth and production of Canada.

But is Canada rich enough to meet the essential needs of all Canadians? If so, why are all those needs not met? It is simply be-

cause the present financial system paralyses everything, monopolizes all the wealth and makes all efforts fruitless.

A financing process which would allow to bring about whatever is physically workable and desirable would result in putting an end to the misery and distress of millions of Canadians who are living below the poverty line.

I would like to say a few words on the consequences of such a financial system on savings, investments, employment, and finally on the consumers in general.

Billions of dollars are invested at present in the public sector, billions coming from the savings of Canadians and which are created at the stroke of a pen, by bonds issued by the federal and provincial governments, municipalities and school boards. Those projects are unproductive by their very nature, because they serve only to pay the interest on war debts.

The billions invested in the construction of roads, bridges, schools, hospitals, are unproductive. This is why the financing formula for the public sector we are suggesting will have the effect of freeing these nonproductive billions which could then be invested in the private sector. We think that it is legitimate to make a profit and that invested savings should bring an income, a reward and that they would find there a great opportunity to serve the common good by contributing to the country's progress.

At the present time, construction of houses, formerly financed on a large scale by savings invested in insurance companies, is paralyzed because government policies have discouraged investors and have led them towards other more profitable sectors. Savings freed from the public sector could be invested in the construction of houses, which would offer an opportunity for profitable investment and which would serve highly social purposes.

Savings diverted from the public sector towards the private one would also provide industry with a plentiful source of capital. Canadian firms would be less and less obliged to call upon foreign investors, foreign banks, to sell bonds and shares in order to insure their financing. Thus, Canadians might finance themselves the economic development of their country.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired, unless he should get the consent of the House to carry on his remarks.

[Mr. Gauthier.]

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed. The hon. member for Roberval.

Mr. Gauthier: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was saying that greater availability of capital, more and larger investments in Canadian industry would also result in creating many jobs for the thousands of unemployed who now have no opportunity of demonstrating their skills and their willingness to serve the Canadian community, enabling them to ensure the welfare and security of their families.

More investments, new factories, thousands of new jobs would flood the Canadian market with products in quantities to meet all requirements, either through sale on the local market, or by exchanging this increased production for foreign goods which we will always have to import.

An abundance of goods would result in lower prices which would benefit all Canadians who could buy those goods more cheaply.

Public capital financing by the Bank of Canada would ensure interest-free loans which would bring about lower taxes. This would result in a nominal increase in the purchasing power of all Canadians as well as in lower prices, which include all kinds of indirect taxes that make prices go up and deprive Canadians.

Mr. Speaker this is my final word. If the formula proposed by the hon. member for Champlain were implemented, the Canadian economy would really benefit the consumers. Since we believe that the consumer is the true purpose of the economy and that the satisfaction of the consumer's needs is the object of industrial activities, those purposes would be achieved. That is what we are asking for.

[*English*]

PRIVILEGE

MR. HOWARD (SKEENA)—DISCLOSURE TO "TIME" MAGAZINE OF INFORMATION IN INTERIM REPORT ON NON-MEDICAL USE OF DRUGS

Mr. Speaker: Approximately 55 minutes ago the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) gave the Chair notice of a question of privilege under Standing Order 17(2). In view of the fact that the hour required for the notice will expire in about two minutes, I

assume there would be consent of the House to allow the hon. member to state his question at the present time. This would obviate interrupting the hon. member who is about to start his speech. He will have an opportunity to make his contribution, without being interrupted, after we have disposed of the question of privilege.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

• (5:50 p.m.)

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, my question of privilege is based upon an article in *Time* magazine which apparently reached the newsstands this afternoon after Orders of the Day had been completed. Thus, this is the first opportunity I have had to raise the matter. If it had not been for the requirement of giving one hour's notice we would have been able to raise it earlier than now.

The article in *Time* magazine, which ranges over six pages, complete with pictures and the like, contains a number of what are purported to be—and I do not doubt their truthfulness—direct quotations from the interim report of the LeDain Commission of Inquiry into the Non-Medical use of Drugs in Canada. Even though that report has been kept as an inner cabinet, confidential document up until now, there have been rumours and expressions in the news field about the contents of the report—but none so extensive as those which appear in *Time* magazine.

Those rumours and the discussions which have revolved around what the LeDain Commission interim report might have contained have been in themselves sufficient to hamper Parliament in the proper and full prosecution of its concern for the question which the commission studied. However, I submit that the question of privilege is primarily that *Time* magazine, in its article which ranges, as I have said, over six pages, gives extensive quotations from the report itself, paraphrases other parts of the report and makes references to minority reports in it and the like, in itself totally interferes with the work of Parliament and makes it at this stage virtually impossible for Parliament, thoroughly and properly, to take any action it would like to take with respect to that report.

If, for the sake of argument, the government wants even at this stage to maintain the confidentiality of the report, if questions are asked about it the government is in the position of not being able to answer, of not being able to make comments about items that appear in the press, and the like. I submit that this is interference. If I could briefly put on the record a few direct quotations from the article in *Time* magazine, it may assist the Chair in coming to a conclusion about the matter of privilege. The article starts off, right in its first paragraph, with a quotation as follows:

> We believe that the emphasis must shift...from a reliance on suppression to a reliance on the wise exercise of freedom of choice.

The next paragraph says:

> So states the interim report of Ottawa's Commission of Inquiry into the Non-Medical use of Drugs in Canada.

It goes on, in this first page, to say about the commission:

> It recommends that possessing or trafficking in either drug remain on the books as a crime, but that the offence be removed from the Narcotic Control Act under which a younster who offers a friend a joint of pot can, theoretically, face up to life imprisonment—
>
> The commission further recommends that criminal records for drug offences be destroyed after two years.

Here is another direct quotation:

> —"one of the major problems involved in the non-medical use of drugs." Says the report—

Then there is another quotation, and so on. I do not wish to give more extensive quotations than these from the first page, nor to go on into the article itself. Based upon those quotations I would offer a motion to the House, if it is found that there is a question of privilege and that the publication *Time* magazine, with the extracts in it from the LeDain Commission report and other factors inherent in the article, interferes with the proper functioning of Parliament. My motion seeks to attach no blame to the government or to anyone else, but simply to have an inquiry or investigation into how *Time* magazine came to acquire this particular report.

We know that in the news field, Mr. Speaker, it is not uncommon for organizations, magazines, newspapers, television stations and the like to try to obtain what in the trade are called scoops and exclusive articles or items, and to obtain them by way of offering money, which often gives them prior and exclusive access to a particular document. Four or five months ago I heard rumours—that is all they were at that time—that *Time* magazine, among others, made offers of pretty substantial amounts of money to acquire the exclusive rights to the interim report. I just

wonder, with the publication of this article today, if *Time* was the successful bidder in that endeavour. But it is a fact that *Time* magazine does have a commission report that has so far been denied the people of Canada, and I submit that interferes with the operation of Parliament in its consideration of this matter.

This is a highly moral question, a matter of great concern to the health and psychological well-being of our nation, because the question of drug abuse is slipping through our society at all levels. One does not even need any great connection with those activities at any level of society to know that this is happening, because there are common and regular references in the newspapers to the fact that marijuana is a common companion at some parties held in our middle and upper classes. We know that we have weekend heroin users in our schools, and that LSD and other drugs are readily available at all levels, by all age groups and in all sections of our society.

We can only seek to deal properly and effectively with this question if everything is above board and if the LeDain Commission, for which we had great hopes, provides the basis of an answer that Parliament might give to the people of Canada, not in a partisan way but in an individual and moral way—in the way that Parliament should operate—on a non-partisan basis. That should be our objective—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest to the hon. member that he is now going beyond the terms of the question of privilege which he has raised. He is debating the essence of the matter, and I do not think his intervention should be allowed to continue along these lines. I fully appreciate the interest in what he is saying at the present time, but perhaps we should try to limit this debate to the strictly procedural question.

I wonder, since it is just about six o'clock, whether it would be the desire of the House that we conclude this matter now. I have some doubt whether it would be entirely fair to pursue it much beyond six o'clock, in view of the fact that we are on a supply day. I would therefore suggest to hon. members that we try to dispose of the matter before we rise.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I was simply making my concluding remarks to indicate the necessity of taking some action. One action I hope to propose by way of this motion, and another is calling for the tabling later this evening, or tomorrow at the latest, of the report itself with or without a policy statement by the government. My motion, based on what I believe to be a proper question of privilege, is as follows:

> That this House is of the opinion that the government should conduct an immediate investigation to ascertain how the interim report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Non-Medical Use of Drugs came into the possession of *Time* magazine and to report its findings, either interim or final, to the House not later than June 26, 1970.

Mr. Speaker: If there is no further debate on the point, I am prepared to give a ruling now.

• (6:00 p.m.)

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a word or two to what has been said by my colleague from Skeena. I will confine myself strictly to the question of whether Your Honour should find that there is a prima facie case of privilege. It does seem to me, Mr. Speaker, without trying to attach blame to any particular group—whether it is the government, some other agency, or what have you—that the fact that this kind of thing happens does interfere with our capacity to do our work as Members of Parliament.

Without quoting all the authorities on privilege, hon. members will realize that this is what privilege is all about, namely, anything that interferes with our right to do our work as Members of Parliament. When this kind of thing happens, I suggest our rights are being interfered with. Therefore it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) has made a proper suggestion, namely, that how this situation arose in this particular case should be investigated; the House should know how it came about. I hope Your Honour will agree that there is a prima facie case of privilege in the sense that the functions of Parliament have been interfered with by what has happened.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) for his contribution to this very interesting point. As was indicated by the Chair earlier, the necessary notice was given just about an hour ago and this gave the Chair time to reflect on the question and study the precedents. It also gave the Chair time to come to a conclusion on the very interesting arguments brought forth by the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard), supported by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

Hon. members realize that this point has already been proposed twice by way of a question of privilege. Last week, on either Thursday or Friday, a like motion was proposed by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) and a similar motion was proposed earlier today. When the first motion was advanced for the consideration of the Chair, the suggestion was that the fact that the report was not being published by the government was in itself a breach of the privileges of the House, and that the matter should be investigated by a committee.

After hearing argument, the Chair reached the conclusion that it was not a question of privilege; that, basically, if a document which has been commissioned by the government is not made public and the opposition wants the document to be made public, it can present a motion for the production of papers in the normal way. This was perhaps a harsh suggestion, and I realize it has serious practical difficulties; but the rule is there. I suggested to hon. members that on this basis there was no question of privilege.

The subsequent question arose as to whether some of the information contained in the report might—as the hon. member for Skeena puts it in a very positive way—have been made public either by the government or some other source, and that that in itself is a question of privilege which ought to be investigated. There again, I have very serious doubts. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and the hon. member for Skeena suggest that in this way the operation of Parliament has been hampered; that hon. members have been hampered in the discharge of their responsibilities as Members of Parliament in that information not yet given to the House has in some way found its way to the press or the public.

Does that constitute a question of privilege? The worst case that might be made by the hon. member would be that there has been deliberate misinformation by the minister. If this were so, then I suggest to hon. members we might have a question of privilege if there were a substantive motion directed against the individual or directed against the minister as a member of the House. If there were a specific charge, the matter might be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. That is not the subject matter of the motion proposed now. The motion is simply that an inquiry should be launched to investigate how this information leaked out, if it is a fact that information has actually been conveyed to members of the press.

I fail to see how this can be a question of privilege. There are a number of precedents indicating to hon. members that this type of situation cannot be treated as a question of privilege. Hon. members may remember that last year the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) raised a question of privilege on the alleged advance publication of information relating to Dorval airport. It was suggested by the hon. member for Calgary North, who was supported by a number of hon. members, that this constituted a question of privilege and that the matter should be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections for investigation. This is precisely what the hon. member wanted to do; he wanted the committee to ask questions, to interview witnesses and ascertain how this information had got into the hands of the public. This is what the hon. member for Skeena would like done in connection with this particular alleged leak of information.

If hon. members will consult *Journals* of the House of Commons for Monday, March 31, 1969, they will see that the Chair at that time had painstakingly gone through many precedents, had studied the precedents in the British House and had come to the conclusion that this could not be the subject of a question of privilege. I refer hon. members to two cases which are particularly relevant. One is the Thomas case, where a motion was made for an investigation under the Tribunals of Inquiry (Evidence) Act. After debate on that motion, it was resolved on the main question "that the report be accepted," etc. The relevant point is that the matter was not considered at any time by way of a question of privilege.

Then in the Dalton case there was a suggestion that information had been leaked out. The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) smiles, but he may not be thinking of the same Dalton.

An hon. Member: They are all in the same Camp.

Mr. Speaker: I am referring to the British Chancellor of the Exchequer of that time. The decision was the same, that the matter was not considered as a question of privilege. The conclusion was reached that the motion for study of the circumstances surrounding the leak of information could not be considered

as a question of privilege but was, rather, a substantive motion and should be considered by way of substantive motion.

I suggest to the hon. member for Skeena and to all hon. members that what is being proposed now is a substantive motion. This kind of investigation cannot be carried out, by way of a question of privilege, by the Committee on Privileges and Elections or any other committee. I hope the hon. member for Skeena will accept the ruling I am making at this time. I am not suggesting that the matter is not an important one. I realize that it is, but I suggest that the duty of the Chair is to find whether there is a prima facie case of privilege and whether an investigation should be carried out by way of privilege. My ruling must be that there is not a prima facie case and that the hon. member's motion cannot be put at this time.

It being six o'clock, I do now leave the chair.

At 6.10 p.m. the House took recess.

[*Translation*]

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY S.O. 58—PUBLIC DEBT FINANCING THROUGH BANK OF CANADA INTEREST-FREE LOANS

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

That, in the opinion of this House, in view of the Government's inability to effectively combat the frightening increase in the public debt, the public sector of the Canadian economy, including the federal government, the provinces, the municipalities and the school boards should be financed by direct interest-free loans from the Bank of Canada, repayable at the rate of the depreciation on the assets thus created.

Mr. Roland Godin (Portneuf): Mr. Speaker, I was in the House at the beginning of this sitting when the member for Champlain (Mr. Matte) introduced a motion censuring for its failure to fight efficiently, and I quote:

—the frightening increase in the public debt—

—and requesting that—

—the public sector of the Canadian economy, including the federal government, the provinces, the municipalities and the school boards should be financed by direct interest-free loans from the Bank of Canada, repayable at the rate of the depreciation on the assets.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Finally, the motion aims at restarting through proper financing all that is presently paralyzed or on the verge of paralysis in the economy. In my opinion, we are living the years 1929 to 1939 all over again.

While the central government is asking Canadians to "tighten their belts", the provinces, the municipalities, the cities are cancelling projects. Thus, workers take to the roads. Being unemployed, Canadians travel from one province to the other. Unemployed from Manitoba and Saskatchewan thumb rides to Alberta and British Columbia while those from the Maritimes and Quebec head for Ontario.

They are qualified workers: electricians, welders, machinists, designers and others from all kinds of trades and they are men of good will. They wander without gaining much since there is stagnation in all provinces.

• (8:10 p.m.)

We attend federal-provincial conferences where tax sharing is discussed. Yet, no effective measure is proposed to solve the problem once and for all. As I said earlier, we are going through the 1929-39 recession over again. Those who are 45 or more remember those ten years of economic paralysis. No government felt able to end it. But suddenly a war was declared and financial permits were issued to produce, to recruit, to destroy and to kill. Ten parliamentary sessions, each lasting several months, each in Ottawa had not succeeded in prompting the government to find a way to end the unnatural crisis which was starving and depriving whole families, while goods remained unsold and many more could still be offered. A so-called emergency session of only six days, namely from September 7 to 13, 1939, was enough to involve the country completely in a war that was to cost billions of dollars. That decision was speedy and unanimous.

A minister in the Mackenzie King cabinet, the hon. J. H. Harris, resorted to all his eloquence when he stated: "the eyes of all Canadians are on this House. If such is the case, does it not rest with us to act and think as one man? The reason is obvious, since christianity, democracy and individual freedom are at stake."

Christianity and individual freedom did not seem at stake to him nor to the party to which he belonged during all those years

when Canadian parents found it impossible to feed their children, when young people took refuge in concentration camps, the said labour camps to get a meagre ration in return for their complete slavery, when able-bodied men were unemployed, wandering in the bush, roving from one town to another, while others were taking shelter in huts which they built with pieces of sheet iron, scrap wood and tar-paper found on the dumping grounds of the city of Montreal.

The authorities had nothing to offer to families or individuals. Of course, the provinces, the cities, the municipalities had to try to balance their budget. For them, as well as for the companies, trying to balance their budget was only normal. But when the budget is prepared by a sovereign government, there should be no need of balancing it. This would be nonsense. Clearly, an individual cannot indulge into expenditures that exceed his income without getting into debt, but the situation is entirely different for a sovereign government.

The sovereign government is the nation itself. If the nation does not increase its total production, the balance will come naturally as a result of the method suggested. Credits in circulation will be balanced by money withdrawals since no monetary expansion will be justified.

However if, as is normal, total production increases, more money will be needed. Issues must exceed withdrawals or else there would not be any money increase.

And if it is not the country itself, through its government, which makes that increase necessary, some other institution will have to take over. In fact, to-day it is the issuing banks which are handling it, but they realize this expansion by creating debts. This is why any development to-day entails a debt.

A sovereign government which strives to balance its budgets gives up its sovereignty. It lowers itself to the rank of a mere individual. It hands over its sovereignty to others, to those who undertake to look after development and credit compensation. That is why, normally, world banks insist so much on every government balancing its own budget. They even bring about the fall of those which pay no heed. They are jealous of their sovereignty and fear that governments should shake themselves free from their bondage.

With what would the government pay public services if it does not obtain money through taxes?

Suggested Interest-free Loans

Once again, I repeat, the government has a mandate from the community. If the community, through its Parliament, has decided to avail itself of the nation's productive capacity, it is simply issuing to those entrusted with the undertaking drawing rights on that productive capacity. It generates its own credits and its own modes of payment. The government and the citizens are drawing on the same productive capacity, but the citizens contribute their money and the government the decision of the community's representatives.

Of course, the productive capacity has to be able to meet the demand. It would be futile for the community to call for a production it cannot supply. The following tax-free public works example assumes the existence of a social credit system including issuance and cancellation of credit-money according to circumstances, with periodic distribution of dividends to each and every citizen, including compensated adjustment of prices. One must keep in mind a complete Créditiste economy to understand the operation of public financing without taxes.

Public works without taxes, the building of a bridge without taxes, it is not under the existing financial system that we can find that. Under this system, finance orders, conditions, limits and restricts the realities.

But under a Social Credit system, finance is nothing more than the accounting representation of realities. We produce and we express in credit the value of the product. We destroy and we express in debit the value of what is being destroyed.

The question: "Are we able to pay"? or "How shall we pay"? no longer applies.

Does a community want a bridge? The only question to be considered is: "Are we able to build a bridge?" To be able, means to have the materials, the technicians, the labour needed to achieve this project.

If it is a provincial undertaking, the Minister of Public Works will submit the project to the provincial government that will approve or reject it, or delays it until later in the name of the community as a whole. To take this decision, the legislature enters into no financial considerations. It only determines whether the project meets the population's requirements and whether the physical possibilities of the province permits it.

Certainly the bridge can be evaluated on the basis of the estimate, of the materials and of the labour required. The construction of

the bridge may be entrusted to the lowest bidder if he is competent. Considering finance as a reflect of reality, a lower cost means less consumption, less materials, time and energy. The more finished goods a country gets with a minimum amount of raw material, the richer it becomes.

Let us suppose the member for Chambly (Mr. Pilon) retires as a member of Parliament to start a business and gets the contract for the building of the proposed bridge. He wants $500,000 to carry out the project. Where will the government get this amount to pay the contractor? It should not worry about it. Finance is not a matter of administration, it is a matter of book-keeping. The working of a Créditiste financial system presupposes the setting up of a book-keeping agency. Let us call it the provincial Credit Office since provincial finance is concerned. The head office is in Quebec, but the Office has a net work of branches according to the needs, more or less like the banks with their head office and their branches.

The branches deal with the local producers and tradesmen and they send their reports to the head office as the banks do. Who will appoint the accounts in charge of the management of the system? The government, since it is a government agency. The appointment cannot be made elsewhere, but once the commissioners have been chosen the government should not interfere with their operations.

In the name of the community the government sets the goals which are determined by the act creating the Office. But it is up to the accountants to carry out the necessary operations in order to achieve these goals according to production and consumption, to the wealth that comes and goes.

It is more or less like the judicial system. The government enacts laws and appoints judges, but it does not interfere with the convictions. Judges are bound by a legislation which they did not make and by actions which they did not make either. Judges could even hand down judgments against the government which appointed them.

This is what the credit board would do. It would not dictate what to produce or what to consume, but would simply record the results. Then, the accountants would draw conclusions on a mathematical basis, according to the objective drawn up in the legislation creating the Board.

[Mr. Godin.]

• (8:20 p.m.)

1. The Bureau should create and cancel credit money in relation with the production and the disappearance of wealth;

2. Periodically credit each citizen a dividend guaranteeing him a share of the assets of his country;

3. Periodically adjust the retail prices paid by buyers, according to the relation of the global consumption to the global production from time to time.

To come back to the bridge: the Bureau would therefore not decide whether or not a bridge is to be built, nor for what amount. But the Bureau, and not the government, would be responsible for financing the bridge as it is built, since in the system under study, finance is but accounting. The contractor for the bridge, the former member for Chambly, could dispose of the required funds to pay the bills and salaries throughout the undertaking. In this case, he would receive his total payment, $500,000, upon handling over the completed bridge. But he could also need advances to pay for material and labour. In that case, very simple: he goes to the Credit Bureau.

Let us suppose the contractor takes delivery of cement, wood, steel, for an amount of $25,000; all he does is present his bills to the Credit Bureau. The bills prove the existence of wealth, since it has even been delivered. The Bureau does not have to make an estimate of the value of the material. They see the bills and create corresponding credit on the basis of that wealth; $25,000. They give that much credit to the contractor who uses it to pay the producers of wealth.

In fact, a loan on demand is granted the contractor, a loan without any other guarantee than the wealth produced and without interest. Why should interest be charged? Why should a fine be imposed on those who produce wealth? While the bridge is being built the contractor can get the necessary credit up to $500,000. Let us assume that the contractor could get advances amounting to $225,000. When and how is he going to pay that back?

When the bridge is built, the contractor has it approved by the Department of Public Works. Once the inspection is over and the bridge has been approved, the minister gives to the contractor a certificate showing that he has delivered a $500,000 bridge to the province. Then the contractor presents this certificate to the credit office which, on behalf of the community which received the bridge, gives the contractor a receipt for the advance

in the amount of $225,000 and a credit-money for $275,000 to complete the price of the bridge. The Credit Office records on the assets side of the province the amount of $500,000 which represents the new bridge. The contractor had made a profit; he has paid a salary to his employees, and he has paid the materials suppliers with the $500,000 which represent a debt on the production of the community. This is liabilities versus assets. If no one had used that money, the province would have simply acquired extra wealth and nothing else would have changed. Of course this money, at least a good part of it, is used to buy food, clothing, shoes, to pay the rent, transportation, medicine, and so on. All these purchases represent consumption, and they also contribute to greater production.

As long as they have not reached their maximum, agriculture and industry can increase their production. No need to embark upon lengthy investigations to find out that nowadays a great part of the production is unused or wasted.

Should the increase caused by the credits issued for the bridge be sufficient in itself to meet the increased demand, the bridge will be paid through that production increase.

In fact, the bridge will have been paid through the work of its builders. And those builders will really have been paid by the community's increased production. The community will have paid the cost of its bridge in the form of work, products, services, without having to deprive itself or to lower its standard of living.

In the opposite case, where consumption financed through the $500,000 would increase without any increase in production, consumption would become greater than production. The result would be an increase in the readjusted price. The buyers would get less for their money. It would amount, in the end, to a tax on the citizen's standard of living. The result would probably be between those two extremes.

But, in any case, the consumers, on account of the price readjustment, get the whole production corresponding to their needs. In every case also, each citizen is sure to get a part of the available production on account of his dividend.

The system has to be considered as a whole to see that not only does it preserve the rights of the individual but also the aspirations of the community while truly reflecting how wealth is produced and destroyed whether it be public or private.

Suggested Interest-free Loans

If we feel that capitalism is better than socialism or communism, let us preserve capitalism. But if we feel that capitalism does not benefit everybody, let us try to study it, analyze it in order to straighten it out, while preserving its strength and its merits. This is elementary logics: not to destroy what is good, but simply to straighten out what is warped.

It is not by creating new debts through borrowing that we shall be able to repay our debts. I believe that the state should recover its financial control. The state must recover control over issuing and regulating money and credit. It will do so through an independent board empowered with all the necessary authority to achieve this purpose, that of financing public services and ownership.

[*English*]

Mr. Rod Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, it would be nice if we could arrange to have all this money referred to in the motion provided interest free. I have no doubt that many municipalities would rush to build some project or other if that were possible. Perhaps some would commence building madly in all directions. However, I feel that the motion would have been more reasonable had the party sponsoring it suggested some limit to it or put forward some priorities in the way of projects to be built with this money. I think all of us, including the members of the Créditiste party to my left, would accept the fact that there must be a limit to what can be built in any given period. If you allowed too much money to enter the economy in a short space of time, the economy would be burned up.

I realize that my friends to my left would not agree with me, but I suggest that it would be a good idea in times of prosperity to build up project banks, if you will, these banks to be comprised of, for example, hospitals, schools, bridges, senior citizens' homes and government building of all kinds. Then I suggest that different communities list their priorities, say in order of age, need and cost, depending on the community. As I say, these banks would be built up when times were relatively good. When a recession hit a particular area, or the country as a whole faced a depression, we could then start to build some of these projects in an effort to compensate for lack of business activity in a community, or to offset unemployment.

Too often in the past when we have felt flush, when business has been good, when

farm incomes have been up and everything going along as it should, we have decided to build a new hospital, a bridge or a school. I am suggesting that this is not really what we should do. I am suggesting we build such projects and use them as economic weapons to offset fluctuations in the economy. In effect, let us manufacture business or employment, as the case may be. I think an approach like this is a fairly reasonable one. I am sure if this idea had been explored in the thirties or at other periods of depression, things would have been much different in certain sections of the economy. However, in those days we did not believe in interfering with this sort of thing.

I will go so far as to say that I do not think even today we are doing all we can to solve such problems. I understand that the Manitoba government has set aside capital grants in their budget for projects of this nature. I think it would be wise to take a serious look at the approach they have taken. A short time ago the federal government attempted to dampen down the fires of inflation and one of the weapons they used was to eliminate depreciation allowances on buildings in cities like Toronto and Edmonton where inflation was at a high level. However, things did not work out as well as they might have. I am suggesting we take the other approach and actually put some money, effort and thought into building up business and employment through the use of project banks.

• (8:30 p.m.)

I have in mind something along this line: If there should be a problem in Toronto, Biggar or Saskatoon, the federal government or the provincial government might suggest to the municipality that if it started within, say, a six months' period to build a hospital or whatever it might be, a larger than usual grant would be allowed for this purpose. This would be an encouragement to the municipality to build such a facility? I believe it would be a reasonable incentive to build during a period when there is slack in the economy. Not only would such a program help the particular community, but it might enable the municipality to get a better deal from the builder if it were carried out when the builder did not have things geared up too tightly.

I suggest that in some areas, for instance in my area, while one might say there is a recession the people in the area might say there is a depression. Too often one looks at an economic situation and says it is a recession, but when it relates to him personally it is a depression. There is a need for a hospital in my home town of Biggar. The municipality might see fit to build such a facility if there were some extra encouragement. In using my community as an illustration I do not mean to suggest that it is any better or worse economically than any other community. I suggest that interest-free money by itself will not stimulate the economy in some areas. I suggest that we take a serious look at the project bank concept which I have mentioned.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Charles-Eugène Dionne (Kamouraska): For several reasons, Mr. Speaker, I derive a great deal of satisfaction from taking part in the debate on the motion now before the House.

First, I would like to show that the present system of indebtedness tends to discourage people. To realize this, one has only to look at the pyramid of unpaid and unpayable debts under today's upside down financial system which leads legislators to dream up every conceivable way of finding new taxes. So much so that legislators and civil servants sometimes contradict each other. Here is an example: It is generally agreed that an annual income of about $5,000 is required for a family of four or five to live decently. On the other hand, legislators under the influence of today's financial dictatorship tax the income over $1,000 of a man with a family. If we stop and think about such legislation, we realize that the lackeys of the system are in total disagreement with reality.

In reply to a question put on the order paper, in 1964, in which I asked how much was paid in interests on the public debt since Confederation, the Minister of Finance said: Gross cost of interest on the national debt to the government of Canada from July 1, 1867, to March 31, 1964, was $15,287 million (including an estimated amount of $952 million for the fiscal year 1963-64).

Economists and politicians would easily find an explanation to the rising cost of living, if they carried out their inquiries on the constant increase of interest charges on public debts. Why continue to look for solutions that are nowhere to be found in a topsy-turvy system?

Social Credit is turned into ridicule by associating it with a "dollar machine". Now the opposite is exactly true. There is no dollar machine more efficient and diabolic than the

present bank system. Diabolic, because it always deprives the people in favour of money lenders.

The people are crushed under the taxes used to pay constantly and gradually increasing interest charges on the national debt, heavy and unfair taxes, because out of proportion to the services rendered by a centralist state.

"The greatest delusion of the mind is to believe that things are as we want them to be rather than what in fact they are." I am quoting Bossuet.

In such a situation, are we not justified in asking ourselves some questions? What occult power compels our governments to maintain such a dictatorship? The real question is to determine who is running the country. The politicians elected by and for the people, or the big financiers?

There are three ways in which a government can obtain funds required to meet its obligations. First of all, it can tax the citizens and the institutions and thereby get hold of their money. Second, it can borrow from the people and the institutions and pay some interest on the amounts borrowed. Third, it can simply create money and use the funds so created to make its purchases.

Opposition to the creation of money in the past used to be based apparently on the belief that demand for goods always had to be equal to the supply, as long as the government did not interfere with the economy. John Maynard Keynes destroyed that belief when he showed that nobody could be sure that the demand was always equal to the supply in rich countries.

Mr. Robert Theobald, an American economist of high repute, wrote the following not so long ago, and I quote:

> There are many methods to make up the difference between supply and demand. It could be possible to decrease the extent of the supply without greatly affecting the demand by reducing working hours for the same salary.

• (8:40 p.m.)

> It would be possible to increase demand by telling the people that more goods are needed to live comfortably and enjoy a higher standard of living.
>
> The government could simply make up the difference between actual and potential production by building new schools, clearing slums and controlling pollution, because there would be unused resources in the economy.
>
> The government would not have to raise money through taxes or loans. Money could be simply created. Additional funds would not cause inflation because, by definition, goods are not scarce.

Suggested Interest-free Loans

This, Mr. Speaker, is the testimony of an American economist who thinks it possible to democratize money and to use new interest-free credit for the development and social organization of a country.

While the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) and this government allow rises in the interest rate and increase the burden of the Canadian taxpayer, everywhere in the world loans are granted under extremely easy conditions, $25, $30, $50 and even $100 million interest-free loans for periods of time from 50 to 60 years and often with a 10 years' grace period.

Those who are against Social Credit generally claim that the application of Créditiste theories would lead to inflation. The Liberal members said it, the Conservative members agree and, unfortunately, a number of economists who base their studies upon the data of the present system, think so too.

However, it is to be noticed that in Canada as well as in the United States, both countries, like most countries in the world, are facing this kind of malaise that they call "inflation" and which was brought about by the unbalanced financial system of today. Is it the fault of the social credit, a doctrine which is not applied anywhere, or is it the fault of the actual financial system?

Today, there is no shortage of credit. The problem is that the credit is not social enough. In these days, it is not necessary to be an expert to find the great number of credit facilities available to the people.

Federal and provincial governments give us a great many examples of the way credit is used in all departments. Such a procedure has become normal. We find that at times, during the session of the various legislatures, federal or provincial, discussions become animated when estimates have to be approved or rejected.

The minister concerned sometimes becomes nervous and anxious. He feels the need to call upon the best advisers in his department to help him justify the use of the estimates submitted for approval. This occasional tension is due to misuse of certain credits voted to cover expenses that sometimes greatly exceed the experts' estimations, because they failed to take probable waste into consideration.

The Glassco report demonstrated how bureaucrats can disrupt the experts' forecasts when carelessness prevails constantly in economic fields where efficiency should be the rule.

Suggested Interest-free Loans

In addition to the kind of credit we have been discussing, there are many others: international, national, provincial, municipal, import, export, credit for purchasing, credit for sales. Indeed our country has advanced so much in the field of credit under our present financial system that we grant credit to foreign countries for the purchase of our products.

Here in Canada, many Canadians are born, live and die on credit. People are continually in tow of the publicity heard on television or radio. A lot of them are feeding themselves with instant products, three minutes meals, and are relying on automatic machines bought on credit. All those rogues have helped many families get head over ears in debt.

But, we need not loose heart, our credit is still good with the finance companies which will provide us with the credit we need to balance our budget for the time being. It is even possible to purchase on credit a second-hand car at the cheapest possible price, in spite of all the hazards this implies in terms of highway safety.

However, the whole process by which these various terms and conditions of credit are established is directed, controlled, managed and monopolized by the system which issues bank credit.

Things controlled by man are subject to the human laws of production, exchange and purchasing power. This power is expressed in a practical way by monetary values. Money is to the exchange of goods what words are to the exchange of ideas. Production and consumption are thus related to the purchasing power or to the exchange power.

If we consider the world as a whole, we realize there is a blockage, an obstruction. For instance, the farming people in Canada are seriously threatened by overproduction due to deviation of consumption. The accumulated surpluses of Canadian wheat are equivalent to eight years of consumption. The dairy products of Canada are anxiously waiting for consumers. In 1969, overproduction of milk in Canada reached one billion pounds of milk or 100 million gallons. Lawyers have now come to the point where they are inverting the order of creation by saying to the farm producers: "Stop sowing; kill your cows."

A premium of $200 is about to be granted to the milk producers in six countries of the Common Market for every milk cow slaughtered.

[Mr. Dionne.]

Too poor to buy their own products, Canadians eat imported foods and chemical products sold at bargain prices. While underfed people are lacking milk and wheat, Canadian citizens, surrounded by mountains of wheat and heaps of milk cans, are suffering from hunger and from thirst.

Capitalis, the object of which is to regularize means of exchange is therefore in a bad conditoin. It should be corrected but not destroyed.

Instead of laying our economic system upon logical principles, upon the natural pattern, we remain tied to a system which does not provide the necessary means of distributing the existing abundance. Thus thousands of Canadian citizens must live in slums while there are enormous quantities of building materials available for the building of decent homes.

Thousands of Canadian citizens have to resort to social relief so as not to suffer too much from hunger, in a country offering through all possible advertising means such a great variety of products. Macaulay wrote in "The History of England":

> The stability of the modern world is based upon the stability of its money, but it is obvious that the value of currency is unstable.
>
> Whether all hardships inflicted upon the British people by bad kings, bad Parliaments, bad ministers and bad judges are not equal to the hardships due to the poor currency is doubtful—

A sound currency, namely a currency that keeps its stability through the repayment of debts and its purchasing power and which protects the purchasing power of salaries, savings and pensions, is the key to economic freedom, to progress and to development.

The end and objective of a monetary policy are therefore to maintain the dollar stability and to be the instrument of a maximum production. Indeed, next to the maintenance of law and order in a country, that should be the greatest responsibility of the state.

Everybody admits that the value of currency is based on goods and services. A steady balance should however be provided between the money issued and the production of goods.

It is unbelievable that governments, one after another, should have allowed private banks to create and issue millions of dollars in new currency without any obligation on their part of maintaining the stability of the purchasing power.

• (8:50 p.m.)

We do not want to disrupt everything or to set up a printing-shop, as some simple-mind-

ed persons have suggested. We already have the institutions required. It is only a matter of adjusting the values, a matter of accounting, so that the financial machinery may reflect the actual wealth, taking into account human self-respect and the value of things that can be produced in large enough quantities to feed, house and clothe the whole population.

It is quite astonishing to realize that all those researchers, more especially in the economic field, have not managed to come up with some means of distributing the abundant production that only has to be oriented to meet the needs of those waiting for it. There is certainly no shortage of means of transportation, since we have reached the point of going to the moon, spending millions of dollars just to satisfy our curiosity to "peer" on another planet, when thousands of human beings suffer from hunger, lack of shelter, clothing and care.

It is high time that our politicians, now at the helm, find a solution other then the plans submitted until now and which have only favoured even more the rich at the expense of the poor.

We do not pretend that the Social Credit theory we are advocating will be a panacea but it is logical to forecast that it will eliminate many reasons for concern.

[*English*]

Mr. F. J. Bigg (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, as most members of the House know, I represent the constituency of Pembina in the Social Credit province of Alberta. It is passing strange to hear this eloquent plea for interest-free money after all these years of provincial Social Credit rule when little, if anything, was done to help the taxpayers of that rich and oil-filled province. You cannot put all the blame on the federal government because, after all, the only source of income for the federal government is the taxpayers, who must reside in a province.

For a long time it has been the practice of federal governments to try to equalize the wealth of the have-not provinces with the wealth of the haves. It is no secret that Alberta is one of the have provinces. One would expect that if Social Credit interest-free money policy could be worked anywhere with any hope of success, Alberta would be a fair testing ground. But what do we find? For at least 25 years the people of Alberta have been living in hope of receiving a dividend of $25 a month. During some of those 25 years Alberta was in a financial condition to make at least a gesture in that regard. As a matter of fact, one year people who had been resident in Alberta for 20 years received $20 from the provincial government. For 25 years they had been hoping to receive $25 a month, but the pay-off was only $20.

The federal government, with socialism in full command and full sweep, is short of money. Even if it wanted to give us a dividend right now, it would be the first to admit it is broke, bankrupt, and it has made the country pretty well bankrupt from coast to coast. So this is no time to ask for a handout; it is no time to ask for a dividend. But, Mr. Speaker, it is time to ask the Canadian people to go back to work, and back to work we must go if we are to compete with western Europe which has now recovered after 25 years of handouts and interest-free money from the United States. Remember the Marshall Plan. The United States put Europe back on its feet, with disastrous results. Now the great United States finds itself alone, without friends. That is a great example of social credit: you find yourself abandoned, without friends. That is where the taxpayers of Alberta find themselves, abandoned and without friends.

Social Credit is supposed to be a free enterprise party. It is supposed to support the taxpayers, the people who do the work. But have those who do the work in Alberta benefited? I will speak for myself. In a small town of 3,500 people, which has no university, my taxes are $700 per year on a three-bedroom house. From the provincial government I get $50 rebate, so my full taxes are $650. If the Social Crediters are sincere, why do they not put oil revenues at the disposal of the municipalities? With considerable riches, hundreds of millions of dollars a year coming in, why do they not put some of this money at the disposal of the people who need it most, the bankrupt municipalities?

Mr. Speaker, if you examine the record you will find that the municipalities in the rich province of Alberta are the worst off in Canada. I can only come to one conclusion, that the Social Crediters do not mean or practice what they preach. They have the money in Alberta. They do not have to go to New York for it. It is there in Alberta, but the municipalities cannot get it because the Social Crediters want the same old power that most governments want, the power to control the purse strings and never mind the poor little worker, the poor little taxpayer. How long do you think you can go on killing the goose that lays the golden egg? Not much longer.

Suggested Interest-free Loans

We in the Conservative party have been consistent throughout the years. Taking over in 1957, we found the country bankrupt as it is today. We found the people of Canada starving in the midst of plenty. We found them with too much grain, too many cattle, too many hogs, too many chickens and nobody to buy these things. So we adopted the only answer—not a quick answer, and not a sharpened pencil. We adopted a rolled-up sleeves, back to work, back to trading policy and we balanced the country's budgets. We got the economy rolling. The only sorrow of Canadians is that they allowed the same old gang to take over again and put us back where we were 13 sad years ago.

We must go back to work in order to compete in the markets of the world. We have efficiency in the working people of Canada. This is no class war that I am waging. In this context I mean the people who are producing, the small businessman, the manufacturer, the efficient builder of houses and the entrepreneur. They are the real source of wealth in this country and no government has a right to tax them, no government has a right to lay red herrings across the trail—Socialist red herrings or Social Credit red herrings—because only through hard work, with reasonable prices and solid world markets, can we regain our feet.

Solid world markets made success possible for us, after we were forced to devalue the dollar, not because of any fault of ours but because Canada was bankrupt. We took the only way out. We got back into the export markets of the world. We recovered our share of the export markets and we sold every bushel of grain until the boast of the Minister of Agriculture of that day was, "You grow it; we will sell it." It is a long time since anybody has dared to say that about agriculture or any other sector of the economy, except perhaps nickel, uranium and some of the other hardware of war.

• (9:00 p.m.)

No government has ever been proud that the only way Canada could keep afloat was to supply the world with war materials. You are getting this from a self-declared hawk, Mr. Speaker. I am a hawk to the extent that I believe in the full defence of Canada. I do not believe in a "respectable" budget for defence which is designed to fool the Americans and bamboozle the Canadian taxpayers. It does not fool the Americans, Mr. Speaker. We have not saved a cent in the defence budget.

[Mr. Bigg.]

We have no defence in Canada, and taxes remain the same. How long can this bamboozling go on?

For 25 years we have had Social Credit rule in Alberta, and the people of that province snort in disdain when debt-free money is mentioned. Grow up! This is the twentieth century. Nobody accepts this kind of promise now, although it put the Social Credit government in power. Nobody believed the old shinplaster about $25 a month when it was promised. Nobody has believed it since, and nobody believes it now. Nobody will believe this resurrection of a concept that never was born. It is an old story.

I find it passing strange, Mr. Speaker, that anybody would dare pretend that an experiment like this would work, for 25 years when they have had the finest opportunity, in the richest province in Canada, to put it into effect and nothing has been done but to give a $20 bill. That is all the people of Alberta ever got. This scheme is a dead loss; it would not even pay the interest on $25 a month for one year. For the last 20 years I have been hearing this empty nonsense, and I am tired of it. If the Social Crediters of Canada would only take a good look at the facts, they would realize that the only effective action in this situation is for all of us to get together with good, old-fashioned common sense, old-fashioned hard work and old-fashioned effort to retrieve the export markets of the world and compete with western Europe, the United States and Asia. We can show that the people of Canada have been, are now and always will be efficient.

An hon. Member: The same old speech that we have heard before.

Mr. Bigg: You will hear it a good many times from me. I can be consistent. I have never changed my view and neither has the party that I have the honour to represent. We have worked for balanced budgets, which is the best form of debt-free money you can get. You cannot pile up a national debt if you pay as you go, and that is the only honest way of going about it. Everybody within sound of my voice—and I imagine that is everybody in this chamber—knows that there is no such thing as debt-free money; there is no such thing as something for nothing. You will never get something for nothing. We believe in paying as we go. We believe in paying our debts and giving people a fair return for the money they have saved. I would not ask people to give us money debt free. That is to steal—

An hon. Member: The CPR got some.

Mr. Bigg: If the CPR got debt-free money, that was taking something they did not have coming to them. There is never something for nothing. Those who try to get it are free riders. The new doctrine of something for nothing, by right, is a lie. The people of Canada may want to give something out of the goodness of their hearts—they have done it to the extent of hundreds of millions of dollars—but there is nothing that says anybody has a right to it. No government has the right to take my charitable feelings and put them into print.

If we want to produce in this country an atmosphere in which a man can work, instead of taking away more and more of the profits of his labour we should be striving to give him more and more in his pay cheque for the work he performs. If you did this you would have fewer and fewer people needing relief. We need policies to send young people back to school. We need aggressive trade policies to sell goods in the markets of the world. We need to encourage businessmen. Forget the white paper and give the businessmen of Canada encouragement to compete in the markets of the world. They have to compete with manufactured goods in the way we have competed with agricultural products.

There is no more efficient farmer in the world than the Canadian farmer, but never has he been so hard up. The policy of lending interest-free money, money at 5 per cent, or subsidizing loans to farmers of western Canada will not do much good unless markets are found for their products. You are only hanging a debt around the farmer's neck. Why let him have $75,000 without a well-thought out policy on how he will pay it back? There is no such thing as debt-free money, and I would never vote for it.

My friends opposite voted for debt-free money. I do not know why they have had this sensible change of heart, except that they know it was Conservative policy which put Canada back on her feet between 1957 and 1962. To the extent that this administration has followed the guidelines we gave them, we have prospered. When they have gone off into the wild blue yonder on a wild goose chase, we have come to disaster. It is the people of Canada who have paid and who will pay until we return to the common sense of hard work, thrift and obtaining foreign markets.

Suggested Interest-free Loans

• (9:10 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the hon. member who spoke before me deal with the motion, I was under the impression that I was sitting in the Edmonton legislature in view of the efforts made to criticize the policy of the provincial government of Alberta. However, the motion is clear and it does say:

> That, in view of the government's inability to effectively combat the frightening increase in the public debt in the opinion of this house, the public sector of the Canadian economy, including the federal government, the provinces, the municipalities and the schoolboards should be financed by interest free loans—

This is where there is a lack of objectivity and efforts are made to impute motives to the Ralliement créditiste and its supporters when they defend this policy.

In my estimation, a man who earns $100 and who agrees to lend it to a friend or a partner is really entitled to receive an interest because in some way he rents out the fruit of his labour. We recognize this and we accept it right away and I consider dishonest those who would like to make the people believe that we object to all this lending system of the fruit of one's work to an industry or to a chum. What we want especially is to lighten the burden of the individuals and the community by strongly urging the government so that all new credit based on the work, of all the Canadian people, be loaned to the federal government, the municipalities, the provinces, under an accounting system but free of interest which crushes everyone at the same time.

Last year, during a debate on pieces of legislation introduced by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) with regard to the Farm Credit Corporation,—to unfreeze this interest system which was frozen at 5 per cent,—our friends in the official opposition categorically objected to it arguing that it would tend to impose an extra burden on the farmers and place them in an unfavourable position.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if excessively high interest rates can create problems for private enterprise, for individuals, why should it be different in the case of the interests that crush the federal and provincial governments, all our public bodies, and those who administer them, who of necessity have to levy high enough taxes to meet their payments?

Suggested Interest-free Loans

I know what I am speaking of in this field, because I have now been secretary of a municipality for some 25 years. Every year I have had to prepare a budget, with the help of the mayor and the aldermen, we must take into account the public debt we have contracted and must honour.

I am in a position to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that what our taxpayers find most annoying is precisely the interest on the public debt.

Fortunately, in the case of many municipalities, that public debt is owed mostly to taxpayers, who were willing to buy bonds or debentures with the money earned by the sweat of their brow, and who are certainly entitled to the interest.

What we condemn through this motion, is precisely what the Liberal government of 1935 condemned through the right hon. Mackenzie King, the Prime Minister at the time, when he stated in Saskatoon on September 23 1935:

> When governments do not control their money and credit, it matters little who makes the laws, those governments are bound to depend on those who control that money, that credit, and it is pointless to speak of democracy.

I feel that the objectivity and the sincerity of all the members of the Ralliement créditiste will be recognized, when we suggest that a stop be put to those disorderly loans which not only overburden the government, but also discourage those who contribute to the financing of public affairs.

A few moments ago I heard the previous speaker complain bitterly about the so-called acheivements of Alberta. Since I became member of Parliament, however, I have realized that if anyone attacks the present financial system and tries, in the name of democracy, to take away from the banks the right of Parliament to control the credit of the nation—credit which is the result of the work of all—the two old traditional parties close ranks in a common front against it. That is a sign of the times, an indication that we are on the right track and that we are really working to ensure for all Canadians the democracy which everybody is talking about.

Some say democracy means freedom. We, Créditistes, go futher than that. We say that democracy truly observed is the assurance not only fo freedom but of security. We work desperately hard at it, in order to give each and every one the opportunity of being himself in a truly democratic country where it is good to live.

[Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse).]

I am surprised to hear the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) say that we must tighten our belts. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) asks us to show restraint although I have noticed everywhere in Canada the presence of considerable wealth and the possibility of production, through the work of those who want to work. We could increase production if the activities of the young and not so young people were not stifled by the provision of that meagre allowance called social welfare. Those people are well disposed, they still have plenty of pluck, they wish to cooperate to the development of Canada.

I recently had the opportunity to travel overseas. I did not go there to wander about, but to watch what was going on. Today, I am in a position to convey my impressions to the House. We have nothing to envy anyone. In Canada, we can better develop our natural resources in all areas, provided that we subdue those who make their living by controlling our credit, those who hold the key to our security and who decide whether the federal government will increase such and such a service, undertake this or that project and authorize such and such a development in such and such an area.

• (9:20 p.m.)

This afternoon, I heard the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand), together with the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin), request the introduction of a bill allowing parliament to help the province of Nova Scotia.

Right now I say that I shall support that bill, for after all, it is good and commendable since it purports precisely to show that there are still potentialities for new developments in Nova Scotia. However, I could detect a smile on the minister's face which seemed to tell the hon. members of the official opposition: Well, I pulled a fast one on you! I am introducing legislation that will benefit even a province which is dead set against us.

I think that in Canada, there is no place for political partisanship when it comes to spending public funds and using the possible credit of Canadians. We should instead try together to create everywhere in Canada an atmosphere of confidence and security. We should stop thinking that there is a rich Canada in the west and a poor Canada in the east. It is not good enough, when we live on the same continent and in the same country, that certain things are blamed on us, sometimes very bitterly.

I received this afternoon a letter from a citizen of Saint-Michel parish, in the Bellechasse constituency, the fairest of the province of Quebec—where people get the lowest per capita income throughout Canada. In my opinion, this is not normal, in view of the present possibilities.

A certain Mr. Roy wrote to me as follows, and I quote:

> Having learned of the famous Trudeau-Benson plan on the radio and in newspapers, I would consider it as coming from two complete idiots.

Of course, I would not call them idiots. I go on with the quotation:

> We, the small and average wage-earners, are we taken for idiots?
>
> If salary increases are limited to 6 per cent, who will be affected do you think? Surely not those in the $20,000 to $40,000 salary range, but rather the small and average wage-earners.
>
> Why should these small wage-earners have to suffer from inflation?

He concludes by saying:

> By their plan, Trudeau and Benson are protecting high-salaried people and capitalists.

Those are his remarks. As for myself, I am his spokesman.

This citizen will be happy tomorrow when he learns that his message has reached Parliament. He wanted to convey what he had in mind, no matter the words he used. He simply means that he has not enough money to live and that he is disgusted to see that in order to fight inflation, those who do not earn enough money already will be asked to settle for a 6 per cent raise while more powerful organizations—such as the Bank of Montreal, as one could read in the weekend newspapers—are allowed to realize an increase in revenue of 27 per cent, which somewhat exceeds 6 per cent.

Those who read newspapers and notice these things are shocked to see that Parliament, which is supposed to defend the interests of the people, is not doing anything. They expect us to assume our responsibilities.

Mr. Roy added:

> We have been laughed at for too long.

I know that nobody wants to laugh at the poor people. I am really convinced of that. I know that Parliament, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) or any former Minister of Finance did not want to laugh at anybody. But it is still a shame that the people who hold such an office are not giving orders but carrying them out. Of course, some decisions have to be taken, and people like the man who wrote to me are in a good position to see what is going on, but they are not always able to judge clearly enough the decisions taken. They then write us letters like the one I just read to you, and that shows what the present mood is.

And that, I feel, is why we must adopt this motion which is not likely to bring about a revolution, but to enable the government, in the field of finance, to liberate what is now frozen, to enable our unemployed workers, as the previous speaker said a few minutes ago, to find work and become useful members of the community, and also our students, over 600,000 of them, some of which visit our offices, inquiring about summer job opportunities. We all want to give them work, but we are all unable to do so, and they go off dissatisfied because they think that in September they will have to get back to university and spend more money when they did not have, during their holidays, any opportunity to earn a few dollars to pay for it. We talk about free education, but it remains that one has always personal spendings to make.

Mr. Roy ends his letter as follows:

> Perhaps we are idiots and small wage-earners, but we still have a good memory.

What does this mean? This means that if something is not done to meet the proposed goal, other means will have to be taken. We will have to elect other members, another government.

Governments have come and gone for a hundred years, but the financial system which supports our administration has remained the same. For that reason we are always in a vicious circle: in alleged periods of peace we should have prosperity.

If I have four or five boys at home and if every morning we have to quarrel for two hours in order to know what we will do, and if we need three more hours to make a decision, it will be noon before we have decided to go to work. A good part of the day is over. How can we work effectively during the rest of the day? How can we achieve anything!

In wartime, every country is experiencing difficulties with respect to finance, economic organization and service. But in peacetime, when we should have some prosperity, how could we explain, Mr. Speaker, that big 20-year-old 200 pound 6-foot-2-inch fellows are glued to their seats, while we, the responsible grown-ups, tell them: Listen, you must understand the situation, the country is broke. But where do those damned bucks come from?

They do not grow on trees. There was a time when I believed that they actually came from the land.

I tilled 90 acres of virgin soil, but I never found one bloody buck behind the plough. So, it must come from somewhere.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): Money comes from whoever has the control over the printing of dollars. Why is it so scarce while there should be plenty of it. Because it is not controlled democratically, but in a wrong way. We, of the Ralliement créditiste, demand that the credit of the nation, made up by the nation, be put at the disposal of the nation. That is all we ask for, and nothing else. This is pure horse sense. The tap feeding the public Treasury should be controlled by the Minister of Finance who is at our service, at the service of the people, at the service of the government, which is not the case of those who have now the privilege of controlling money and credit.

• (9:30 p.m.)

That is all we are asking for. It seems to me plain common sense. And then we find people who say: "As long as you do not bring us together with some influent person able to help us understand what Social Credit, we cannot believe in it.

Mr. Speaker, in turn, I ask the government and those who are advocating the present system to bring us together with some influent person able to help us understand the present financial system and its effectiveness when—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I regret I have to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired unless the House will give unanimous consent to allow him to carry on his remarks. Is it the pleasure of the House?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed. The hon. member for Bellechasse.

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also thank my colleagues. I am convinced of one thing and it is that all of us here are working in all goodwill. We want our discussions to bring about improvements.

That is why the hon. member for Bellechasse was allowed to proceed with his remarks and he will not take advantage of the confidence and the right to speak granted to him.

I shall conclude my remarks and make my point by referring to a conference on pollution which I recently attended in France. I hope I may be allowed this reference for I believe that when parliament pays the expenses of members like the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Marceau) or any other, for that matter, in order to make a trip, it is with a useful purpose in view.

We have studied there the problem of air and water pollution now facing mankind. The problem of providing us with fresh air is indeed important. I made a personal experience with a little bird. I tried to put it in a cage which I gradually made smaller, which means that the volume of oxygen was shrinking gradually, and I reduced its size to the extent where at one point, the bird flapped its wings, and dropped dead. Why? It had run out of air; there was an abundance of it around, but I controlled it.

We have also studied the important problem of water pollution. The problem is vital for the nations.

But there is another problem, that of the pollution of our financial system and of our democracy. We are polluted and do not realize it. We realize there is uneasiness, that some people are unhappy. We seek the cause, but we really avoid looking for it where it really lies. What is lacking? What is wrong? Those who oppose the reforms advocated by the Creditistes, embroil matters purposely. It is easy to do so, to ascribe all kinds of intentions to us.

But God knows that our intentions are as good as anyone else's. In Parliament and elsewhere, we want our work to be of benefit not only to ourselves but to others.

A while ago, I heard the hon. member from Pembina (Mr. Bigg) say that there are surpluses, and perhaps if we were to relax credit, this would create a surplus of money, which could become dangerous.

Allow me one small remark, no harm meant.

There are milk and wheat surpluses. But there are hungry people, deprived of the bare necessaries to whom we must bring relief and comfort.

Some people claim that all the Créditistes want is the recognition of rights but that they refuse to accept the obligations of community life. Nothing is further from the truth. We recognize that each individual has rights and obligations and that we cannot live within a

community if our rights and obligations are not respected. That is the reason why we keep saying that we must not only ensure the recognition of the rights of the individuals but also enable them to fulfil their moral, economic and social obligations. Why is it that so many people nowadays refuse to fulfil their obligations, within society? Because they are deprived of the right to participate through their work in the development of the community. I am shocked, as a head of family, to see that the Canadian government is spending in Sainte-Anne-Des-Plaines $32,450 per inmate. An institution was built to accommodate 450 inmates, while families, are systematically refused the right to obtain the credit required to build a home for their children.

In my opinion, the government is not living with the times when it does not make use of all possible means to ensure to these families a right to live in a dwelling of their choice large enough so that they might perpetuate the human race.

In France we were told that the French people do not wish to emigrate to Canada because they like to stay in their country. As for us who enjoy a huge country, we can increase our population in a natural way without being obliged to resort to integration as of birth into a given area, which would systematically allow the normal growth of the population because of the famous dollar which, coming from a system proposed by the Créditistes, will be inflationary, painful and bad because there will be too much money in circulation. However, if the money comes from those who control the credit of the nation without any active and industrious participation, it is not inflationary, or dangerous for the economy. This system is sacred, it must not be changed.

Therefore, let us continue to see things unrealistically.

Very few members know the tragic events which I and certain others lived through during the 1930-39 depression. We were not even allowed to have a 3-cent stamp to mail a letter to our mothers, and that really hurt. It is difficult to wait for daybreak at the edge of the wood to begin working without fear of injury. Some are laughing at that. Let them. He laughs longest who laughs last.

I have lived through such incidents and through those difficult years and today I consider it my duty, because I have been trained to fulfil my own responsibilities, to stand as the protector of my fellow citizens. In fact, they also have the right to live in their own country with a minimum of security while enjoying the freedom we cherish.

Mr. Henry Latulippe (Compton): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have this opportunity to speak for the motion introduced by one of our colleagues. The motion is logical and might be acceptable, but if the House is unable to understand, how can we expect to convince a whole country?

Parliament is supposed to group the best brains of a country, honest citizens who are supposed to work only for the nation and to develop the full physical, moral, intellectual and financial possibilities of a country. But any talk of reviewing our system, of correcting its inherent abuses is called nonsense.

Just while ago, the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Côté) stated that Liberals, Conservatives and NDP members disagreed with those who advocate an inflationary policy, a social, normal and intelligent policy which was only second-rate and extolled by a few members in a certain corner on the house who do not know what they are talking about. Those are approximately the words used by the minister.

• (9:40 p.m.)

When we have ministers who do not even know the difference between public and private capital, how can the administration of a country be normal, consistent and beneficial to the people?

We are convinced that the public debt is a nonsense, that it is the worst monster which we ever had to face, a dreadful monster, with all the necessary power and tentacles to pick up all that is consistent, powerful and weighty: finance. And it is that monster which is protected by those who govern us in Canada since confederation.

It is the Liberals and the Conservatives who governed us. They are those who increased the public debt to please, to enrich, to give more strength to that monster which now crushes and chokes the whole population. And they too are being choked and crushed by that monster but, alas, they do not feel it!

It is a bit of luck for the House to have Ralliement créditiste members, who see things clearly, who have studied the situation and tell it like it is. Truly, the House should realize its luck in having us here.

Suggested Interest-free Loans

Even if we are convinced that our words will fall on deaf ears and it is pointless to talk to empty seats, we shall do our duty, because people in our constituencies in Canada and Quebec have asked us to. They asked us to represent them here and before the Parliament of Canada, where we must seek the best means to achieve happiness for our fellow-citizens.

This is our reason for being here. We were elected on such terms and the other hon. members were not, because I know that they advocate opposite views. However the people who elected them are similar to the people that elected us; they have the same needs and are entitled to the same benefits. At any rate if those hon. members refuse to provide those people with such benefits, they will have to answer for it.

We know that their childish, naive and ridiculous prejudices prevent them from considering the Créditistes like normal citizens, capable of having some consistency in their ideas and some sense in their reasoning, but, in spite of all that, remarks are still made to us about the ridiculous manner in which Canadian affairs are now being run.

Oh, we are well taken care of. Have a look. The municipalities, the provincial governments, the federal government, in short, everybody is on the verge of bankruptcy! Individuals are taxed, overtaxed and all on the verge of bankruptcy in order to, I repeat, give more power to that awful monster that we want to strengthen all the time.

Then, the more our Canada is prosperous, the more we get into debt. The more interest we pay, the more the country gets engulfed in debt towards a small group of Canadian or foreign citizens who collect each year the greatest part of our national production at the expense of 40 per cent of our people who still live from day to day, with no security, in the most shocking poverty or destitution, in this era of progress, machines and automation.

I believe that those who are present, although most of the seats are empty, should open their ears and their eyes and take a closer look in order to find what improvements are needed in our outmoded financial system that has never been corrected since its foundation, while we have developed, through knowledge, progress, technology and the development of our universities. In spite of all that, the system we advocate is as old as the hills, and no one has ever dared change it in the least to make it fit the economic reality.

[Mr. Latulippe.]

Therefore, we are right, when we say we are not ridiculous. On the contrary, it is the Grits and the Tories who are ridiculous because they have never changed anything to this barbarous and famous system that we have. The members of the old parties can laugh, if they want to, but really, they are the ones who are ridiculous. They will continue to enrich the rich by paying them higher interest rates on the public debts, and will continue to make the poor poorer in levying higher taxes on them to pay higher interest rates to the rich owners of our 800 largest corporations in Canada. The same causes always produce the same effects.

On the whole, however, the disruption of our national economy, the poverty of the masses, the accumulation of capital in the hands of millionaires, are what the present system permits. When are you going to open your eyes and ears?

Have there not been enough warnings? What is keeping you from bringing yourselves up to date, from attuning yourselves to a progressive society? Do you Progressive Conservatives and Liberals mean to be the only ones to benefit from progress? Do you intend to reserve it mainly for the rich, the educated, the powerful, the leaders?

The two great parties are ridiculous in all their commercial and legislative activities. Again this year the government has increased from 6 to 8 per cent, i.e. a 33 and $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent increase, its interest rate on the renewal of $275 million in bonds that had come to maturity and that the government cannot manage to repay on maturity.

Have you thought of this? At the same time, the government restricts the workers to 6 per cent salary increases and allows capitalists a $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent increase in interest rates. Every millionaire who used to get $60,000 for every million dollars loaned is now going to get, thanks to the 8 per cent interest rate, $80,000 in interest only for a $1 million loan.

The federal government allows a 8 per cent interest rate, but what about the municipalities and the provinces which now have to pay 10 and 12 per cent rate on capital and on credit merely advanced on scraps of paper?

At the same time our Parliament has become a Hyde Park where dissenters can speak out their minds. At least we have the pleasure of speaking. Even if we are sure that nobody listens to us, at least we speak with open heart. We speak out our mind and we

spill out what we have to say. After all, we enjoy impunity. This is still granted to us in our free country. We are free to speak, even if we are sure that nothing will be changed and that nobody will listen to us. Long live our beautiful Parliament, long live democracy, long live the people where only millionaires are heard, appreciated, listened to, protected, favoured and glorified! If only one would try to know the origin of those millions and of those billions of debts which weigh heavily on the people!

The more our country is progressing, the higher the debt and the heavier the interests. After the war, Canada's debt was about $12 billion, with an interest rate of 2 or 3½ per cent. Today, after 25 years of peace, our debt is $30 billion and we are paying an interest rate of 8 per cent. Is it not ridiculous?

• (9:50 p.m.)

Who is stupid enough to accept this diabolical situation? Who is getting the interests? Who pays them? What millionaire individuals and corporations are getting the interests paid by the Canadian people? The Liberals, the Progressive Conservatives and the NDP members are defending this kind of government. The Social Credit party is the only one to offer an honourable solution which tends to balance a little more the economy, without destroying free enterprise, wealth, science or power of wealthy, learned and powerful people.

At present, the middle class as well as many learned and powerful people are gradually destroyed because of the absurdity of the financial system.

If we look closely to the gross national product from 1949 to 1967, after 18 years of peace, we see that it has increased from $16 billion to $62 billion, a raise of over $45 billion. However, in constant dollars, one realizes that in effect production has increased from $16 billion to $37 billion in 18 years, which amounts to a $20 billion increase instead of $45 billion.

What was formerly called "wet capital" was simply some way of inflating prices to give the people the impression that business was improving. And now they have the check to tell the people that it produces inflation. It is an artificial inflation, without any real basis. It is a very wide misrepresentation meant to lure people who do not know a thing about economics.

And the governments we now have, whether red or blue—and the same may apply to the New Democratic party—are concealing from the people the fact and the possible truth about the country, and the financial system as well. One day, however, they will all have to pay for the mess. Justice will prevail in the end.

This help us to somehow understand the increase of the prices and securities on the stock exchange. Our economy is based on fanciful, lazy calculations, devised by economists, hard put to explain away facts they were unable to foresee, mistakes they could not prevent, misfortunes they could not avoid. And the victims are forever the people.

When an economist or an engineer makes a mistake, it is never his fault. Even a voluntary and intentional mistake, with due knowledge, is always forgiven.

Only the ministers and the members in power are responsible for the leadership and the formulation of our national and international policy.

In view of these facts, why do such a large number of people live in misery, poverty and insecurity? In view of so much profit from capitalization reserves accumulated by the large multimillion dollar corporations, why those complaints, difficulties bankruptcies, medium or small, why—

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. It being ten o'clock, it is my duty to inform the House that pursuant to section 11 of Standing Order 58 the proceedings on the motion are now considered to have expired.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

CRIMINAL CODE—ABORTION—REMOVAL OF PROVISIONS FROM LAW

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I asked the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) if he would reconsider his decision and take abortion out of the Criminal Code, thus freeing qualified doctors to act in consultation with

pregnant women. He replied that both he and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has already stated the government position, and added, "that is it for the moment".

Last night in Vancouver the Prime Minister held what the Canadian Press terms "a reasonably orderly discussion" on the subject with about 60 members of the Women's Liberation Group. According to the press dispatch, the Prime Minister said that current laws allow doctors to perform abortions if they wish, but added that the liberalization proposed by the group would force them to do so, possibly against their will. No one knows better than the Prime Minister what the present abortion laws permit. He knows that they do not permit doctors to perform abortions, no matter how much they wish to do so, except under conditions so rigid that it is estimated that about one woman in every 500 who require an abortion can get one.

• (10:00 p.m.)

As to the Prime Minister's charge that the changes proposed by the Women's Liberation Group would force doctors to perform abortions, possibly against their will, if the Prime Minister had taken the trouble to meet the group when they came to Ottawa on May 9, or even to read their brief, he would have seen that their demand in regard to abortion was simply this:

> That in this session of Parliament the government sponsor a bill removing all mention of abortion from the Criminal Code.

There is no mention there, or anywhere else in the brief, of forcing doctors to perform abortions. Indeed, what the doctors need is freedom to follow their consciences, without the legal shackles of hospital boards and whole desert areas where there are not any hospitals that will permit abortions or where hospital facilities of any kind simply do not exist.

The truth is that our present abortion laws are forcing women to bear children regardless of their wishes, regardless of their state of health, regardless of whether or not they can afford to care for and educate them properly, regardless of what additional children do to the health and chances in life of the others. A few doctors, unable to watch the helpless misery of such women trapped by unwanted pregnancy, have been performing abortions on their own. With what result? They are arrested and tried as criminals. Last week this happened to a respected doctor in Montreal, Dr. Henry Morgentaler, president of the Humanist Association of Canada. At a press conference in Ottawa he told of one woman, the mother of three children, brought into a Montreal hospital following a botched operation by a non-doctor. Infection developed and an emergency hysterectomy was performed, but several days after that press conference the woman died horribly of gas gangrene. No, Mr. Prime Minister, the current law does not permit doctors to perform abortions if they wish.

The Prime Minister is to be commended for trying to broaden the abortion laws last year in the face of strong opposition. But it is now evident that further changes are urgent to combat the menace of dangerous abortions performed by quacks and butchers and to wipe out the discrimination that permits a woman with means to have a safe abortion while a woman without money faces the risk of infection and death. The Prime Minister claims the public is not ready for changes in the abortion laws. A Gallup poll was taken in March of this year on the question, "Would you vote for a law that would permit a woman to terminate pregnancy at any time during the first three months?" Forty-three per cent said yes, 48 per cent said no, and 9 per cent were undecided.

A year ago it was the persistence and drive of the Prime Minister that put through the present abortion law. He did this in the face of opposition that would have discouraged most men in his position. I am quite convinced that if he now decides to make the change that experience has shown is necessary, that is, to take abortion out of the Criminal Code and leave the decision to the doctor and his patient, he will be able to switch that undecided 9 per cent into the "yes" column, thus making a safe majority of public opinion in favour of the change. Mr. Speaker, I hope the Prime Minister will take this risk as he took the risk to his career last year.

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, in the unavoidable absence of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) I should be pleased to reply to the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis). However, I do not think I could add anything to what the Minister of Justice

said in this House a few days ago. The Minister of Justice and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), have indicated to the House that because the law relating to therapeutic abortion was amended less than a year ago, it would not be appropriate to reopen the issue until sufficient time has elapsed to evaluate how the amended law is working.

The Minister of Justice has indicated he will study the statistics which result under the new law's reporting procedures and, when a proper assessment can be made, he will take whatever steps may be required.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.07 p.m.

22478—25½

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

The House met at 2 p.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. KNOWLES (WINNIPEG NORTH CENTRE)—UNAUTHORIZED PUBLICATION OF DOCUMENTS IN POSSESSION OF GOVERNMENT—LACK OF REDRESS BY HOUSE

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege of which I gave Your Honour notice a couple of hours ago. It is true that what I shall be saying arises out of events of the last few days concerning which there have been two or three interventions, but I assure Your Honour that I am now raising a new question of privilege, one that I believe affects every member of this House and also affects the working of this Parliament.

My question of privilege relates to the fact that it is now clear that when a crisis arises involving the unauthorized publication of a document that has been in the possession of the government, Parliament seems to have no recourse; there is nothing it can do to cope with the crisis. It is because we face this situation, and because it greatly hampers the working of this House of Commons, that I feel we should come to grips with this issue and call upon the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization to go into the matter and make a recommendation to the House.

• (2:10 p.m.)

In order to outline the situation, Mr. Speaker, may I take just a moment to remind Your Honour of what has happened. As everyone knows, when the present government came into power the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) laid down very strict rules regarding cabinet secrecy and made clear to his ministers what would happen if these rules were broken. For some time now we understand the cabinet has had possession of the report of the Le Dain commission but that the cabinet has kept possession of it on a secret and confidential basis. However, certain bits of information have leaked out and, as was indicated in a question of privilege at six o'clock last evening, *Time* magazine has published a report which seems to be based on possession of the document or at least on possession of a summary of what is in the document. In other words, secrecy and confidentiality have been broken.

Now, sir, it seems to me this type of thing interferes with the efficient and proper working of a democratic institution such as this House of Commons. May I add, Mr. Speaker, that I think it interferes greatly with your position. I fully respect the rulings you have made on the interventions that have been raised in the last two or three days. I believe you have followed precisely our Standing Orders and procedures. Yet I think I would be less than honest if I were not to admit that Your Honour has looked uncomfortable because of the crisis which has been facing the House of Commons.

Your Honour has ruled against any motion under Standing Order 43 or any motion under privilege for the tabling of the report of the Le Dain commission. You have said that the only thing a member can do is to file a notice of motion for the production of papers, and Your Honour admitted from the Chair that at this stage of the game that is a rather unrealistic vehicle.

Your Honour has ruled against a request under privilege or under any other device for an inquiry into this whole matter which, as I say, is serious to us all. Personally, I well remember an incident of some 18 years ago. My friend the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury) will remember it very well also. At that time there came into my possession the original version of a document known as the Currie report.

An hon. Member: How did you get it?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): A friend wants to know how I got it. To this day I do not know the chain of hands through which that copy went but I do know that within days after I produced it the Royal Canadian Mounted Police were put on the trail and charged an unemployed printer.

Mr. Baldwin: Were they on horseback?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): This unemployed printer spent 30 days in jail. There are times when an inquiry or an inves-

tigation can be made but those times seem to be limited to occasions when the government takes the initiative. But the government is responsible to Parliament. That is the kind of a system under which we operate and yet we seem to be stymied. There would seem to be no way by which we can have an investigation made into this matter to determine whether someone in the cabinet is responsible for an unauthorized leak, whether there has been thievery or what have you.

I suggest that this matter hangs like a cloud over Parliament and that it ought not to remain that way. However, I have already said I do not quarrel with the rulings Your Honour has given from the Chair. I may have presented argument on the other side but when Your Honour made the rulings I felt they were correct. But I think that in Parliament we ought not to find ourselves in this kind of a situation, frustrated as we are, when there is something in the nature of a crisis which affects the workings of Parliament. Yet we are asked to sit here helpless, unable to do anything about it. Instead of looking like the highest court of the land we are made to look like a barrel of monkeys.

I submit we should not be in this situation. There ought to be a way by which we can find out how this report came into the hands of *Time* magazine. We ought to be able to find out who was responsible. I suppose I should also say that we ought to be able to find out if *Time* magazine does have the correct report. It should not be made a matter of mystery and uncertainty, hanging like a cloud over Parliament.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, despite your rulings of the last few days that it is not a matter of privilege to refer to a committee the question of the source of this report in *Time* magazine and that it is not a matter of privilege to seek an inquiry into the whole matter, I do ask Your Honour to consider the difficult spot in which the House and you as our presiding officer are placed because of the fact that when a crisis of this kind develops there seems to be nothing we can do. If you find that in the name of Parliament I do have a prima facie case of privilege in what I have stated, I would then be prepared to move, seconded by my colleague, the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis):

That the lack of any redress on the part of the House of Commons when a confidential document in the possession of the government is made public without authorization be referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization for consideration and report.

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I should like to add a word or two in support of the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. I reiterate that this whole situation was brought by the leaking of the report and the subsequent interpretation and opinions expressed by *Time* magazine about the contents of the report or about the contents of a resumé prepared in the office of the Minister of National Health and Welfare for presentation to cabinet. Either way, the situation has arisen because a private group outside of Parliament obtained the report or a resumé of it and expressed opinions about it, thus giving what may be an unclear and distorted view to the general public and to Parliament particularly.

The report may well have been leaked out so that the Minister of National Health and Welfare could strengthen his hand with the obstinate members of the cabinet who disagreed with him.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Howard (Skeena): The minister, a man of high integrity, I am quite sure would not have done this—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest that the hon. member is now straying some distance away from the very limited point raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. If I understood the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre well, he has raised an entirely new question of privilege. If it were not a new question of privilege, he would not even be entitled to put the question to the Chair and to the House. The hon. member is essentially reiterating the arguments which he put forward last evening and which were followed by a ruling of the Chair. If he wishes to address the House, it should be on whether there is a matter which should be referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I agree with you, Mr. Speaker. I was just laying the groundwork in order to lead up to a citation from Beauchesne which I believe substantiates what is being attempted here. I point out that the cabinet knew two or three days before the *Time* magazine article was published that it was in fact going to be published. Thus the cabinet created the situation deliberately by refusing to make the report public and maintaining *Time* magazine's exclusive position. It makes one wonder whether the Prime Minis-

ter's declaration that we should have "a little bit of pot" in every chicken has permeated the whole cabinet.

I submit that citation 106(2) of Beauchesne provides us with the opportunity to accept this question of privilege because it points out that "the dignity and independence of the two Houses are in great measure preserved by keeping their privileges indefinite", in other words, not spelling them all out but permitting the opportunity for each case to be dealt with on its own merits. Because there was some ineptitude, fumbling and incompetence on the part of the Minister of National Health and Welfare in the handling of this report, or on the part of one of the flunkies in his office in distributing it for an unauthorized purpose, I submit that Your Honour should look upon this question of privilege favourably and provide Parliament with an opportunity, through the Committee on Procedure and Organization, to discuss ways and means whereby Parliament can deal properly and fully with such a situation in the future.

• (2:20 p.m.)

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I shall not add too much to what has been said.

Mr. Trudeau: You never do.

Mr. Baldwin: Our position in this party, despite the rude interruption by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) who did not learn too much when he was out west, has been well stated on a question of privilege I raised some time ago and through questions by my leader and by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams). We therefore think there is a question of privilege.

I do not intend to add to the words uttered by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). However, should Your Honour hold that there is not a question of privilege and that this might well be in the nature of a substantive motion which would have to be put in the usual way—I hope you do not do so—may I suggest an alternative because no legislative body should be frustrated and inhibited by its own rules when an important matter like this arises. Should Your Honour so hold, and I hope you will not, possibly by unanimous consent the hour devoted to private members' business this afternoon might well be set aside for this particular motion with a provision, to which unanimous consent could also be given, that the question would be put at the end of the hour set aside for private members' business.

This is a very important question, and obviously it has been established that there is a roadblock somewhere in the proceedings of the House. The three judgments that Your Honour has rendered in connection with the questions which have been raised clearly indicate that. Possibly Your Honour may, by the exercise of great ingenuity and aided by the words of wisdom you have listened to this afternoon, find your way clear to get out of the jungle where we now rest. However, if this is not the case I would hope there would be unanimous consent—I am looking directly at the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald)—to set aside private members' hour for this very reasonable motion so that it can be debated for an hour and the question then put. In that way, by the time the next session rolls around the House would have come to a wise and sensible decision on the question with which we are now faced.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond at once to the suggestion of the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) that the cabinet knew that the report was in the hands of *Time* magazine and that it was going to be published. I can say that was not the case, and that is not a true statement.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): How about some of your colleagues' statements?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I can only point out to the hon. member that cabinet did not know and I can instantly rebut what he has said. I can confirm on behalf of the government that we too would like to know the source of these particular leaks, and we too would favour the kind of examination of this procedure that has been suggested by the hon. member's motion.

I would say, in response to the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), why wait for five o'clock? Why not do it now? In other words, Mr. Speaker, I would make two suggestions to avoid your having to make a ruling on the question of privilege. First, perhaps by unanimous consent this motion could be regarded as a motion under Standing Order 43. Second, perhaps we could equally unanimously agree to pass it right away so that the matter could be referred to the committee at once.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Publication of Le Dain Report

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps before a ruling is made by the Chair I should obtain the views of the party leaders on this suggestion. I have to say, in fairness, that the Chair has been advised by the Leader of the Opposition of a proposed motion under Standing Order 26 which might further complicate matters. However, if there is unanimous agreement of the House that the motion proposed by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre be put and debated at this time, the Chair could put the motion and if it were agreed to unanimously it would have the effect of sending this matter to the Committee on Procedure and Organization. Since this would have to be done by agreement perhaps the Chair might be guided in this respect.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, we would be quite satisfied if the House would unanimously agree to have this motion moved under Standing Order 43 and passed by unanimous consent so that the committee can look into the whole question of how Parliament has redress in a situation such as that we are facing. This does not, of course, deal with the basic problem of an investigation at the present time into how the interim report by the LeDain Commission got into the hands of persons outside the government and outside Parliament. As a first step, however, certainly the reference of this matter to the committee will deal with part of the problem. The problem of an investigation still has to be dealt with, however, and I hope it will be dealt with some time today.

Mr. Speaker: There appears to be unanimous agreement that the motion proposed by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre be considered a motion under the terms of Standing Order 43. The motion reads as follows:

That the lack of any redress on the part of the House of Commons when a confidential document in the possession of the government is made public without authorization be referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization for consideration and report.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is carried.

Motion agreed to.

An hon. Member: Fire the minister.

Another hon. Member: Fire Munro.

[Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale).]

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

HOUSE OF COMMONS

ABSENCE OF MINISTER OF NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the absence of the Minister of National Health and Welfare who, on this day more than any other, should find it within his responsibility to attend upon Parliament and set the record straight by taking action to table the interim report of the LeDain Commission on the non-medical use of drugs, particularly in light of the publication yesterday by *Time* magazine of either an excerpt from that report or from a resumé which was prepared in the minister's office.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I doubt very much whether this is a point of order. I apologize to the hon. member if I have interrupted him too soon but I have a strong feeling that it is not a point of order. If the hon. member has a citation or any Standing Order that he would like to refer to, I will certainly allow him to do so.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I was going to do that, Mr. Speaker, but I thought it necessary to do it in perspective and show how the minister is ignoring the House. Maybe he is afraid of it as he was yesterday. Maybe he does not want to be in the same place as the Prime Minister—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member indicated that he would refer the Chair to a particular Standing Order. I wish he would do this as he has not offered any evidence of a legitimate point of order up to now.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I was distracted by the noise on the other side, Mr. Speaker. I do not say this facetiously but with great respect: I wish Your Honour would protect me from these people.

Mr. Trudeau: You are afraid.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Standing Order No. 5, Mr. Speaker, reads as follows:

Every member is bound to attend the service of the House, unless leave of absence has been given him by the House.

The Minister of National Health and Welfare is not here. He may have got leave of the House to be away but I do not know how he

did it or when he did it. I submit that there is a valid point of order and that the absence of the Minister of National Health and Welfare should be noticed by Your Honour and you should say that there is a valid point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member, I am sure, cannot seriously suggest that the Chair should take judicial and official notice every day of the absence of a member of the House of Commons. Standing Order 5 does not apply only to cabinet ministers; it refers to the attendance of hon. members. This point has been raised from time to time. I recognize that the Standing Order is there. I have felt also that perhaps the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization should look at Standing Order 5. I have suggested that before but for some reason the members of the committee have thought that the Standing Order should not be interfered with and that it should be allowed to stay. According to my information, the last time that Standing Order was applied was back in 1875. I would not think, after all these years, that this Standing Order should be referred to to signal the absence of any individual member of the House. I do not think that the point is well taken.

• (2:30 p.m.)

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member will have to raise another point of order because the Chair has already ruled on this point of order. Of course it cannot be discussed after the ruling has been made.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order with respect to the ruling just given.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have just indicated to an hon. member that he cannot raise a point of order in respect of a ruling which has just been given. I can quote to the hon. member the Standing Order which says that that is not in order.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order relating to the absence of cabinet ministers from the House. This is a direct violation of Standing Order 5 in that their absence from this House—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. MacInnis: —is being interpreted—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has brought this point up on a number of occasions. I have made a ruling on the point which he brought up. That ruling having been made, I suggest to him respectfully that the point cannot be brought up again.

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

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member rising on a question of privilege?

Mr. Nowlan: That is right, Your Honour. I find it a peculiar point of privilege that I must raise with Your Honour this afternoon. When Your Honour, tells this House and the Commoners of this House that we have in our Standing Orders Standing Order 5 which is so obsolescent, so ridiculous, that it has not been invoked since 1875, I consider that a reflection on my intelligence in sitting in this House. As long as we have Standing Orders that are so ridiculous I say to you, Mr. Speaker, with all respect—

An hon. Member: What intelligence?

Mr. Nowlan: If the hon. member had been in this House long enough and knew a little bit more about parliamentary procedure, he would get up from his seat and off his brains when attempting to speak. The point is, Mr. Speaker—

An hon. Member: Is that all?

Mr. Nowlan: That is not all. This is a very serious point.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nowlan: This strikes at the whole spirit of this institution. Those people across on the treasury benches who have not been in the House long enough to know what this institution is for are those who lead the catcalls of the jackals behind them.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nowlan: I agree with Your Honour that, taken by itself, Standing Order 5 is rather ridiculous and stupid. The hon. member for "Barley York" or "Barley Danson" or York North (Mr. Danson) can speak at any time, if he dares to and if he has permission. Seriously, Mr. Speaker, I believe this rule by itself is rather ridiculous. You cannot stand up each day, point to empty

seats and say that certain members are absent in violation of Standing Order 5. But when an hon. member stands up in this House and uses this order to ask Your Honour to call the attention of the House to the absence of a member of the treasury benches, I find it rather difficult to reconcile Your Honour's ruling with the Standing Order. That is my point.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

DRUGS

AVAILABILITY OF LE DAIN INTERIM REPORT TO "TIME" MAGAZINE—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43. The matter I put forward does not relate directly to what the hon. member for Skeena raised a moment ago. The fact is that there is not yet a resolution before the House relating to the determination of the source of the cabinet leak. Standing Order 43 provides that in cases of urgent and pressing necessity a motion may be moved if unanimous consent is given. The matter of urgent and pressing necessity is the publication yesterday by *Time* magazine of purported extracts from the interim report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Non-Medical Use of Drugs.

This report has not yet been made available to members of this House and the public at large. It is, therefore, still a confidential cabinet document. By publication, cabinet confidentiality has been breached by someone in or close to the cabinet. At best this constitutes an unethical breach of parliamentary practice and at worst there may be illegality involved.

Therefore, under the provisions of Standing Order 43 I ask leave to move, seconded by the member for Skeena (Mr. Howard):

That this House is of the opinion that the government should conduct an immediate investigation to ascertain how the interim report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Non-Medical Use of Drugs came into the possession of *Time* magazine and to report its findings, either interim or final, to the House not later than June 26, 1970.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members have heard the motion proposed by the hon. member. It can only be proceeded with if there is unanimous agreement of the House. The Chair must inquire whether there is unanimity.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

[Mr. Nowlan].

Mr. Speaker: There is no agreement and the motion cannot be put at this time.

Mr. Woolliams: The Prime Minister said no again.

[*Translation*]

INDUSTRY

SHOES—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to move the adjournment of the House under Standing Order 43 in order to discuss immediately the emergency resolutions required on steps to be taken to remedy the situation of the Canadian footwear industry, which I consider very precarious.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the study of this question justifies an emergency debate considering that since January 1, 1970 shoe factories have been closing down at the fantastic rate of nearly one a week and, considering that between 1956 and 1969, Canada's footwear production has decreased by 1 per cent whereas imports have jumped by 568 per cent, considering that the industry now employs 3,260 fewer workers than in 1966 and considering also that the government seems to have lost control of footwear imports into Canada.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that the unemployment rate depends mostly on the great number of unskilled workers on the labour market. Since a large number of employees of the footwear industry are in that category, I dare urge Your Honour to allow a debate to be held as soon as possible on ways to solve the pressing problem of that industry.

On June 2, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) announced to the House that talks were under way about restrictions of footwear imports and I believe the same measure is urgently needed regarding the footwear industry.

I therefore ask Your Honour and hon members to consider, if possible, the motion to adjourn I am proposing to that effect.

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the proposal put forward by the member for Richmond suggesting the adjournment of the House under the provisions of Standing Order 43, in order to discuss an urgent question concerning the situation of the footwear industry in Canada.

The member cannot proceed with that proposal nor discuss the motion, without the unanimous consent of the House. Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is no unanimous agreement, so that the motion cannot be put.

[*English*]

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

STATEMENT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, following the tabling of the third report of the Special Committee on Statutory Instruments, the government has made a full analysis of the impact of the recommendations in that report upon the many thousands of statutory orders and regulations issued by government and its agencies, and upon the procedures followed in preparing and reviewing regulations. The government has now determined a proposed course of action for responding to the report.

Due to the nature of the committee's recommendations it is not practical, nor is it reasonably possible, to proceed with their implementation by any one means. Rather, implementation of the committee's recommendations will require action of three different kinds: First, legislative action by Parliament to replace the existing Regulations Act by a new statutory instruments act; second, a number of cabinet directives to implement several of the recommendations which cannot be dealt with by general legislation and, third, amendment of the Standing Orders for the purpose of establishing a scrutiny committee to review regulations.

• (2:40 p.m.)

The government accepts fully the principle that both Parliament and the public are entitled to be fully informed of, and to have convenient access to, regulations and other instruments made under the authority of Acts of Parliament. The legislation and other measures that will be proposed by the government will be guided by this paramount principle, and only demonstrably necessary and carefully defined exceptions to the general requirements of the law relating to the examination, registration and publication of such instruments will be permitted.

The new statutory instruments act will update the present Regulations Act in light of the committee's recommendations. We will recommend that the definition of a regulation be expanded in order that certain subordinate legislation that is now excluded from the application of the present Act will come within the scope of the proposed new law. It will be proposed that the review procedure of proposed regulations that is conducted by the Clerk of the Privy Council in consultation with the Deputy Minister of Justice be given a statutory basis and that the fundamental principles in light of which the review is conducted be set forth in the legislation. A new system for registration of regulations will be provided and the date of registration will, in most cases, be the day on which a regulation will come into force. The Canada Gazette will be recognized by statute as the official gazette of Canada and powers to make regulations with respect to its publication will be provided. Other matters such as the requirements of the law to publish regulations and the right of members of the public to have access to and obtain copies of regulations will be dealt with in the new Act.

It is the intention of the government that the committee's recommendation No. 6 which is concerned with the publication of departmental directives and guidelines be dealt with by means of a cabinet directive. Departmental directives and guidelines that might reasonably be interpreted as affecting the rights of members of the public in a legal sense will be required to be submitted to the Deputy Minister of Justice before they are issued. The Deputy Minister of Justice will make a report to the person desiring to issue the document indicating whether the proposed directive or guideline is essentially legislative in its nature and, if so, whether it would be appropriate to incorporate it into regulations or, where there appears to be no authority to do so, whether the relevant statute should be revised with a view to conferring such authority.

With reference to the committee's recommendation No. 7, which is concerned with the general principles that should govern the conferring by legislation of regulation-making powers, a cabinet directive will be issued to all ministers directing that, in future, all such enabling legislation should be drafted in accordance with the principles proposed to the committee as acceptable to the government by letter dated September 30, 1969,

addressed to the chairman of the committee and signed by myself as President of the Privy Council.

The government agrees with the general recommendation of the committee that a scrutiny committee should be established for the purpose of reviewing regulations. During the next session of Parliament the government will recommend that such a scrutiny committee be established and that by the proposed statutory instruments act all regulations, with the single exception of regulations the disclosure of which would be injurious to international relations, national defence security or federal-provincial relations, will stand permanently referred to such committee. After consultation with representatives of the parties, the government will put forward an order of reference in the next session to enable Parliament to establish a scrutiny committee.

Mr. Speaker, the limitations of a statement of this nature do not make it possible to give a detailed response to all of the committee's recommendations and, as a result, the foregoing is only a general outline of the manner in which we intend to implement the recommendations of that committee. In conclusion may I, on behalf of the government, express my gratitude to the chairman and members of the special committee for the contribution they have made by their report.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, what the President of the Privy Council has said today bears out a maxim with which I became familiar in the early days of my practice of criminal law—that no matter how black the heart appears to be or how desperate the character there is always a glimmer of light and virtue if one waits long enough for it.

I congratulate the President of the Privy Council on making this statement. We have been waiting for it a long time, but obviously when it comes to good things the period of gestation of this government, like that of the elephant to which the Prime Minister refers from time to time, is very lengthy. For myself and for some others in the House it is the end of a ten-year period during which we have attempted to bring ourselves to a point at which we could hold up our heads and say that together with other democratic countries, particularly the countries of the Commonwealth, we have obtained some reasonable measure of ability to scrutinize statutory instruments and regulations.

[Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale).]

This is a most essential thing that we do. The trend in modern legislative practice to delegate authority to the government is increasing. I know the reasons for it. I do not like it. But we have to live with it. We also have to learn to contend with it and place some brakes upon it, some means of scrutiny. We are happy, therefore, that the President of the Privy Council should indicate that the position taken by the government offers to be one of almost complete compliance with the report of the committee. The trend to which I have just referred has developed under this government and Parliament from what was a fair-sized river to a flood. The extent to which we in this House have been and are being asked to delegate to the government powers to deal with the people of this country is simply staggering, and precautions of the kind outlined today are a condition precedent to the maintenance to the kind of law and order for the individual which is needed in a democratic society.

There are one or two points I should like the government to take into account. It was proposed by the committee that the Minister of Justice should have over-all authority with regard to the examination of all regulations to decide whether or not they came within the category of those covered by the hon. gentleman's proposal. I appreciate that the minister was not able to deal with all the committee's proposals, which are minute and detailed, but the one to which I have just referred was among the main aspects which the committee considered.

Second, the question of the openness of disclosure is tremendously important. The minister told us in his statement, as found on page two, that "the government fully accepts the principle that both Parliament and the public are fully entitled to be fully informed of, and to have convenient access to, regulations and other instruments." I almost read "commission reports" into that as well but I am glad I stopped there.

In addition, the question of the establishment of a scrutiny committee is one with which the House should be particularly concerned. There is a scrutiny committee operating in other jurisdictions. There is a particularly good form of committee in the United Kingdom. I had the opportunity to attend the proceedings of that committee when I was in London not long ago. In the first instance, in the United Kingdom the chairman is a member of the opposition. The chairmen of both the Public Accounts committee and of

the scrutiny committee dealing with delegated authority are both members of the opposition. I tried to get the special committee to go as far as that but was not altogether successful. The committee did say, however, that in order to make the objectivity of the committee apparent there should be some rotation among the parties as to the chairmanship. I do not know what the government intends to do in this regard, but if it does not go at least as far as the committee proposed the value of this work of scrutinizing regulations and so on will be seriously lessened.

Now a word about the kind of officials who should assist the committee. A great deal of work has to be done; there is a vast area to be covered. In the United Kingdom Sir Robert Speed, counsel to Mr. Speaker, advises the committee and examines all the statutory instruments closely. In the absence of assistance of this kind, the value of the committee will be entirely lost. Assistance must be given at a very high level in order that it may function properly. There must be adequate staff.

• (2:50 p.m.)

I particularly call to the attention of the government and members of the House the need not only to deal, as the committee did, with academics and people learned in the law but to hear from those people of the country, the millions of little people, businessmen and farmers, who are affected by delegated legislation and authority. These people do not know what Orders in Council have been passed and are not aware of them until the long arm of the law reaches out and touches them.

This is a tremendously important step and on behalf of myself and my party may I say that if the government will co-operate with us we will co-operate with the government 100 per cent in seeing that these proposals are implemented in an orderly and reasonable fashion. In particular, we will see that the type of committee set up to scrutinize statutory legislation is one that will function efficiently and properly, one that will do for the people of this country that which for so long has been left undone.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, my colleague the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) was our member on the committee, the report of which is referred to in the statement, and if he were here today he would be making this response. He did not get permission under Standing Order 5 to be away, but it is interesting that by coincidence he is appearing before the Immigration Appeal Board which deals with matters that arise as a result of the exercise by a department of delegated authority. When I showed the advance copy of the statement to my colleague this morning, his comment was not unlike that which has just been made by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), namely, that once in a while something good does come from the government now in power. This is one of those rare occasions.

We welcome the statement by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) that the government is prepared to implement the basic principles of the report made by the committee on statutory instruments. I support the general principles that have been laid down so well by the hon. member for Peace River, and we look forward to the promised legislation being introduced as early as possible.

There are just two or three comments I should like to make which might be of a critical nature. First, we find it strange that regulations dealing with federal-provincial relations should be put in the same category as regulations dealing with international relations or national defence security. We see no reason why these matters should be grouped together. Surely our provinces are not sovereign states to be treated like foreign powers. Surely relations between Ottawa and the provinces can be carried on on the kind of level that would produce regulations which would not be injurious to the unity of this country. We strongly urge that regulations relating to federal-provincial relations be deleted from this category.

The second comment I should like to make is that in this statement made by the President of the Privy Council there are two references, but only two, to cabinet directives that are to be made governing certain aspects of this whole process. If the picture were one of multitudes of things that had to be dealt with by cabinet directives, then maybe a case could be made for it. But if there are only two matters under this general heading that are to be dealt with by means of a cabinet directive, I suggest it would be far better to have those matters dealt with in the legislation itself.

My final comment is that it seems to me that the scrutiny committee which is to be established—this is the heart of the whole

matter, the part of the statement that we welcome most—should have referred to it just not Orders in Council and regulations but also the various departmental directives that are promulgated down the line. These directives can have the force of law just as much as regulations, Orders in Council or statutes of Parliament. We find it difficult to understand why they are not included among the items which will be referred to the scrutiny committee. In this regard I might go one step farther and say that ministerial press releases could also be referred to the scrutiny committee, because many a time a ministerial press release relating to something that is going to be done is practically a case of promulgating law.

These points can, of course, be reviewed when the government presents the legislation, I presume at the next session. However, our general position is one of welcoming this forward step in the control by Parliament of the law-making process, which is as it ought to be.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, we are satisfied with the announcement of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) who just told us of the decision of the government to accept the recommendations concerning the proceedings of committees and the recommendations of the Committee on Procedure and Organization, which has been sitting for months, in order to suggest to the government the use of more flexible methods to formulate laws and let the public know about them.

Mr. Speaker, I would not like to repeat here the proposals of the previous speakers, but we entertain doubts as to the future formulation of laws, as a result of the recommendations made to the government after consideration in committee, the object of which is to give wider powers to the executive.

At the present time, we do not know to what extent this legislation will interfere with our democratic institutions and increase the powers of the executive. In fact, we are well aware that time and again in the past we have had to deplore the attitude of certain ministers who announced the tabling of legislative measures of which committees had had no prior knowledge and of which hon. members were only informed at the time the bills were tabled.

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

We are convinced that certain recommendations must be accepted but we also believe that some of them must be very seriously considered before they are submitted to Parliament and eventually incorporated to our Standing Orders so that debating and legislating procedures have to conform to them.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills. First reading of Senate public bills. Government notices of motions.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, having given Your Honour notice of a motion under Standing Order 26 I simply wish to indicate that I do not intend to proceed with it. I am so struck by the co-operative spirit shown today by the President of the Privy Council that I am hopeful that the Prime Minister will be equally ready to straighten out this whole affair when I ask him in a moment whether he will agree to tabling the LeDain report promptly and also to giving satisfaction regarding the leak that has taken place. It is with this hope that I do not proceed with the motion at this time.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

• (3:00 p.m.)

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

DRUGS

REQUEST FOR PROMPT TABLING OF LE DAIN COMMISSION INTERIM REPORT—INVESTIGATION OF LEAK

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): I would like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister whether, particularly in view of the apparent leak of the LeDain report that has occurred and the resulting state of confusion in the public mind, he can now assure the House that this interim report will be tabled promptly, and by promptly I mean within a day or two? Can he give the House this assurance?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot. I believe the matter of the leak has been dealt with substantially in the motion put earlier, to which we agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Trudeau: We are as anxious as any member of the opposition to find out what

has leaked and from where it has leaked. There is no certain indication that the report itself has been leaked. Perhaps the leak comes from someone who has knowledge of it, but if the House can assist us in making inquiries into the way in which this might have happened, as the President of the Privy Council said we would be very happy to do so.

Mr. Stanfield: I am very happy to be able to assist the government in any way I can, but I have not yet been asked to assume the responsibilities of my right hon. friend. I would ask him whether the government has launched an inquiry into this incident?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, on the one hand we are asked to pass a motion which will make sure that the House—

An hon. Member: Answer the question.

Mr. Trudeau: I am told by the Leader of the Opposition that we must assume the responsibility. We did not ask the Opposition parties to move this motion. We felt that they wanted to move it and therefore we agreed to the procedure. We are not asking them to assume responsibility for this motion, but if they want to assist us, fine.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The motion passed by the House does not refer to this incident in particular. If I may remind Your Honour, it reads as follows:

> That the lack of any redress on the part of the House of Commons when a confidential document in the possession of the government is made public without authorization be referred—

It is the lack of redress on the part of the House that was referred. Again I put my question to the Prime Minister and ask him not to evade on a matter such as this. Would he indicate to the House whether the government has launched an investigation into the apparent leak of this report?

Mr. Trudeau: Very simply, the answer is yes. I discussed the matter with the Minister of National Health and Welfare and he had already begun to launch an investigation to find out from where the leak might have come.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Is he investigating himself?

Mr. Trudeau: But I repeat that, to his knowledge, the document itself was not leaked but perhaps someone who knew of its existence and some of its contents did leak this information. I can only say that we have assumed this responsibility. I am glad to hear that the opposition parties are now supporting the government in its position that leaks should not occur from cabinet concerning confidential documents, and that they are prepared to assist us in this investigation.

Mr. Stanfield: Am I to understand from the right hon. Prime Minister that the only investigation launched so far has been some sort of personal inquiry the Minister of National Health and Welfare is conducting on his own?

Mr. Trudeau: I do not think he has put on gumshoes and personally gone to find out. May I just remind the House that the last time a leak of this kind occurred it had to do, if my memory is correct, with parts of the B and B report. At that time, we were chided by the opposition parties for putting the police on the tail of the organization which had published such confidential documents. Now, apparently we are not reacting strongly enough; we should attack the press and put the police on their tail to track down these people. I am not sure what the opposition wants.

Mr. Stanfield: I have a supplementary question—

Mr. Speaker: The Chair will allow a supplementary question to be asked by the Leader of the Opposition, but I think in fairness we should allow the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands to put his question.

Mr. Stanfield: I am only asking a supplementary question because of the false imputation by the Prime Minister. I wish to ask the Prime Minister whether he does not feel that it is within the sphere of responsibility of the government, not to attack the press but rather to conduct an inquiry as to who may be responsible for this incident within the sphere of the government and its officials?

Mr. Trudeau: Of course, Mr. Speaker, but the way to find out who might be responsible, I suppose, is to look at the nature of the leak and at its source. I repeat that when the leak to which I referred occurred this is exactly what we suggested we should do, that we should try to find out how the publisher got hold of that confidential document. Certainly, the Leader of the Opposition cannot suggest any more effective way than that.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): In view of the fact that it is quite apparent from the article which appeared in the June 22 issue of *Time* magazine, in which there were extensive quotations from what purports to be the interim report of the LeDain Commission, that whoever wrote the article is in possession either of a complete copy of the report or a very full summary of it, and in view of the fact that this appears to be a breach of trust which puts a cloud of suspicion over the head of every cabinet minister, including the Minister of National Health and Welfare and members of his staff—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): —as well as the members of the commission and their staff and the Queen's Printer, may I ask the Prime Minister whether, in fairness to all who have had access to the report, he will not order an official investigation so as to ascertain how this report came into the hands of an unauthorized person?

Mr. Trudeau: I will gladly consider the suggestion, Mr. Speaker, although I must point out that many of the assumptions made by the hon. member are not correct. Suspicion does not fall on all members of the cabinet because very few members of the cabinet saw the document. But it is true, of course, that many other people, such as employees, printers and so on, have seen it, including members of the commission themselves. Therefore I will gladly entertain the suggestion of a full-scale investigation by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police into this very regrettable leak. I just hope that the House will remember this the next time we order such an investigation on the grounds of maintaining cabinet secrecy, and I hope that at that time they will not attack or ridicule the government for going after the press, as happened on a former occasion.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): In view of the fact that the Prime Minister could have saved himself and the government a good deal of embarrassment by tabling this report when it came into their possession, may I ask the Prime Minister now whether we can expect to have this report tabled during the present week?

[Mr. Trudeau.]

Mr. Trudeau: Well, Mr. Speaker, if this were a way to avoid a great deal of embarrassment I take it we would also table every cabinet document. There would be no such thing as a confidential document in the government's records.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I ask the Prime Minister whether he considers this to be a cabinet document. Is it not instead a report of a royal commission to which Parliament and the people of Canada have a right to have access?

Mr. Trudeau: The hon. member was making a suggestion to avoid cabinet embarrassment. I tell him that the reasons for having secrecy respected have nothing to do with embarrassment of the cabinet but rather have to do with an efficient way of running a government.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): There has not been much evidence of it.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Trudeau: While I am on my feet, I should like to add to an answer I gave a few minutes ago when I indicated that all ministers did not have a copy of the LeDain report. This was true as of the end of last week, at which time the obvious publication was being prepared. I am told that since the end of last week all cabinet ministers have been given a copy of the LeDain report.

An hon. Member: They did not have *Time*.

LE DAIN COMMISSION INTERIM REPORT—INVESTIGATION OF LEAK BY JUDICIAL INQUIRY

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): In view of the fact that the Prime Minister and his government are insisting on keeping the LeDain report secret at this time, and as he has talked about an inquiry, will the Prime Minister be prepared now to set up the machinery for a judicial inquiry into the leak of the report which is now appearing in all newspapers from day to day like a soap opera serial? Mr. Speaker, may I put the question—

Some hon. Mmebers: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order. Is the hon. member rising to ask a supplementary question?

Mr. Woolliams: Yes, I will rephrase it. Would the Prime Minister now agree to a

judicial inquiry into this whole matter so as to take away the clouds which have resulted from this leak?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me this suggestion is one for escalating this matter beyond the degree to which we thought it necessary to escalate it at the outset. We are making an inquiry now, without the benefit of a full-scale judicial inquiry, and the House has just put through a motion which will lead to means of redressing this situation. We hope that the standing committee will assist the government in finding out how this particular leak occurred. If the step that the hon. member suggests eventually proves necessary, of course we will take it.

Mr. Woolliams: Whatever inquiry the Prime Minister and his government do conduct, would he be prepared then to come here, and make a full statement on the results of that inquiry to see if a judicial inquiry will be necessary?

Mr. Trudeau: Well, Mr. Speaker, I made the statement just now that if such an inquiry proves to be necessary and useful and possible, we will of course make it. But I am not prepared now, without knowing the facts, to state whether this will be necessary and useful. We may find out things that will indicate to the contrary.

I just want to repeat that we are very grateful for the opposition's insistence that cabinet and other secret documents be respected by all concerned.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre.

LE DAIN COMMISSION INTERIM REPORT—UNAUTHORIZED PUBLICATION OF INFORMATION—"TIME" MAGAZINE SUBSIDY

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the minister in charge of the Post Office. In view of the fact that a purported portion of a secret and confidential report in the government's hands was carried in a foreign-owned and controlled publication while Canadian publications did not have an opportunity for equal access—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have to interrupt the hon. member. I have to rule that this is not a supplementary. I will come back to the hon. member in a moment. I believe the hon. member for Peace River has a supplementary.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Benjamin: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, my question relates to the questions which have just been asked of the Prime Minister. It is a supplementary to another minister on exactly the same subject. I wonder, whether I may complete my question?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, it might be useful to tell the hon. member that if Canadian publications do reproduce what this publication has carried they will be reproducing a great many false words.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps I did not understand the hon. member's supplementary correctly. In the circumstances, he should be allowed to complete the question.

Mr. Benjamin: In view of the fact that equal opportunity of access to this information, secret or otherwise, was not available to Canadian publications, will the Postmaster General and Minister of Communications advise the House whether he and the Post Office Department will give consideration to removing the almost $750,000 subsidy received annually by *Time* magazine?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, I do not know precisely what equal access to secret information means, but the answer to the latter part of the question is no.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Prime Minister one supplementary. If a judicial inquiry is held and a report is made, will the results be concealed, published, or leaked to the public?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

LE DAIN COMMISSION INTERIM REPORT—POSITION OF MAGISTRATES AND JUDGES FOLLOWING LEAKING OF INFORMATION

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question to direct to the Prime Minister. I am wondering if the right hon. gentleman does not agree that since parts of the LeDain Commission report have been given wide circulation through one means or another, magistrates and judges are placed in a very awkward position. Does this, therefore, not make it more urgent than ever for the government to evolve a policy on this important matter?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Speaker: I would suggest to the hon. member that his very interesting supplementary question is rather an argument. I would not think it is in order as a question.

[*Later:*]

LE DAIN COMMISSION INTERIM REPORT—DISTRIBUTION TO ATTORNEYS GENERAL

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister and is supplementary to the questions which were asked earlier. Could he indicate whether copies of the LeDain Commission report have been circulated to the various Attorneys General, in light of the confusion that now exists, and whether or not it is the intention of the Prime Minister's office to take this step so as to eliminate any possibility of confusion with respect to all of these reports to which the Prime Minister has alluded?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the suggestion is made in a constructive vein, but if I can be equally constructive I could perhaps remind the House and the Attorneys General that, although I did not read the *Time* magazine article myself, I am told by the minister that much of it is incorrect and leads to false conclusions. I know that the opposition parties are just yearning to state their positions on this whole question of the legalizing of drugs, but I must warn them to wait a little while because if they are too hasty they may be basing them on a false report.

LE DAIN COMMISSION INTERIM REPORT—SCOPE OF INVESTIGATION OF LEAK

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a supplementary question to the Prime Minister, but first may I say that we wanted to have the report tabled and tabling would have prevented this situation from happening. In any event, the Prime Minister said that currently an inquiry is being conducted by the Minister of National Health and Welfare and that some other cabinet members, I think he said a few, not all the cabinet ministers, had access to the report itself. Is the authority of the Minister of National Health and Welfare in this inquiry confined to his own office, his own department, or does he have authority to inquire into the offices of other ministers and their office staffs, and the staff of the Commission—in short, all those who had access to the document?

[Mr. Fairweather.]

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): As I indicated earlier, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of National Health and Welfare will not be doing this alone. He will be asking for the assistance of other ministers, and I take it principally that of the Solicitor General under whom the RCMP comes.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. I ask the Prime Minister, why does he refer to what he calls a false report as a leak?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I believe it is the opposition that has been asking questions about leaks, not the government.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, all during the afternoon while questions were put to the Prime Minister he continued to refer to this as a leak. He now refers to it as a false report, and he has cautioned the opposition not to push this matter because of further leaks to come.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

[*Translation*]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—INCREASE IN BANK PROFITS—LOWERING OF INTEREST RATES

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

In view of the fact that the financial statements of chartered banks show a net profit of some 27.7 per cent for the past six months, does the Prime Minister intend to make representations to them in order to have them lower their interest rates on loans to Canadian individuals and companies so that they may efficiently fight inflation?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I will gladly refer the question to the Minister of Finance, but I might add that he dealt with the matter in reply to a question put last week. In fact, to the best of my memory, he mentioned among other things, that certain chartered banks had lowered their interest rate.

[*English*]

GRAIN

WHEAT—ACREAGE REDUCTION PROGRAM—FARMERS' CANADA PENSION PLAN PAYMENTS

Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the

Minister without Portfolio in charge of the Wheat Board. The question arises from the difficulties of western farmers in remitting their payments under the Canada Pension Plan because of low quotas imposed under Operation Lift. Has the government set up any special provisions to meet this unfortunate and unjust situation?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is presumably referring to a situation related to a quota system which will come into effect on August 1, but of course he is stating it completely inaccurately when he refers to low quotas under Operation Lift. The eight bushel per acre quota for wheat, for instance, will bring forward the full amount of grain required.

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker, I believe the minister misunderstood my question. I pointed out that some provision must be made to enable farmers to remit payments under the Canada Pension Plan in order that they may get benefits from the plan at a later date. Has any arrangement been made with the other departments in view of Operation Lift and the consequences thereof?

Mr. Lang: I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not yet understand any additional implications of the question the hon. member is asking.

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker, my further supplementary has to do with the inability of farmers to remit payments under the Canada Pension Plan as they have done in the past, with the result that they will not be able to participate in the benefits. Has there been any discussion between the Minister without Portfolio in charge of the Wheat Board and other departments of government to offset this injustice?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I say again that I know of no change in the pension regulations, but I will be glad to discuss them with my colleague. The hon. member referred to a quota problem arising out of Operation Lift. There is no such quota problem, so I do not see the basis for his question.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member rising on a point or order? I suggest that since there are a number of supplementaries we might hear them.

WHEAT—FURTHER CONFERENCE OF EXPORTING COUNTRIES RESPECTING PRODUCTION

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): I should like to ask a question of the Minister without Portfolio in charge of the Wheat Board. In light of the continuing high levels of United States wheat production and recent reports that the United States is headed for another banner crop of both spring and winter wheat, is the minister planning to call another conference of the wheat exporting nations in order to avoid Canada being left as the only country with a significant reduction in wheat production?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Once again, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is obviously reading reports which must emanate from a very mysterious source. The last report I saw indicated that, whereas this year's United States wheat crop had dropped about 100 million bushels compared with last year, the forecast was that next year's crop would be down about another 80 million bushels.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Gleave: I have a further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the minister is not prepared to accept the information I gave him, would the minister conduct inquiries to satisfy himself and report to the House in due time as to the reduction in wheat production in other countries since that was related to the Lift program?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I might indeed try to make available from time to time to hon. members some information about production in other countries since their sources seem to be so clearly unreliable. I will try to see that at least some hon. members opposite who are interested are furnished with accurate reports from time to time.

WHEAT—ACREAGE REDUCTION PROGRAM—EXTENSION OF DEADLINE FOR REMOVING COVER CROPS

Mr. A. B. Douglas (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, my question relates to the Lift program and is addressed to the Minister without Portfolio in charge of the Wheat Board. In view of the uncertainty and concern of Prairie grain producers with regard to the removal of spring cover crops of oats by July 15, can the minister inform the House definitely whether or not the deadline will be set back to July 31 or some later date?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, some days ago the Minister of Agriculture stated the position with regard to cover crops and indicated that these were essentially intended as a protection against erosion. There is no new problem in that connection. We are still watching the forage situation very carefully, of course, to see whether the requirement for forage might require a change in the rule itself.

WHEAT—PROVISION OF FOUR-BUSHEL QUOTA TO ALL ELEVATOR POINTS BY JULY 31

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): I have a supplementary question for the Minister without Portfolio relating to quotas. Since the latest Canadian Wheat Board report of June 8 indicates that more than 50 per cent of delivery points in the designated area are still on a two-bushel wheat quota, can the minister assure the House and the producers that the four-bushel quota will be achieved prior to the end of the crop year, a commitment which he guaranteed would be effective?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, at the present time more than 50 per cent of the points in the Prairie region are in fact on three or four-bushel quotas. Very rapid progress is being made in the opening of quotas and the forecast movement for the remaining months is still sufficient to allow the quotas to open as predicted.

Mr. George Muir (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, my question is not supplementary but I have a question for the minister.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps the hon. member will allow the Chair to recognize the hon. member for Vegreville on a supplementary.

EXTENSION OF INCREASED BARLEY QUOTA TO ALBERTA PRODUCERS

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): I wonder if the minister would undertake to assure the House at some time that the barley quota will be increased for Alberta producers prior to the end of the crop year in order that it may equal that of the producers in Saskatchewan and Manitoba?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, the barley which was required, and for which the special quota was opened was required particularly for movement through the Lakehead. There are good forward sales for barley and therefore there is every possibility of allowing Alberta producers as well to deliver barley in a similar manner. Deliveries of barley from Alberta are still coming in at a very rapid rate.

ADOPTION OF PROTEIN STANDARD AMENDMENT TO CANADA GRAIN ACT PRIOR TO PASSING BILL C-196

Mr. George Muir (Lisgar): I have a question for the Minister without Portfolio from Saskatoon-Humboldt. In view of the intensive study required in committee of Bill C-196, the new grain act, and the full appreciation of all members of the committee of the importance of a protein standard for export grain, would the minister be prepared to ask the government to bring forward the appropriate amendment to the present Canada Grain Act, which could be passed quickly as a desirable interim measure while the new Act is being studied?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, the direction of the Canada Grain Act falls more particularly under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Agriculture. The hon. member, however, has put his finger on a very important point, that the passage of the new Canada Grain Act is in fact essential if steps toward protein grading are to be proceeded with. This is a matter of great importance to wheat producers throughout Canada. I hope the agriculture Committee and the House will be able to expedite passage of this legislation accordingly.

Mr. Muir (Lisgar): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the importance of the new Canada Grain Act, which is new legislation entirely, and the fact that serious study must be given to it, it is going to be impossible to bring this bill back to the House before the recess. In view of that fact, would the minister discuss with the Minister of Agriculture the importance of bringing in an appropriate amendment to the present Act—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is making a suggestion to the minister and he has to assume that it will be considered or taken into account.

PUBLIC SERVICE

APPLICATION OF SIX PER CENT WAGE INCREASE GUIDELINE TO POSTAL AND OTHER EMPLOYEES AND TO OTHER FORMS OF INCOME

Mr. David Lewis (York South): I should like to address a question to the President of

the Treasury Board, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that wage settlements in the private sector continue to exceed the 6 per cent guideline, would the minister inform the House whether it is still the intention of the government to impose a 6 per cent limit in its bargaining with the Public Service in general and postal employees in particular?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the last part of the question, the offer made by the government to the postal workers was made some time ago and represented not an adherence to the guideline but what was thought and felt to be a reasonable offer in all the circumstances. That position has been maintained.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister's answer mean he is denying that the government is seeking to impose a guideline of 6 per cent or less in negotiations with public servants?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, I am not seeking to deny anything. I am providing information.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister a question arising out of some statements made by the Minister of Labour in a television broadcast the other day. I am going to ask the question directly and not quote the Minister of Labour. I should like to ask the minister, who was present if my memory serves me right at the meeting with provincial Ministers of Finance in Winnipeg recently, whether at that meeting the provincial ministers gave any undertaking or assurance or made any other kind of statement about establishing guidelines on executive fees, managerial fees and other income areas, including rent controls?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, the propositions put forward at that meeting by the Chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission made it quite clear that the policies and proposals for restraint applied not only to wages but also to salaries and other forms of income, and included also all revenues derived from increased prices. The policy of restraint was not limited to one particular area but was to be universal, and his proposals related not only to restraint on wages and salaries but also to prices and other forms of income in both the public and private sectors.

Mr. Lewis: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member raises a point of order.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that I did not ask the minister what Dr. Young told the provincial ministers. I can read that. I asked the minister what the reply of the provincial ministers was to what Dr. Young said to them. He carefully evaded that question.

Mr. Speaker: That, of course, is not a point of order. The hon. member is repeating the question he asked in the first instance. Apparently he was not satisfied.

Mr. Lewis: I hoped I might obtain an answer.

[*Translation*]

CRIMINAL CODE

ABORTION—REMOVAL OF PROVISIONS FROM LAW

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

Is it his intention, as he stated at Vancouver, to introduce an amendment to the Criminal Code to remove therefrom the provisions regarding abortion?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this is not exactly what I said at Vancouver. However, I can give the House an accurate account of what the question and the reply were, since the hon. member has shown his interest in this connection.

They made up a hypothetical situation where hon. members would be prepared to push through the House in a single day a piece of legislation repealing the abortion provisions of the Criminal Code. I replied that I knew from experience—and hon. members are well aware of it—that any amendment liberalizing the Criminal Code could hardly be carried in a single day, since it took several weeks to adopt the amendments we introduced last year.

However, I repeated that, to go along with the hypothetical situation, should the House agree to pass such a bill within a single day before the end of this part of the session, I would be prepared to introduce such an amendment.

Again, I am putting the question to the House. If such is its wish, I shall assume my own responsibilities.

Mr. Beaudoin: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a supplementary question.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Does the Prime Minister mean that such a bill will be introduced before the House adjourns for the summer recess?

[*English*]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

GROWTH RATE FORECAST BY OECD—RATE OF DESIRED SLOWDOWN

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I had a question for the Minister of Finance. I do not know whether he has fled the country or whether he has been kidnapped by the Canadian Bankers Association. Perhaps the Minister without Portfolio from Windsor West would answer my question. It relates to the forecast made by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development of a 2.5 per cent growth rate for Canada for the current year, which is substantially below the growth rate predicted by the Minister of Finance. Does this indicate that, even with the credit restraints, having been dropped, the slowdown is greater than that desired by the Department of Finance and the minister? Also, in the view of the minister is this attributable in any way to the floating dollar?

Hon. Herb Gray (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice. I believe my colleague, the Minister of Finance, is expected in the House tomorrow and I am sure he will be ready to deal with the always stimulating questions of the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Stanfield: I hope so.

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

DELIVERY OF PENSION AND OTHER CHEQUES BY SPECIAL MESSENGERS

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. It has reference to the delivery of government cheques by special messengers in areas affected by rotating postal strikes. Can he advise whether it is government policy for other departments to circumvent the Post Office Department and thereby, in effect, court the charge of being strike-breakers?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I will gladly make an investigation of this. I believe it has been the practice in the past when a strike has been imminent to obtain consent of the unions—perhaps this is done without their consent—to deliver cheques in such ways so as not to inconvenience the people who need them very badly. I will inquire into the point raised to see if this is done without consent.

[Mr. Beaudoin.]

PUBLIC SERVICE

EMPLOYEES EXCLUDED FROM COLLECTIVE BARGAINING—REPORT OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON PAY AND EMPLOYMENT CONDITIONS

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the President of the Treasury Board. On April 10 of this year I asked him a question about the report of the advisory committee on the pay and conditions of employment of public servants excluded from collective bargaining, which is sometimes known as the Clyne Committee. At that time the minister said the committee was being urged to complete its work. Can he tell me whether this has been done and whether the report is expected soon?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, the so-called Clyne Committee has been asked to advise on a number of questions. We have received some reports from them, but their work has not yet been completed.

POLLUTION

ADHERENCE TO CONTROL REGULATIONS BY OIL EXPLORATION COMPANIES

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. My question concerns the control of potential pollution sources in Canada's northland connected with oil drilling and other petroleum activity. Have inspectors from his department investigated all the sites on which petroleum exploration is being carried out, and can he assure the House that these companies are living up to all the government's pollution control regulations?

Hon J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, in the areas under federal jurisdiction in the Yukon and Northwest Territories, questions of oil drilling, oil permits and the administration of regulations come under the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Speaker, since the minister is concerned with Canada's mines and

resources, does his jurisdiction not extend to all parts of Canada and to all petroleum drilling?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That question, of course, is not acceptable in that form.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Speaker, may I rephrase my question. Does the minister's department exercise control over petroleum drilling in any part of Canada and are regulations issued by his department?

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, I understand the hon. member was on the committee and probably knows that in offshore areas the regulations are administered by my department.

OIL SPILL INTO ATHABASCA RIVER—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister is now ready to make a report on the question I asked him about the pollution of the Athabasca River and Lake Athabasca. Some of these waters fall under federal jurisdiction. The minister was going to send experts there to find out what was going on.

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, my information is that apart from the national park, which comes under the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and may be affected, the pipeline is completely a provincial pipeline and is administered under the Alberta act, under which immmediate action in regard to the situation that has occurred has been taken. It is only pipelines that cross interprovincial or international boundaries which come under the jurisdiction of the federal government and the National Energy Board Act.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

LEVEL OF MERCURY IN HUMANS—USE OF BLOOD INSTEAD OF URINE TESTS

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, may I address a question to the Minister of Fisheries. On June 10, as reported at page 7961 of *Hansard*, I asked the minister a question. His answer shows that there may have been some misunderstanding about the question. I asked whether, in view of the grave doubt that urine tests are reliable in determining the level of mercury, blood tests are being taken of those persons who eat fish as a staple diet so that they can be assured there is no danger of any bad effect on the brain or on the nerve system?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, I understand that the principal tests relate to blood and brain tissue.

HOUSING

PRESENT POSITION OF MALVERN, ONT., PROJECT

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, may I address a question to the minister in charge of housing. In view of the undertaking the minister gave before the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs when his estimates were before it that he would immediately study the proposal of the Ontario government with regard to adopting the Malvern project, may I ask if the minister has completed his study and is prepared to make a report on it?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, the Malvern project, in its final form, has not been presented to me from the other level of government. I have put inquiries in motion to indicate that we should like to see it brought along, but until it is approved by the Ontario government I cannot put our approval on it. I am as concerned as the hon. member to see that it is dealt with quickly.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

SALE OF HMCS "BONAVENTURE"

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, my question is very simple and brief and is directed to the Minister of National Defence. Can he indicate whether he has received any acceptable proposals or offers to purchase the *Bonaventure*? If so, has he taken any action on them?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I do not like to pass the buck but I think this question should be directed to the Minister of Supply and Services.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Speaker, may I direct the same question to the Minister of Supply and Services?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of offers, but none which were acceptable.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister consider making the *Bonaventure* available to his colleague, the Minister of Transport, for service between Newfoundland and Nova Scotia?

URBAN AFFAIRS

ESTABLISHMENT OF PROPOSED COUNCIL IN LIGHT OF MONTREAL MAYOR'S OPPOSITION

Mr. W. C. Scott (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister without Portfolio in charge of housing. In view of the statement made by the mayor of Montreal that he is unalterably opposed to the minister's proposal for the establishment of a national three level urban council, would the minister say whether he still plans to pursue the matter?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): I still plan to pursue the matter.

FISHERIES

LAKE ST. CLAIR—HONOURING OF FEDERAL COMMITMENT RESPECTING COMPENSATION BECAUSE OF BAN

Mr. Harold Danforth (Kent-Essex): I should like to direct this question to the Minister of Fisheries. The minister is aware that on April 15 he and his associates met with their Ontario provincial counterparts in Toronto and agreed on joint financial reparation for the hardship caused by the ban on fishing in Lake St. Clair and adjoining waters. Since the provincial government has already carried out its commitment, can the minister tell us when the federal government will be prepared to honour the commitment it made in this instance?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): We have been carrying out all our commitments with respect to fishermen.

Mr. Danforth: A supplementary question to the Prime Minister in light of that answer. Having seen the published itinerary of the welcome visit of the Prime Minister to southwestern Ontario in a few days time, may I ask whether the right hon. gentleman would consider altering his program to the extent of providing an opportunity of meeting with the citizens of Kent County, not only to enjoy their famous hospitality but also to hear petitions and grievances?

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

[Mr. Richardson.]

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CANADA LABOUR (STANDARDS) CODE

INCREASE IN MINIMUM HOURLY WAGE

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-214, to amend the Canada Labour (Standards) Code, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre) moved:

That Bill C-214, an Act to amend the Canada Labour (Standards) Code, be amended by deleting from lines 12 and 13 thereof the words "one dollar and sixty-five cents", and by substituting therefor the words "two dollars".

He said: It is not my intention to provoke a lengthy debate on the amendment which has now been placed before the House but I hope hon. members will be prepared to accept it and thus make a significant improvement in the bill which has been brought in by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey). Having said that in my view a prolonged debate at this stage is unnecessary, I shall not repeat the arguments I used when we discussed this bill on second reading on May 29, although I should like to use again one or two of the arguments I advanced when the bill was before the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

As hon. members are aware, the bill is a very simple one in that it makes just one change in the Canada Labour (Standards) Code. It proposes that the minimum wage stipulated in the Code, which is now $1.25 an hour, should be made $1.65 an hour. My amendment proposes that, instead, the minimum wage be set at $2 an hour. As we all realize, this is a statute which applies to workers who come under federal labour jurisdiction. It does not apply to the federal public service but rather to workers such as railway employees, communications workers, bank employees and the like who, under the terms of the British North America Act, come under federal labour jurisdiction. There are about 550,000 workers in Canada who find themselves in these various categories but of course the number affected by any minimum wage provision is very low, since many of them have better arrangements as a result of collective bargaining agreements.

I must, however, correct the figure I gave on May 29 when I said I thought there were

probably fewer than 10,000 people who would be affected by this bill—that there were fewer than 10,000 of the 550,000 whose wages were so low that they would get an improvement if their wages were brought up to $1.65 an hour. I now find from figures which the Department of Labour has been good enough to furnish to us that the number may be as high as 20,000. Previously, I estimated that only 2 per cent of those under federal jurisdiction were affected; the figure may turn out to be closer to 4 per cent. Since this larger number of people would be affected by the legislation, it is all the more important that we should do the right thing by them.

I said earlier that I will refrain from repeating the arguments I used on second reading. But when we got into the committee there were two points which I sought to make, and I beg the indulgence of the House to make them here as well. I shall try to make them a little more effectively than I did there, in the hope that we can go just a step further. In the committee, when I moved my amendment there and it came to a vote, a tie resulted and the chairman had to decide by his casting vote that the bill should remain as drafted. I hope this will not happen today. I hope you will not be put in that awkward situation, Mr. Speaker. I hope that instead of a tie there will be a clear majority in favour of my amendment.

The first of the new arguments I used in committee involved quoting an authority we in this party do not often put in that category. I refer to Dr. John Young, the chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission. But even people who hold ideas with which we do not agree can, at times, have ideas which are correct. I remind hon. members that when Dr. Young issued his statement at the famous weekend meeting in Winnipeg calling for restraint in terms of there being no wage increases allowed beyond 6 per cent, he said very clearly that there were certain groups of people to whom this should not apply. One of these groups consisted of those earning less than $2 an hour. In other words, Dr. Young recognized that anyone whose wage was below $2 an hour could, notwithstanding the policy of the Prices and Incomes Commission, have that wage brought up to $2 an hour. The proposed restraint does not apply. Anything less than $2 is so low that even Dr. Young would not object to its being brought up to the figure I propose.

Surely, with all this support the government is giving to Dr. Young in connection with the negative proposals he has made, the minister and his colleagues will also go along with his more positive suggestion, namely, that no wage below $2 an hour should be tolerated at all. I, therefore, call upon the Minister of Labour to help avoid the possibility of a tie, should the amendment come to a vote, by throwing his weight behind my proposal and helping to improve the position of those who are governed by the minimum wage under the Canada Labour (Standards) Code.

• (3:50 p.m.)

The other argument which I introduced in the standing committee was one to which a colleague of mine alluded in a question that he asked during the question period yesterday relating to an example of some of the people who are getting these low wages. I confess that I was astounded when I got these figures from the Department of Labour setting out the numbers of people who are drawing wages that work out to less than $1.65 an hour. Believe it or not, Mr. Speaker, but of the 20,747 people who in June 1969 were drawing less than $1.65 an hour, 8,000 were employees of the chartered banks of this country. In other words, 40 per cent of the employees in this lower bracket are employees of the banks of this country.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission has finally twigged to the inconsistency of some of the things that the banks are saying and doing by calling for an investigation into the profits of banks. A report in the *Globe and Mail* a few days ago carried the headline "Major banks show $275.2 million profit". That is covered by another heading which reads "27.7 per cent first half rise". That is their increase in profits in the first half of their fiscal year. If the banks of this country are making profits that run into these many millions, profits that in terms of percentage shoot high, wide and handsome through any guidelines talked about by the Prices and Incomes Commission, I suggest it is downright immoral for these people to be paying wages of less than $1.65 an hour to 8,000 of its employees. There just is no defence for this whatsoever.

By the same token, I submit that the government has no defence if it does nothing about this. All that the government has to do to correct this situation is to accept the

amendment now before the House in my name calling for a minimum wage of $2 an hour, for all those who come under federal labour jurisdiction. In that instance, these 8,000 people would get their wages increased to $2 an hour, and there are probably a few hundred or thousand between $1.65 and $2 an hour who would also get an increase to that figure.

Not only are there the 8,000 bank employees to whom I have referred, who are receiving a starvation wage, but there are 5,675 persons in the transport industries who are receiving less than $1.65 an hour. I have grouped together several branches of transport, covering railway, air, road and water transport services. For the most part, workers in our transportation industries are covered by collective agreements, and most of the workers in those industries are doing better than $1.65 an hour. But these employees are persons in non-scheduled positions of various kinds, and there are some 5,675 of them whose present wage is less than $1.65 an hour. I should qualify the word "present" by saying that the figures I have are the latest I could get from the Department of Labour and are for June 1969. Although there may have been some improvement since, I am sure the situation has not been rectified to any great extent.

In addition, we have been told that the radio and television industries are not exactly on the rocks; that if you can get a licence to run a radio or a television station, in effect it is a licence to print money. Yet in radio and television in this country there were in June, 1969, 860 people who were receiving wages that worked out to less than $1.65 an hour. I do not think we should stand for this another day or even another afternoon.

I think there should not be any question at all about my amendment this afternoon. The House should say to the banks, to the transport industries and to the radio and television licensees that the least they must do is to bring their employees up to $2 an hour. The minimum wage proposed by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) of $1.65 an hour, for a person who manges to work 40 hours a week, 52 weeks in the year, would work out to $3,432. The Economic Council of Canada has selected the sum or $4,200 as the poverty line for an employee with a family today, so to say to these people that they should get by on $3,400 is selling them short by $800.

This is what this bill in the name of the minister would do, that is, unless my amendment were accepted. If the amendment were accepted, it still would not bring affluence to these people. A wage of $2 an hour would mean, working 40 hours a week 52 weeks of the year, an annual wage of $4,160, which is at least within $40 of the poverty line indicated by the Economic Council of Canada. I have used 52 weeks in those figures to get the maximum amount in both cases, but I would hope that the provisions relating to vacations with pay would also apply to these people, that some of the employers who are getting away with these low wages are not at the same time getting away with practices that deny vacations to these employees.

There it is, Mr. Speaker; it is a simple proposition. I see no reason at all for the House not accepting this amendment of mine this afternoon. I know, of course, that we will be handed the usual arguments. The minister will tell us that he is trying to be realistic. I get awfully fed up with this line about having to be realistic. What about those people who are trying to live on this sort of money? What about realism for them?

I know the minister will also tell us that we have to be careful; that this matter involves the provinces as well as the question of whether industries will move from one province to another, or move from Canada to some other country; that we have to look at all these things; that we have to find some sophisticated ways to cope with the problem of poverty; that we must concern ourselves about the question of regional disparity and all that sort of thing; that maybe we will have to look at the situation of the banks as distinct from the situation of other industries. But after all these arguments have been put, we come back to the simple fact that this afternoon we are dealing with some 20,000 people employed in industries that come under federal labour jurisdiction and who are receiving less than $1.65 an hour. Probably some 22,000 or 25,000 or maybe more are receiving less than $2 an hour. I suggest that all of these arguments about federal-provincial relations, sophistication and realism do not apply.

The minister himself has said, and he said very effectively the other day in committee, that he is the kind of individual who is concerned about people. He did not claim anything for himself that he did not accord to the rest of us. But if we are all concerned about people, let us show our concern this afternoon by telling the minister that, yes, he has taken a good step by bringing in this bill to increase the minimum wage from that terribly low

figure of $1.25 an hour to a higher figure. But in the name of those people who are affected, and in a desire to be fair and to have some kind of just society, let us not stop there. Let us make it fair and reasonable. The other day one of the members of the committee complained about my amendment because he was afraid that if $2 an hour were agreed to this year, then in a year or two I would be asking for $3 or $4 an hour. I probably will be; in fact, I hope I will be. Progress does not stop. But it is not an answer to people who are living below the poverty line to tell them that for reasons of realism, of sophistication or of procedural difficulty, they have to stay at the same level.

• (4:00 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, the members of this House of Commons are sometimes shoved aside and sometimes feel irrelevant, but this afternoon we have the opportunity to act on behalf of 20,000 or 25,000 people. Therefore, I urge that this House support my motion, and by doing so let us raise the minimum wage in the Canada Labour (Standards) Code to the more reasonable level of $2 an hour.

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): I never cease to wonder at the political skill and acumen of the hon. member, having myself been a member of this House since 1962. I notice that in anticipation of my arguments he either paid attention to what I had said on second reading or in committee or else reread my remarks in *Hansard*. I do recall the hon. member saying, with his refreshing candour, during the second reading stage that had I come up with $2 for a minimum wage I would now be faced with an amendment for $2.25.

An hon. Member: What is wrong with that?

Mr. Mackasey: Not a thing, except that you must be consistent. Had I brought in $2, he would have proposed $3, and he would never be satisfied. In proposing $1.65, I had to ignore some of the political arguments and some of the very humanitarian aspects in the hon. member's remarks. I must, in all fairness to the hon. gentleman, take into consideration that he is consistently in this field and is genuinely and sincerely concerned about the people to whom he referred.

However, I think the hon. member will be the first to agree that that concern is not limited to him or to members of his party. There are no basic differences between the hon. member's arguments advancing his amendment and his speech on second reading or in committee the other day, nor will I attempt to come up with any different arguments in rebuttal. As I recall the debate on second reading, the one encouraging factor of course was the unanimous theme running through all the speeches made by members of all the parties in the House, including the Official Opposition, that there should and must be some increase in the minimum wages in this country. Had I viewed the minimum wage as the only instrument to alleviate poverty for certain classes of people, possibly I would have come up to $2. But when you are a minister charged with a certain responsibility you do not always have the freedom and flexibility that you may have in the opposition in taking into consideration one or two points.

Certainly, politically at least, it would be very palatable, so far as the relationship of the Minister of Labour and the government to 10,000 or 20,000 people is concerned, to bring in an amendment suggesting $3 an hour as the minimum wage. If I had that freedom, I would have proposed more than $2 an hour because it is certainly politically attractive. But as I mentioned on second reading and in committee, I have certain responsibilities and I have many other considerations which I thought I made as clear as possible.

We heard some very valuable contributions from representatives of the Atlantic provinces regarding the whole question of minimum wages. I think that in all the speeches on second reading some myths were dispelled which exist all too often in central Canada that the cost of living is so much lower in the Atlantic provinces. The fact that the people there can exist on a lower income is hardly a valid argument, but, as I pointed out earlier in the debate, I am opposed to the concept of regional minimum wages, either within a province or in a province within the nation.

So, in searching for a suitable figure, it became very obvious to me that I must come up with one that created the usual incentive, and the leadership with which the federal government has been associated ever since 1965 in establishing a minimum wage. I also had to establish a figure that did not create a distortion within a province or create unnecessary hardships for marginal industries, which may briefly be described as labour oriented rather than capital oriented. I was not unaware of the fact, through research in certain provinces, not necessarily the Atlantic provinces, that an increase in the

minimum wage even in the federal field could have perhaps induced a degree of rationalization in an industry which would be premature in the sense that in some cases it may have been economically advantageous to industries heavily dependent on machinery rather than labour before the regional expansion in that part of the country was sufficiently advanced to absorb displaced people.

I do have a responsibility not only to the employees but also to employers, and in many marginal industries dependent on labour rather than machinery we must take into consideration the effects which the minimum wage would have on their operation. I do not intend to refute any of the arguments which the hon. member brought forward with regard to chartered banks in this country and their ability to pay a living wage. It would seem to me that these banks would want to review their policy, taking into consideration their ability to pay, because I certainly do not consider the banks in this country to be marginal industries.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Hear, hear.

Mr. Mackasey: I know that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) has established a very high level of debate as have other members, such as the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) and the hon. member from Newfoundland who participated in the second reading debate as the official critic for the opposition on industrial relations, as well as other hon. members. However, I cannot help reminding the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre that the arguments he advanced today, persuasive though they may be, did not persuade the premier of Manitoba to reach the $2 plateau. I think he would be the first to admit that he tried.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I am still trying.

Mr. Mackasey: As I said on several occasions, I sympathize with the hon. member, who is a very persuasive member of his party, on his inability to persuade the premier of that province. I can only assume that now that the premier is no longer a member of the opposition in this House but has the responsibilities of office, he has had to take into consideration some of the factors that I have to consider. He has to consider the impact of too great an increase of the minimum wage on marginal industries in a province, just as I must take into consideration the effect which it might have on some of the less favoured parts of this country. However, I do think that the intermediate aim in this field should be to find, through a series of conferences with my provincial counterparts, a standard that is acceptable in all provinces as well as in the federal field. There is no particular reason why in time the minimum wage in this country could not be uniform across the country, and it is not the purpose of the federal government and of the Department of Labour, despite the fact that this will affect only 10,000 or 20,000 people, to embarrass my counterparts in the provinces.

What I mean to do is perhaps to persuade them, to create incentives, and to point out to marginal industries that they can take advantage of incentives through the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce to rationalize and protect their industries. I am thinking of a few industries that are perhaps too labour oriented, but this must be taken into consideration, together with the ability of a particular area to absorb those people who, perhaps through lack of education, lack of opportunity or other reasons, have been unable to take advantage of jobs that are available to those with greater skills and better education. So, frankly, I am more interested, having consulted many experts on the subject, in trying again to re-evaluate the real effect of the minimum wage on the income level based on studies available in this and other countries.

• (4:10 p.m.)

I am pleased to find, contrary to the opinion recently expressed by certain economists, that an increase in the minimum wage does not create undue unemployment, and that through the minimum wage we are helping the unorganized worker rather than the organized worker. This is an equal responsibility which I have, the responsibility to protect the unorganized as well as the organized, not only with respect to standards, not only with respect to wages, but with respect to hours of work, overtime, and all other factors. I think we do this fairly successfully.

I was also persuaded by certain experts, particularly those who devoted some years to a study on the impact of the minimum wage, that all too often in too many countries for a variety of reasons, the good influence of an increase in the minimum wage is lost because of the period of time between increases. Perhaps this is not anything that anybody should be proud of but it is a fact

that the last time there was an increase in the minimum wage in the federal field in this country was in 1965.

I think that an annual increase would have a greater impact, and in the final analysis would be more beneficial to the unorganized workers at the bottom of the economic scale than would be an unduly high increase which could shut down certain industries in areas to which those industries are important. I promised in committee that it is my intention in the fall, when there will be a more intensive review of the Canada Labour Code, to introduce into the amending bill some provision that would permit the Minister of Labour, after an annual review, to recommend to his colleagues an increase in the minimum wage annually and, through some formula acceptable to the House, to avoid the necessity of coming to the House for sanction.

I am not the type of person who believes in government through regulation, but I think in view of the acceptance, expressed in all parts of the House, of an increase in the minimum wage, this should be possible. I do not make any protestation that concern for people is limited to the Minister of Labour. I know this from the speeches of many members in all parts of the House. I share with the hon. member for Cape Breton-The Sydneys (Mr. Muir) the same concern that he has often expressed, perhaps as a result of my upbringing. I often wonder why when I look at a balance sheet, nowhere does a company mention its most precious asset, the people working for it. When it comes to the day that machines are more important than people, we will be in bad shape in this country. It is a fact which is forgotten all too frequently, forgotten not only in my field but in the medical field and in many others, that people are more important than anything else.

While I share the sentiments and the concern of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre that the Minimum Wage is one of the instruments in the fight against poverty, I point out that it is not the only one. It must be viewed in the context of rationalization of industry through the programs of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin). It must be looked at in conjunction with the programs brought forward by the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand). It must be looked at in conjunction with the programs of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen).

What we must do for the people on the bottom level is to give them the same opportunities that are available to the more fortunate people in central Canada. If we want to make more progress we must make sure that those in the less well-to-do parts of the country get better education, more job opportunities, and we must take steps to rationalize industry, particularly any industry that survives on slave labour. In other words, we must spread the wealth across our country if we want it to remain as one country.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I arrived at the $1.65 figure in a very logical manner. The hon. gentleman opposite took exception to the word realistic, but it is no sin to be realistic when one is running a ministry. The figure of $1.65 is not something I plucked out of the air. It is a figure we arrived at by combining two indices, one the cost of living, and the second the productivity of the work force, and this worked out at $1.65. If I can persuade my colleagues between now and some time in the fall, and I believe this to be quite possible, then I give my word that when the Canada Labour Code is revised in the fall the amending bill will contain a formula providing for an annual review of the minimum wage. By this time next year, therefore, the minimum wage could increase by another ten cents or 15 cents.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I point out to the House that when the amending bill comes forward in the fall, there is nothing to prevent us reviewing the minimum wage standard in the light of the economic conditions of the country at that time and the advances that other segments of labour and of society have made in the interim. I seek the co-operation of the House in moving this legislation forward, in the hope that it can be implemented by July 1 because there are certain adjustments that employers must make between now and July 1 if the bill is to come into effect on that date.

At the moment I would prefer not to answer any of the other arguments that have been advanced. I hope the House will accept the $1.65 figure. In the fall, we will have an opportunity to review not only the $2 figure suggested but to discuss ways of making annual adjustments to the minimum wage, ways of making those adjustments much easier, so that we do not have to wait another five years to help people who, in effect, have no leverage because they are unorganized, and are a very dispirited segment of the work force.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I am sure all members of my party

will agree when I say I am certain that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) would like to do the right thing. But, Mr. Speaker, the right thing is obviously not $1.65 per hour. I cannot believe that the minister was really serious when he said they arrived at $1.65 per hour through some kind of scientific study concerning productivity and the cost of living. I am inclined to take a much more political and pragmatic view of how they arrived at that figure, namely, that that was the highest figure the Minister of Labour could persuade his colleague, the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury) and a few other ministers, to accept. I point out that the President of the Treasury Board never had to worry about making a living, and that he represents the constituency of Westmount.

The minister talked about various other methods which can be adopted to raise the living standards of workers, particularly of unorganized workers who carry the main brunt of the low minimum wage. I agree with him that it is almost exclusively the unorganized workers who must live with the low minimum wage. But, Mr. Speaker, it is not much use to say to Canadian citizens, whether they live in Montreal, Winnipeg or Halifax, that some day in the future they will have pie in the sky, that some day in the future when the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) has worked out some of his beautiful plans, and the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) has worked out some of his plans and make the textile industry much more efficient than it is now, their wages will go up. Unfortunately, they have to live now, and as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) said, they have to live now on $1.25 an hour. Since the minister has rejected the $2 per hour suggested by my colleague, they will have to live on $1.65 per hour in the future.

The $1.65 per hour figure means that a married man with a family, if that is his wage, will receive an annual income which is $800 a year less than the Economic Council of Canada has set as the figure which divides those people who live in a state of poverty from those who live with some kind of decency. As I said on second reading, Mr. Speaker, this minister ought to be ashamed of himself for making such a niggardly proposal.

• (4:20 p.m.)

I was glad to hear the minister substantiate the claims of members from the Atlantic provinces, and others such as my own, that the cost of living is not much lower in the Atlantic provinces or Manitoba than in Ontario or Quebec. That simply reinforces the argument of those of us who say that the minimum wage, both federal and provincial, is too low and ought to be higher.

The last point I wish to deal with, and the one that brought me to my feet, is the suggestion or criticism—if it was a criticism—which the minister made of the government and the Premier of Manitoba because that government, which is NDP, had not moved immediately to a $2 minimum wage. The minister knows very well why that government has not moved. The minister knows that in every province there are marginal industries and if the minimum wage were increased in one province before another, it is likely those industries would be pushed out of business.

There is a very important garment industry in Manitoba. Most of the workers in that industry live in my constituency and that of my colleague, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). The minister knows very well why the government of Manitoba has not unilaterally increased the minimum wage to $2 an hour, just as he knows that the minimum wage was increased to $1.50 on a temporary basis. It has been announced that it will probably be raised again in the fall. The government of Manitoba would like nothing better than to increase the minimum wage and I am sure that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) is aware of that, Mr. Speaker. But this cannot be done until other provinces with similar industries increase their minimum wage. It is for this reason I am so critical of the minister for this miserable increase he is proposing and which he wants us to support today.

Just speaking from memory and subject to error in some small detail, Mr. Speaker, I point out that when the federal minimum wage was set at $1.25 five years ago, no province had a minimum wage of more than 90 cents. We knew, of course, that there were not many employees coming under federal jurisdiction who were not receiving $1.25 then, just as there are not many employees coming under federal jurisdiction receiving less than $1.65 today. We knew, when the minimum was set at $1.25 five years ago, that the main effect of it would be to act as a spur on the provinces to increase their minimum wage and that is precisely what happened. The minimum wage in Manitoba is now $1.50 and I believe that in Quebec it will be $1.55

[Mr. Orlikow.]

an hour by this fall. The minimum wage in every province has increased substantially since the legislation was passed five years ago. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that what was accomplished when the rate was set at $1.25 cannot be accomplished today when the rate is set at $1.65 because most of the provinces are already close to that rate. The benefits attained by the increase five years ago will not be attained today.

I say to the minister, Mr. Speaker, that to a large extent this amendment to the bill is an exercise in futility. It will not do for the workers of Canada, whether under federal or provincial jurisdiction, what the original bill did five years ago. I say to the minister that in the light of his constant speeches and protestations as to his interest and support for the ordinary people of this country—and I believe that the minister is sincere in this—and in the light of his constant reiteration of a desire to improve the conditions of the worker, the Parliament of Canada had a right to expect a good deal more from him than we are getting today.

An hon. Member: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

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

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

• (4:30 p.m.)

Division

YEAS

Messrs:

Beaudoin
Benjamin
Brewin
Broadbent
Carter
Coates
Dionne
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Forrestall
Gauthier
Gilbert
Gleave
Godin
Harding
Howard (Skeena)
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Lambert (Bellechasse)
Latulippe
Lewis
MacEwan
MacInnis (Mrs.)
McGrath
Matte
Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys)
Nystrom
Orlikow
Peters
Rodrigue
Rondeau
Rose
Rowland
Tétrault
Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley)—33.

NAYS

Messrs:

Aiken
Allmand
Anderson
Andras
Asselin
Baldwin
Barrett
Béchard
Bell
Benson
Bigg
Borrie
Boulanger
Breau
Brown
Buchanan
Caccia
Cadieu (Meadow Lake)
Cadieux (Labelle)
Cafik
Chrétien
Clermont
Cobbe
Comtois
Corbin
Côté (Richelieu)
Côté (Longueuil)
Crossman
Crouse
Cullen
Danforth
Danson
Davis
Deachman
Deakon
De Bané
Dinsdale
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Downey
Drury
Dubé
Émard
Fairweather
Flemming
Forest
Forget
Foster
Francis
Gendron
Gervais
Gibson
Gillespie
Givens
Goyer
Gray
Greene
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Haidasz
Hopkins
Horner
Howe
Isabelle
Jamieson
Jerome
Kaplan
Kierans
Korchinski
Lachance
Laflamme
Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt)
Laniel
La Salle
Leblanc (Laurier)
LeBlanc (Rimouski)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Lind
Loiselle
MacDonald (Egmont)
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLean
MacRae
McCleave
McCutcheon
McIntosh
McKinley
McQuaid
Major
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Mazankowski
Monteith
Morison
Muir (Lisgar)
Munro

Division

Nesbitt
Noble
Noël
Nowlan
Olson
Orange
Osler
Paproski
Peddle
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Pilon
Portelance
Pringle
Prud'homme
Reid
Ricard
Richardson
Roberts
Robinson
Rochon
Roy (Laval)
Sharp
Skoreyko
Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Southam
Stafford
Stanfield
Stewart (Marquette)
Sullivan
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Thompson (Red Deer)
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Wahn
Walker
Watson
Whelan
Whicher
Whiting
Woolliams
Yanakis
Yewchuk—148.

● (5:00 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Stewart) who is abroad on official business.

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour) moved that Bill C-214, to amend the Canada Labour (Standards) Code, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Mackasey moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, obviously $1.65 an hour is better than $1.25 and therefore we shall not oppose this bill, although we regret it has not been improved as we proposed. I should like to say, however, that we shall hold the minister to his promise to bring in a measure this fall to review and improve the Canada Labour (Standards) Code, including a review of the question of the minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions among represen-

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard).]

tatives of the parties, and I think there might be some disposition to suspend the private members hour for today's sitting.

Mr. Speaker: Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: The hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Harding)—Pollution—Monitoring of waters receiving effluent discharges from plants using mercury; the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow)—The Canadian Economy—inflation—Restraint on bank profits in line with six per cent wage increase guideline; the hon. member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Rose)—Industry—Proposed closing of Canadian subsidiary by SKIL Corporation of Chicago.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

EXCISE ACT

AMENDING LEGISLATION

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-209 to amend the Excise Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister of National Revenue) moved that Bill C-209, to amend the Excise Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Côté moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

CANADA ELECTIONS ACT

MEASURE TO CONSOLIDATE AND REVISE

House in Committee on Bill No. C-215, respecting the franchise of electors and the

election of members to the House of Commons—Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale)—Mr. Béchard in the chair.

The Deputy Chairman: Order, please. Before calling the first of the many clauses in this bill, I should bring to the attention of hon. members of the committee the terms of the Special Order made on June 9 as found at page 7935 of *Hansard* for that date. In accordance with that order, the Chair will group any clauses containing revised provisions of the present act. The new material will be called in each case. I might add that the Chair will endeavour not to move too rapidly.

• (5:10 p.m.)

Shall subclauses 1 to 5 inclusive of clause 2 carry?

Subclauses agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall subclause 6 of clause 2 as revised carry?

On clause 2 subclause 6—*Election documents or election papers.*

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I should indicate to the House that the amendment here is the addition of the reference to proxy certificates which by this bill have been added to the Elections Act for the first time.

Subclause 6 agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall subclause 7 of clause 2 as revised carry?

On clause 2, subclause 7—*Election Officer.*

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I should explain that the change here is merely to delete the reference to the Representation Commissioner.

Subclause 7 agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall subclauses 8 and 9 of clause 2 carry?

Subclauses 8 and 9 agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall subclause 10 of clause 2 as revised carry?

On clause 2 subclause 10—*Electoral district.*

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The explanation here is that it is to delete the reference to dual ridings which no longer applies since the last redistribution.

Subclause 10 agreed to.

On clause 2 subclause 11—*Enumeration date.*

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The definition here is only a clearer definition of the exact date for the purpose of enumeration.

Subclause 11 agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall subclauses 12 to 24 inclusive of clause 2 carry?

Subclauses 12 to 24 agreed to.

On clause 2, subclause 25—*Political Affiliation.*

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The definition here is changed consequential upon the stipulation further on in the bill that political affiliation will be noted on the ballot.

Subclause 25 agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall subclauses 26 to 32 of clause 2 carry?

Subclauses 26 to 32 agreed to.

On clause 2 subclause 33—*Registered party.*

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): This is a change consequential upon the registration provision introduced in clause 13.

Subclause 33 agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall subclauses 34 to 36 inclusive of clause 2 carry?

Subclauses 34 to 36 agreed to.

On clause 2 subclause 37—*Rural polling division.*

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The change here is for the purpose of providing a slightly greater discretion for the chief electoral officer for the purpose of designating which are urban and which are rural polls. It happens, with the shifts of population in our highly mobile society and also with the frequent annexation of rural areas as part of municipal change, that some urban polls still comprise farmlands while there may be polls regarded as rural polls under the definition which, for all practical purposes, are urban. This is to give the chief electoral officer greater flexibility in designating which are urban and which are rural polls for the purpose of enumeration.

Subclause 37 agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall subclauses 38 and 39 of clause 2 carry?

Subclauses 38 and 39 agreed to.

On clause 2 subclause 40—*Urban polling division.*

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): This is the converse of the previous change.

Subclause 40 agreed to.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Asselin: Mr. Chairman, I am trying to follow you and I am wondering whether we are finished with the clause concerning the definition of the word "oath"?

Mr. Goyer: The battle of the flags.

[*English*]

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): May I point out to the hon. member—and I agree it is out of alphabetical order in the French text—that it is dealt with under subclause 19 of clause 2.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Asselin: Mr. Chairman, may I comment briefly on this clause?

[*English*]

The Deputy Chairman: Does the committee give unanimous consent to the hon. member to revert to subclause 19 of clause 2?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

On Clause 2, subclause 19, *"Oath"*.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Asselin: Mr. Chairman, I have a question for the President of the Privy Council.

The matter of the oath by members is presently an issue in Quebec where they are wondering whether the oath should be taken in the traditional manner of according to another procedure. Considering the constitutional and legal difficulties that this matter entails for certain Quebec members who are not sitting in the National Assembly because they do not want to swear allegiance as provided in the constitution, do the President of the Privy Council and his officials intend to examine the possibility of amending the constitution in order to change the traditional oath and select a procedure which would be more acceptable to certain Quebec members, instead of maintaining the formula which is still in the Elections Act?

[*English*]

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Whatever the merits of that particular proposal, may I draw the hon. member's attention to form No. 2 at page 202 of the draft. The hon. member will notice that the oath in that particular case is the oath to be taken by the returning officer. My understanding of the difficulty which has recently been experienced in the Quebec Assembly had to do with the oath of allegiance. That question of course does not arise in connection with this provision. As to the oath of allegiance, I agree it has been a question of some legal nicety, but it would be clearly beyond my jurisdiction and beyond the terms of the bill if I offered my comments at this time.

Subclause 19 agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall subclauses 41 and 42 of clause 2 carry?

Subclauses 41 and 42 agreed to.

Clause 2 agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall subclauses 1 and 2 of clause 3 carry?

Subclauses 1 and 2 agreed to.

On clause 3 subclause 3—*Communication with Governor in Council.*

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The change here is for the purpose of increasing flexibility among the members of the Privy Council who are to be responsible for the purposes of this act. Traditionally, this has been conferred specifically on the Secretary of State for Canada, but as is now apparent this function may be assigned from time to time to another member of the cabinet. The amendment will make it possible to change this responsibility from time to time without having to make an amendment to the Elections Act.

Subclause 3 agreed to.

On clause 3 subclause 4—*Salary and expenses of Chief Electoral Officer.*

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The amendment here is for the purpose of making any change in the remuneration of the chief electoral officer independent of a direct government decision which it would be if this were left to the exclusive responsibility of the Governor in Council, or alternatively to avoid the necessity to come back to the House from time to time with a statute to increase that officer's salary as circumstances might dictate. What this means, therefore, is that his salary will be subject to any changes that may occur from time to time in the remuneration under the Judges Act. It will be recalled that virtually every year the Judges Act is opened up. Therefore, any changes that will take place with regard to judges will automatically take place with regard to the chief electoral officer.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): As one of those in the standing committee who supported this change, I want to endorse it of course. But since the standing committee met and I made this determination, I find that on the passage of this provision the salary paid the chief

electoral officer will be increased over what he receives at the moment under the procedures used for setting salaries. Since the committee made that decision, somebody named Dr. Young, who has something to do with the Prices and Incomes Commission, made a statement, which I understand is government policy, about limiting salary increases to 6 per cent. I am speaking as one who supported the amendment in the committee because at that time, presumably, we were operating as agents free from any prescription set by the government or the Prices and Incomes Commission. I ask the President of the Privy Council whether, as a result of this change which would establish the salary of the Chief Electoral Officer as equal to the salary of a puisne judge of the Exchequer Court of Canada, the increase exceeds the 6 per cent policy announced by the government?

• (5:20 p.m.)

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Yes, it does. I think it is evident, Mr. Chairman, that there will be certain cases, and this is obviously one, where for a great many years the salary of the particular officer has been fixed. It would be reasonable to do this, therefore, to enable him to catch up with the position accorded to most other groups in society by reason of the change in the price level. Therefore, on this basis, I would acknowledge that is an exception to the general principle set out by the Prices and Incomes Commission, but I think it is one with which the House generally would agree.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I think the House would find it more agreeable if the 40 per cent of people who work in banks, and who fall in the extremely low category covered by the minimum wage, had their wages increased to $2 an hour, which the minister voted against a few minutes ago.

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, I, too, supported this suggested amendment in the Committee and I would like to say I think that the Chief Electoral Officer should have his remuneration looked after in this particular way. I cannot help but observe, however, that the hon. member for Skeena has in fact caught the government with its inconsistency showing a bit.

Subclause 4 agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall subclause 5 of clause 3 as revised carry?

On clause 3, subclause 5—*Superannuation and compensation.*

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the change here is to bring up to date the statutory provisions with regard to the superannuation of the Chief Electoral Officer, in line with the provisions for others in the public service.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, might I be permitted to inquire of the President of the Privy Council what regulations are referred to, or what is the connection with the regulations that may be made pursuant to section 5 of the Aeronautics Act?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): These, Mr. Chairman, are the flying accidents regulations of the Aeronautics Act. The effect of them is that where members of the public service are flying under air arrangements which would not normally be covered by policies of insurance, for example on non-scheduled airlines, they are accorded insurance under the provisions of the Aeronautics Act.

Subclause 5 agreed to.

Subclauses 6 to 12 inclusive, agreed to.

Clause 3 agreed to.

The Chairman: We are now on clause 4. Shall subclause 1 of clause 4 carry?

Some hon. Members: Carry.

Subclause 1 agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall subclause 2 of clause 4, as revised carry?

On clause 4, subclause 2—*Power to adapt Act.*

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, this is really a redrafting for greater certainty. By way of indication of the types of emergency or unusual circumstances referred to, it is my understanding that after the last general election there was a postal strike, or threat of postal strike action, which made it difficult to forward the returns by way of postal services, and they had to be returned in that case by way of air express. Rather than have any contest on that particular question this amendment is to make it clear that the Chief Electoral Officer may use all possible means to communicate this type of information, or any other type of information, where ordinary services of communication have been interrupted for any reason.

Subclause 2 agreed to.

Subclause 3 agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall subclause 4 of clause 4 as revised carry?

On clause 4, subclause 4—*Exception.*

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, we are including here a provision which is analogous to one already found in the Ontario, Quebec and Manitoba elections acts. What is involved here is really to provide a little flexibility for the Chief Electoral Officer where, for example, there happens to be a bomb scare in a polling booth, perhaps at five o'clock in the afternoon, and where as the result of safety precautions it may be necessary to clear the poll for several hours and therefore run the risk of disenfranchising a number of voters. It is subject to an over-all time limit so that the poll in total will not be open for a longer period of time, than is general under the act but this does permit that particular poll to remain open for a longer period of time than is usual. The discretion is exerciseable by the Chief Electoral Officer on the advice of the returning officer.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I realize we probably cannot cover every contingency and possibility here, but there is a provision elsewhere in the Act that no one shall publish the results of the election in one part of the country until the polls have closed in another part of the country, taking into account the time differences. Here we have a situation where a particular polling station in a particular polling division may be kept open beyond the normal closing time because of an emergency, or something unforeseen that may happen, in order to give the people in that polling division substitute time in which to cast their ballots. I am wondering whether the other provision relating to the sanction against publicizing the results of the election is included in this, or will it be permissible to publicize them in this instance? Will it be an infringement to publicize them if a polling station has to be kept open until midnight, or until three or four hours after the other stations close?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I understand that the inhibition elsewhere in the legislation applies to an entire electoral district, so that the general publication of election results elsewhere in the electoral district would not be an infringement of the statute if one or more polls were left open. I think the over-all logic is that it would be difficult to hold up the whole country while two or three polls voted.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, I was not raising this for the purpose of objecting to it, because I think it would be an impossible situation. Take the case of an accident, or of a riot, or of something of that kind happening half an hour before the polls close. You cannot possibly get that information all across Canada in that period of time. But I just wanted to ask the question so that the information will be on the record, because presumably the Chief Electoral Officer and other people may be reading the proceedings here, and if this is set out in *Hansard* there will be a clear understanding of what it means.

[The Chairman.]

Subclause 4 agreed to.

Clause 4 agreed to.

The Chairman: The committee will now consider clause 5.

Subclause 1 agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall subclause 2 of clause 5 as revised carry?

On clause 5, subclause 2—*Superannuation and compensation.*

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, the changes to apply with respect to the Assistant Chief Electoral Officer are the same as apply to the Chief Electoral Officer himself, that is to say, with respect to changes in the public service benefits.

Subclause 2 agreed to.

Clause 5 agreed to.

The Chairman: The committee will now consider clause 6, subclauses 1 to 3 inclusive.

Subclauses 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

• (5:30 p.m.)

The Chairman: The committee will now consider clause 6, subclause 4 as amended.

On clause 6, subclause 4—*Returning officers to act to enable elections to be held.*

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, there has been a general revision of the criminal provisions in the bill and this will appear later. The revision really reflects the changes in so far as they pertain to the returning officers being able to act.

Subclause 4 agreed to.

On clause 6, subclause 5—*Withdrawal of writ.*

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to present, for the consideration of the committee, on clause 6, subclause 5, paragraph (c). I assume this subclause means that in the event of flood, riot or other disaster that would prevent the holding of an election within the electoral district, the Chief Electoral Officer may cause the writ of election in that electoral district to be withdrawn and a

new writ to be issued later. The provisions of paragraph (c) of subclause 5 now read:

a new writ ordering an election shall be issued within six months—

I am sure that the Chief Electoral Officer, the President of the Privy Council and all members would agree that for a general election the decision should be made at the earliest possible date. Therefore, it seems to us that in this case six months is not necessary. I would therefore like to submit an amendment for the consideration of the committee. I hope and trust that the President of the Privy Council and other members will agree that the amendment is suitable for this purpose. I move:

That clause 6 be amended by deleting paragraph (c) from subclause 5 and substituting therefor the following:

"(c) a new writ ordering an election shall be issued within three months after publication of the notice of withdrawal of the writ in the *Canada Gazette*; and that such writ be returnable within three months after issue; and"—

Then it goes on to the succeeding paragraph. The intention of this amendment is that when a writ had been withdrawn in an electoral district because of a disaster or emergency, the Chief Electoral Officer would cause a new writ to be ordered by the Governor in Council within three months, the writ to be returnable within three months after issue. In a general election the vacancy would be filled within six months, instead of taking six months to issue the writ and then whatever period was necessary after that to hold the election. I urge that this amendment be accepted because it seems more fitting and proper to conduct the election process in this manner, particularly in a general election when all electoral districts should be settled as early as possible.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, the substance of the amendment would be acceptable, but in terms of the procedure I have one objection. The subclause provides that the election shall be conducted according to the procedures prescribed in this act for all elections. I would advise that at by-elections, writs are not returnable; therefore, the final line of the hon. member's amendment will appear not to be consistent with our procedure. I would suggest that we stand this particular subclause, consider any consequential effects it may have on the wording throughout the rest of the bill, and return to it after the dinner hour, if that is agreeable to the House.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Subclause 5, paragraph (c) stands.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment to present for the consideration of the committee. It would have the effect of adding a new subclause to clause 6. Many of us have been concerned over the years about the length of time it has taken to fill vacancies in Parliament. In years gone by vacancies were filled in a manner which nowadays would be considered nothing more than political chicanery or political manœuvring. I think members of all parties agree that the electors of any electoral district have the right to be represented in Parliament at the earliest possible date following a vacancy in the House. I believe that no party in Canada, in this modern age, desires delay when vacancies are to be filled. I appreciate that on the death of an hon. member a reasonable period should be observed, out of respect for the member, before a writ is issued. That would be natural and courteous.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, I think delays in the recent past have been longer than necessary. I do not ascribe any motives to the government. In the case of the former hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands, who died on July 10, 1968, subsequent to his election to the twenty-eighth Parliament, eight months passed before the vacancy was filled. In the case of the former hon. member for Selkirk, who resigned from this House and was successful in seeking opportunity elsewhere, 11 months passed before the vacancy was filled. At present a vacancy exists because a member of the Ralliement Créditiste resigned to sit in another chamber.

I urge upon the members of the committee an addition to this clause. I move:

That clause 6 be amended by adding thereto the following subclause:

"(6) Notwithstanding anything in this or any other act, where any vacancy happens in the House of Commons a writ ordering an election of a member of the House of Commons to fill such vacancy shall be issued within three months after the receipt by the Chief Electoral Officer of the warrant issued pursuant to the House of Commons Act, and that such writ be returnable within three months after issue."

I hope all members will favourably consider this amendment, Mr. Chairman. I know all of us would be interested in hearing the views of members from all parts of the chamber. I hope there is a general feeling that the day has long past when any government, of whatever party, would delay filling vacancies

in an electoral district at the expense of Canadians who would not have representation as soon as they should.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, the short-coming of the amendment is similar to the one already moved, in the sense that writs are only declared to be returnable in the case of a general election. More fundamental, perhaps, is the fact that the House of Commons Act regulates this particular situation and the membership of the House of Commons as it is constituted from time to time.

• (5:40 p.m.)

I would think that any amendment along those lines ought to be considered within the over-all context of that statute and not of this bill which seeks to amend the Canada Elections Act. Therefore, instead of making the change at this time we would be disposed to consider it in any future amendment to the House of Commons Act. Very likely, that measure will arise for consideration in the next session. We will, therefore, not make this change in the context of the bill now being discussed.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Chairman, I am not enthusiastic about the suggestion of the President of the Privy Council. He has merely said it is likely that the Senate and House of Commons Act will be amended in the next session. In view of the number of times we have been told it is likely that legislation apropos the Canada Development Corporation will come before the House, we take the minister's suggestion with a great deal of skepticism.

I would be more disposed to listen to the President of the Privy Council if he advanced some real arguments showing why the amendment of the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre is not now practical. Surely the minister does not want members of the House to think that the government needs freedom, for political reasons, not to call an election in any constituency for up to one year after a vacancy has occurred, and so leave that constituency unrepresented in this House. I have some experience of this situation. The former hon. member for Selkirk, who is now the Premier of Manitoba, asked me to look after certain matters relating to that constituency until the by-election could be held. I was happy to accommodate him, but I must admit that being a member who represents an urban riding I found some difficulty in dealing with the difficulties raised by the farmers of the constituency of Selkirk.

[Mr. Benjamin.]

The President of the Privy Council has not told us why any seat in this House should remain vacant for almost one year. The government may have political reasons; but I suggest to the minister that the democratic system being what it is, it is possible that the Liberal Party will not always form the government of Canada. There may come a time when it will be in opposition, and it will wish certain by-elections to be held even though the government of the day may not wish them to be held.

I suggest that we ought not to be playing politics in this kind of situation. We ought to enact rules saying that as soon as possible after a vacancy occurs, a by-election shall be held, no matter which party forms the government of the country. Therefore, if the minister has no political reasons for refusing the request of the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre, I urge him to accept the proposal of the hon. member.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, as I pointed out when replying to the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre who introduced this question, my reason for neither accepting nor rejecting the proposal put forward is that I think it should be considered in the over-all context of the House of Commons Act and not on the spur of the moment or in the manner now suggested. I would agree with the hon. member that it is patently obvious that the ability to postpone the holding of a by-election has not in any sense been of advantage to this government. The hon. member could characterize my reasons as political, but probably the sensible thing would be to deal with the matter within the context of the over-all statute and not to agree to this particular change at this time.

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre has brought forward a significant matter. This question has been dealt with in other jurisdictions. We seem to have developed a technique, if it is a technique, of prolonging vacancies. We have here a device whereby the executive arm of government is influencing improperly the composition of the legislative chamber. Other jurisdictions have, as a result of unfortunate experiences, found it expedient and wise to write into their laws provisions of the sort which the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre has brought forward.

While the suggestion may have been brought forward on the spur of the moment, in the eyes of the minister, the spirit of the suggestion is not at all new. I think events in this Parliament have served to underline the iniquity of our system whereby the executive, through inertia or other causes, can delay by-elections and thus the completion of the people's representation in Parliament.

I think any self-respecting government would wish to move as quickly as the law allows so that the people's parliamentary representatives may be installed in the law-making chamber. So I support the amendment, which I think would improve—and it is improvement that we are after—the efficacy of our system of representative government.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Chairman, may I join the mover of this amendment and my colleague the hon. member for Hillsborough in supporting this amendment. It seems that about every ten years we turn our attention in a substantive way to major changes to the Canada Elections Act. While I support the spirit of the Government House Leader's comments and think the matter ought to be looked at in the larger context, I hope the committee will not need to wait ten years for the consideration in that larger context to which he referred.

The Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Amendment (Mr. Benjamin) negatived: Yeas, 14; nays, 28.

The Chairman: I declare the amendment negatived. The committee will turn to clause 7. Shall subclause 1 of clause 7 as revised carry?

On clause 7, subclause 1—*Appointment of returning officers.*

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, may I draw to the attention of the committee a related clause. I refer to clause 114(2) on page 198 of the bill which provides:

> The Chief Electoral Officer, the Assistant Chief Electoral Officer and every other election officer appointed under the former act who held office immediately prior to the coming into force of this act shall continue to hold office with like effect as though they had been so appointed under this act.

• (5:50 p.m.)

Under the previous Elections Act, the statute enacted in 1960, the positions of returning officers were declared vacant, for whatever use it was at that time. It is the considered opinion of the Chief Electoral Officer that, particularly in light of the change in the size of the electorate and the complications which would result from having to appoint 263 new returning officers, it would be desirable to keep in office those who have had experience. This preserves the positions of the returning officers.

Mr. McGrath: What is the rate of pay for returning officers at the present time? I understand there is a retainer paid during years when there is no election, and a special rate during the time of an election. I also ask what procedures the Governor in Council follows when appointing people to fill vacancies in places where vacancies exist.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): A tariff of fees is established pursuant to clause 61(1) of the current bill. There is no fixed sum applicable to all returning officers; the amount depends upon the number of names on the electoral list and is determined during the course of each election. As to the second question, an attempt is made to appoint someone experienced in election procedures. The hon. member became a member of the House before I did, and no doubt he is familiar with the process on his side.

Mr. McGrath: If that is an indication from the minister to make a recommendation to fill the vacancy in my constituency, I will gladly comply.

Mr. Rose: Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to propose to clause 7(1). It proposes that returning officers should be appointed by the Chief Electoral Officer rather than by the Governor in Council. I make this suggestion as a result of my interest in the matter as well as on the basis of an exchange which took place in one of the earlier meetings of the Committee on Privileges and Elections at which I was present. I should like to quote from the *Minutes of Proceedings* No. 2, dated October 31, 1968, beginning at page 8.

> Mr. Rose: My question is supplementary to something Mr. MacGuigan said. He said that you and your office do not appoint the returning officers; that is done by the government.
>
> Mr. Hamel: That is correct.
>
> Mr. Rose: You see, this brings up all kinds of interesting aspects of political patronage and that kind of thing in the appointment of these various returning officers, and I am interested in knowing what kind of recommendations you might have in this connection.
>
> Mr. Hamel: I do not have any recommendations. If you go back, I think to about 1930, the Chief Electoral Officer was responsible for the appoint-

ment of the returning officers. I do not think this would be efficient because I do not have the machinery, having my office in Ottawa, if at the beginning of an election a returning officer drops dead or decides not to take the job away out in British Columbia, Alberta or in Saskatchewan, to try to find a replacement.

Mr. Rose: Do I understand, then, that the returning officers are appointed by the province or some organization within the province?

Mr. Hamel: That I do not know.

Obviously, the Chief Electoral Officer has to reply officially. He does not know. The record continues:

Mr. Hamel: How they go about getting their names, I do not know.

Mr. Rose: It seem very strange, sir, that no one knows something as vital and as basic as this and I just cannot conceive its happening. It is like the answer we got yesterday concerning the political affiliations of appointees. I am not laying this at the door of any one political party, because I think this certainly has happened under both of the major political parties, but I think we could certainly look to some other kind of method for appointing these people, because I am convinced that not always are the best people appointed for this purpose and further, that there have been some very capable ones who have been replaced regardless of the changing of the boundaries.

This is the amendment which I am proposing, Mr. Speaker:

That clause 7 be amended by deleting subclause 1 and substituting therefor the following:

"(1) The Chief Electoral Officer shall appoint a returning officer for any new electoral district, and a new returning officer for any electoral district in which the office of returning officer becomes vacant, within the meaning of subsection 2. Such vacancy to be filled after the Chief Electoral Officer has publicly advertised the vacancy, invited applications, and held open competition for the position."

I believe our civil service operates on the basis that vacancies are regularly published as they occur in the government service. In my opinion, this is an admirable method of procedure and I do not see why it cannot be followed in this instance when it concerns the staff of the Chief Electoral Officer. I am surprised that the government has not thought it wise to ensure that these appointments are made without any hint of patronage. In the past, capable people were removed and their positions given to government supporters who were not necessarily the most competent among the applicants.

These appointments offer a small crumb to some people, but one wonders why the government has not seen fit to remove the taint of party advantage from an area which is of vital concern to everyone in our democracy. I am not moving this motion because I have been personally wronged by any electoral officer, but I believe the government should show confidence in its Chief Electoral Officer's competence to make appointments of this type impartially.

[Mr. Rose.]

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed at 8 p.m.

The Chairman: Order. House again in committee of the whole on Bill C-215, an act respecting the franchise of electors and the election of members to the House of Commons.

When the committee rose at six it was considering clause 7, subclause 1 and the following amendment moved by the hon. member for Fraser Valley West:

That clause 7 be amended by deleting subclause 1 and substituting therefor the following:

"(1) The Chief Electoral Officer shall appoint a returning officer for any new electoral district, and a new returning officer for any electoral district in which the office of returning officer becomes vacant, within the meaning of subsection 2. Such vacancy to be filled after the Chief Electoral Officer has publicly advertised the vacancy, invited applications, and held open competition for the position."

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, when the hon. member for Fraser Valley West brought this amendment forward he referred at some length to an exchange that took place in the Standing Committee between himself and the Chief Electoral Officer, which seems to me probably the most effective answer to the points he was making at the time. As the Chief Electoral Officer pointed out, though I hesitate to quote him without reading his actual remarks, the system here appears to produce the most efficient way of appointing returning officers. It was also indicated at the time that up until about 1929 or 1930 they were appointed in the manner suggested by the hon. member. Then the House, nearly 40 years ago, changed the procedure so that they would be appointed by the Governor in Council and ever since that time this particular proposal has been in effect.

I understand it was the statement of a former Chief Electoral Officer, who operated under the older system, that the reinstitution of the system which in effect got him into controversy in a particular constituency by choosing the returning officer, would be a resigning matter as far as he was concerned. In other words, the law was changed specifi-

cally because of unhappy experience with the exact procedure that the hon. member is suggesting in this regard.

One other aspect of the hon. member's amendment which seems to me to be a good reason for recommending that the committee reject it is that there are other provisions in the statute—in particular subsection 5 of clause 7—for the purpose of the early filling of a vacancy, so there will not be a delay, and providing that the returning officer shall be appointed within 60 days. The procedure put forward by the hon. member, however, is a lengthy one with regard to which there can be no assurance whatever that within 60 days, or at any particular time, a vacancy would be filled. In other words, in order to carry out the procedure proposed by the hon. member, a particular constituency could find itself several weeks before an election campaign without a returning officer, and because of the restrictions that he imposes, without the ability of appointing one at an early date.

On that basis, Mr. Chairman, both because Parliament long ago rejected the proposal and because it will not provide, to adopt a term that has been used, for the efficiency of appointment, I recommend to the committee that it reject this amendment.

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, I think it is of the essence that every way we can find to reduce even the suggestion of partisan input into our election procedures should be welcomed. I am somewhat attracted to the proposal of the mover of this amendment. I notice that in several sections of the bill steps have been taken to put beyond question or reproach even any slight suggestion of partisanship. In the holding of an election, surely any distinction between a party in power and a party seeking power must be removed just as completely as is possible in all practical circumstances. I think it is well that we consider ways and means to reduce even the possibility of accusing a group in power of using the fact that they are in power for purposes other than the best purposes.

I am not suggesting that in our day and age elections have not been well conducted in this country, though in an earlier day that was not the case. I remember reading of an experience in the nineteenth century when nominations were made at an open meeting. The sheriff of one county did not tell the opposition party where the meeting was going to be held, and there was no one there to nominate the opposition candidates. As a result, there was an acclamation. However, things have been much better in recent times. If we could move toward de-politicizing—if I may use a terrible expression—our election campaigns to this extent, it would be a very good idea. When enumerators are appointed, the whole matter is carefully looked into; you have one designated by one party and one by another, so there is an assurance that you have reduced to the minimum any possible suggestion of partisanship. If we could do this with the returning officer, I think it would be a very good idea.

If I remember history correctly, I think at the time of the plebiscite that Mr. Mackenzie King called there was a procedure whereby in odd numbered polling divisions the deputy returning officer was the nominee of the government party, and in even numbered polling divisions he was the designate of the second running party. These are devices whereby you establish a good, proper, non-political basis which is of the essence in our electoral process. This is my point of view, and I support the amendment.

The minister was dilating this afternoon about the value of experience in the office of returning officer. Before we proceed further with this clause I wonder whether he could tell us how many of the returning officers who were appointed in the aftermath of the 1960 legislation are still functioning, because I agree with him that there is value in the experience of good people.

• (8:10 p.m.)

Mr. Otto: Mr. Chairman, before we become involved in the de-politicizing, or whatever the term is, let me make some comments in the privacy of this House. I see we have complete privacy because there is no one to report us. Let us consider what the result of this amendment would be. The Chief Electoral Officer would be very careful not to choose anyone with political ideals either Conservative, Liberal or NDP. This would automatically eliminate about 80 per cent of the people who know something about politics and about the running of elections. The Chief Electoral Officer would look for someone who had never been involved in political activity of any nature and who did not know a poll sheet from any other document. Such a person would have to be trained. This is the type of person who would be a returning officer.

In addition, about five years ago the Prime Minister decided it would be a good idea to take patronage completely away from all appointments. Where did we turn? We could

not go to the general field of economics or industry in order to find people, because they were involved politically with the Liberal Party, the Conservative Party or the NDP. It was decided that academicians of the universities would be suitable because no one could say that they were partisan. Eventually the various commission appointments were filled by academicians—good natured souls, mind you, but people who have very little experience in the outside world. So in their little Valhalla they set down rules which in theory are perfect but which in practice have no application at all. Why should we penalize anyone who has been involved in political activity? What has such a person done that would warrant his being eliminated entirely?

An hon. Member: No one suggested that.

Mr. Otto: That is what an hon. gentleman across the way said. He said we should take politics away from these appointments. It was suggested that if a person is to be appointed as a judge, a commissioner, a returning officer, and so on, he should never take part in politics. In other words, the suggestion is: Never vote. Do not become involved. This is in fact what has been said.

I say it is time we reviewed this whole question. I see nothing evil in being involved with one political party or another. I can conceive of the Governor in Council obtaining an even better group of men from those who have been involved in politics than from those who have not.

Mr. Rowland: Mr. Chairman, I feel obliged to reply to the arguments put before the committee by the hon. member who has just spoken because he is drawing from this amendment a conclusion which should not be drawn. Such an interpretation has no place in our discussion of the amendment. The sole purpose of the amendment is to ensure that the most competent people are selected to fill the position of returning officer. For obvious reasons, this would not eliminate a person merely because he had been involved in politics. Indeed, I think any intelligent Chief Electoral Officer would consider intimate involvement in politics to be a "plus" factor in the selection of a returning officer.

This amendment does not in any way indicate that a person must be non-partisan. It simply indicates that he must acquire the position as a result of an open competition. What it does mean is that if there should be a Liberal government in office, all the returning officers would not be former Liberals; and if there should be a Conservative government in office, all the returning officers would not be former Conservatives. Similarly, if an NDP government should be in office, all the returning officers would not be members of the New Democratic Party. It simply means that there would be a competition and the most competent applicant would fill the position. That is the point; anything else is totally irrelevant to the question. On that basis I urge the committee to adopt this amendment.

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, I thank the hon. member for Selkirk for apologizing, on my behalf, for things I did not say and for interpretations I did not mean. No one is suggesting that the appointees be political neuters: they must become that, because the law does not allow them to vote when the poll is open. I was suggesting that politicizing be withdrawn from the appointing product rather than from the end product. I do not agree that one must be partisan in order to be competent. I can conceive of the independent voters managing the Elections Act, too.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a few words—

The Chairman: Order, please. I will recognize the hon. member after the hon. member for Fraser Valley West.

Mr. Rose: Mr. Chairman, I would gladly withdraw if I could be the last speaker. The hon. member would then have my permission to go ahead, but in the event that committee of the whole procedure precludes this kind of generosity, I should like to proceed. It seems to me that the arguments against my amendment have been approached from the wrong premise. I do not accept the type of argument rendered by the hon. member for York East, to the effect that my amendment means that people who have taken an active interest in politics should by virtue of their interest be precluded.

We are interested in obtaining the best possible people to fill the position of returning officer. My concern is that the best possible people be appointed by the government for the position of returning officer. I feel that the fact the government is involved in various partisan considerations might tend to make it appoint persons who are favourable to its political party.

Essentially, I am asking that there be an open type of competition in which people who have been involved in partisan politics

from the point of view of scrutineer, enumerator, returning officer, and so on, would have a free hand in submitting applications to the Chief Electoral Officer for consideration by him in his wisdom, intelligence and great experience in dealing with this type of person, rather than the appointment being made through the Governor in Council.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, I should like to support the amendment, but I am not so naïve as to believe that over the years governments have amended the act so that they could obtain returning officers who were more favourable to their own cause. Let us get down to brass tacks. What we need is something exactly like the amendment now before the committee. This situation is similar to that in respect of redistribution. That is something I always oppose.

It was said that judges should be appointed to the redistribution commissions because they were independent persons. Unfortunately, in various areas judges were politicians before they became judges. Therefore, we had as much politics in redistribution as we would have had had we turned the matter over to a committee of the Senate and House of Commons. If any member should stand in his place now and suggest that parties do not play politics with regard to this act, in relation to returning officers, they should examine their own conscience or their own people. They have all been playing politics. The NDP have not been in office federally, but they were in office in my home province and I did not see any non-politics there.

• (8:20 p.m.)

Mr. Dinsdale: You should see them in Manitoba.

Mr. Woolliams: I have not seen them there. But they would be no better and no worse than the Conservatives or the Liberals so far as bringing in this bill is concerned. Let us not fool ourselves. But at least the hon. member's amendment tries to bring about some justice. We know that every time there is a new government, it amends the Elections Act. The purpose is not to give a greater franchise to the people of Canada—it is time somebody said this—but to appoint men who might give the government a small advantage here and there.

I support the amendment wholeheartedly. We are all politicians; we would not be here if we were not. We all have certain advantages, and people appointed to positions by governments are generally political animals. Once in a while the government appoints one Tory and 19 Liberals to make it look as if they are just, and another government might do it the other way round. Let us stop this nonsense of saying that the other parties are more political than we are. We are political beasts and we like having a little advantage here and there. Let us get the best advantage for ourselves. But if an amendment is proposed that will lift us a little above that level and away from that influence, I am for it.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Chairman, I would join the hon. member for Calgary North in expressing a comment or two about this amendment. I am one of those who admit to being a political animal from time to time. But I am one of those who—I have no hesitation in confessing it—in the few years that I have been here have found it a lot more enjoyable to work for people for all but two months of the four or five years that a government is in office, and at that time to be a little political.

While I support this amendment—I have no hesitation in doing so, largely for the reasons enumerated by my colleague—I think that in fairness it should be brought to the attention of the committee, its acceptance would give rise to serious questions about other procedures under the act. It is to the other procedures that I should like to direct my attention: not only to the procedure that involves partisan politics in the selection of returning officers and their clerks, but to the entire procedure to which we must direct our attention from 1970 onward.

I am not about to say that political appointees are not competent. I hope I misunderstood my hon. friend when he expressed what I understood to be that opinion, because I believe that regardless of their political beliefs, when people are considered for roles such as this they are by and large competent. But what is important is that we do not strip—I simply mention this for what it is worth—the political process in Canada of the means of adequately prosecuting general elections.

The point has been made by the minister, and I think validly so, that there are times when the returning officers must seek local advice. It is not always possible at the eleventh hour for the returning officer responsible for the prosecution of an election in a given electoral district to secure the required replacement, if that is what the problem is, and he must turn to somebody for advice and

direction. There is not always time the day before the election to run an advertisement in a newspaper and to secure a list of candidates from which he can select an appropriate returning officer.

I draw this matter to the attention of the committee, and at the same time I run the risk of being contradictory when I say that notwithstanding this very apparent difficulty and the very difficult position in which we might place the Chief Electoral Officer, and indeed the voters in a given riding, it is perhaps time, in 1970, that we devised a more efficient way of securing the appropriate officers who are required to prosecute elections.

The amendment very clearly has merit. I only hope that in the wisdom of the chamber, if we decide to accept the amendment we will look with charity at consequential amendments that will have to be made, some of which will be moved by myself. I commend the amendment to the committee. I do so on the basis of 14 or 15 years' experience of dealing directly with these matters. The matter should be taken out of the hands of political organizations, because this is in fact what we are talking about.

It does not matter how much we try to hide it, it does not matter how much we try to get around the basic fact of the matter: what happens in truth is well known to all of us, and in many instances has caused some of us who have had responsibility in running elections, both on our own behalf and in assisting others, considerable difficulty, particularly during the latter stages of general election campaigns. I sincerely urge hon. members who are here tonight to reflect for a moment or two on the merit of this amendment. If in their wisdom they decide that it should be rejected, I ask each of them individually to make a plea to the Government House Leader who is responsible for the passage of this bill to make sure that this item is included in the promised review for this fall.

The Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Amendment (Mr. Rose) negatived: Yeas, 23; nays, 36.

• (8:30 p.m.)

On clause 6, subclause 5, paragraph (c).

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, this afternoon the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre proposed an amendment to subclause (c)—

[Mr. Forrestall.]

Mr. Rose: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, do I conclude from the House Leader's intervention that we are moving to another clause, because I have another amendment on clause 7 which I would like to submit for the consideration of the committee?

The Chairman: Order, please. The procedure, as I understand it, is that we are now reverting back to clause 6(5)(c), which was stood this afternoon, to deal with an amendment moved by the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre, after which we will return to clause 7(1). Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, the substance of the hon. member's amendment was to require a new writ under this clause within three months rather than six months after publication of the notice of withdrawal. The advantage of the dinner hour has been used for the purpose of examining the legal effect of the amendment proposed. I have an alternative wording here, and if it were acceptable to him and to the committee, the hon. member's amendment might be withdrawn. The amendment suggested is as follows:

(a) by striking out lines 30 to 33 on page 13 and substituting the following:

'(c) a new writ ordering an election shall be issued within three months after publication of the notice of withdrawal of the writ in the *Canada Gazette;*

(d) a day not later than three months after the date of issue of the new writ of election shall be named in the new writ as the day fixed for the holding of the poll; and

Then there is a further, consequential amendment:

(b) by renumbering paragraph (d) of subclause 5 of clause 5 as paragraph (e).

If that meets the substance of the hon. member's amendment, perhaps he would be willing to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to have the advice of the President of the Privy Council and of his legal advisers. My legal advisers consist of the hon. member for Skeena and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, and I may say I am glad the trial is not any more serious. I believe that the new wording the President of the Privy Council has presented means what I intended to present in my amendment, that a by-election, in the event of this circumstance, would have been completed within six

months. As long as that objective is achieved, I am quite prepared to withdraw my amendment and accept the wording of the amendment of President of the Privy Council.

The Chairman: Does the hon. member have leave to withdraw his amendment?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Amendment (Mr. Benjamin) withdrawn.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Perhaps I could give the hon. member the assurance that my understanding is that this amendment will mean six months plus one week.

Mr. Benjamin: That is better than it used to be.

Mr. Forest: Mr. Chairman, I move:

That Bill C-215 be amended

(a) by striking out lines 30 to 33 on page 13 and substituting the following:

'(c) a new writ ordering an election shall be issued within three months after publication of the notice of withdrawal of the writ in the *Canada Gazette;*

(d) a day not later than three months after the date of issue of the new writ of election shall be named in the new writ as the day fixed for the holding of the poll; and

(b) by renumbering paragraph (d) of subclause 5 of clause 5 as paragraph (e).

Amendment (Mr. Forest) agreed to.

Clause 6 as amended agreed to.

The Chairman: The committee will now return to the consideration of clause 7(1).

On clause 7, subclause 1—*Appointment of returning officers.*

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, before we proceed with the amendment indicated by the hon. member for Fraser Valley West, I rise on a matter of order. I do so in a very expansive and generous way, to point out that the Chief Electoral Officer is in reality, as I understand it, an officer of Parliament and not an officer in the sense that a member of the public service is an officer attached to a particular department.

It is true that the Chief Electoral Officer is here on the floor of this House. I have some doubt about the propriety of that, but that is another matter. He is here with a very attractive young lady whose position I do not know so far as the Chief Electoral Officer is concerned. The question I want to raise is that the office of the Chief Electoral Officer being one of Parliament, it should not be one, just by proximity to the President of the Privy Council, to be in any way considered as a position seconded to the President of the Privy Council as a member of the cabinet.

I am sure that Mr. Hamel and the office of the Chief Electoral Officer are available during tonight's sitting, as was the case this afternoon, to any member who wants to consult them about the technicalities, legalities and other details of anything involved in this legislation. But I think that this office and its facilities, being an office of Parliament and not a partisan one—not attached to government or opposition—should be available to opposition groups who are as concerned as the government about developing the Elections Act so that it will meet the requirements and the needs of the people of this nation in their election of Members of Parliament.

I do not know whether we could arrive at some arrangement in this respect. I realize that the Chief Electoral Officer cannot be jumping from one party to another in the developing of amendments and in suggestions about them, but the office of the Chief Electoral Officer should be available to all parties and all groups in this House as easily as it is to the President of the Privy Council at the moment.

Whether it is possible to work this out at the moment, I do not know. There may be some technicalities involved in doing so. But I think it is incumbent upon us in this House, and upon you, Mr. Chairman, to look upon this question as having great validity. The hon. member for Hillsborough and the people associated with him in the Conservative Party who have spent a fair amount of time over the years, before many members came to this House, dealing with electoral reform and the Elections Act, should have available to him and to the group associated with him the expertise and knowledge that exists within the office of the Chief Electoral Officer. My friend from Regina-Lake Centre should not have to rely upon the highly incompetent legal advice that he says he gets from myself and from the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. He should be able to draw on something much more knowledgeable than that. I raise the point and leave it with the committee for comment. I think it is a very worth-while point that we should consider.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, I would like to make it perfectly clear, on behalf of the Chief Electoral Officer, that the opinion of the hon. member for Skeena is correct, that he is an officer of Parliament

and that he is and will be available to all hon. members from time to time as they may need assistance. In terms of physical mobility around the floor of the chamber, I am open to suggestions as to how he could be made more available than he is now. But I am advised that the procedure now being followed, with the Chief Electoral Officer advising the minister who is conducting the passage of the bill, was the procedure followed when the House last had the Elections Act before it in 1960, and it was the practice followed in years before that. So I would make it perfectly clear that he is not the exclusive adviser of the government. If there are to be amendments which may involve technical advice on their consequential effect on other parts of the act, I think it might be necessary to postpone them. In terms of legal advice, may I take the opportunity to introduce to the House Miss Edythe I. MacDonald—she is no relation—of the Department of Justice, who has done a first-class job of redrafting this bill.

• (8:40 p.m.)

Mr. Forrestall: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, if I may—

The Chairman: I take it we are still dealing with the point of order. I do not know whether the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East is still on the point of order. I will hear him on it.

Mr. Forrestall: In connection with the point of order, Mr. Chairman, I would bring to your attention that just now, in the middle of the hon. member's remarks, I sought the advice of the Chief Electoral Officer. I suggest to my hon. friend, not necessarily because it strikes me as being funny, that if his feet were as big as his tongue he could have walked across the chamber and done the same thing.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Chairman, it seems to me there is a very simple way of solving this problem. Mr. Hamel could sit over there, and Miss MacDonald could sit over here with us.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rondeau: Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a few remarks on clause 1, which stipulates that the governor in council may appoint a returning officer and—

[*English*]

The Chairman: Order, please. I am prepared to recognize the hon. member. I take it that in the spirit of amicability, the point of order raised by the hon. member for Skeena has been resolved to the satisfaction of both sides; but I am not sure if that includes the proposal just made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. I will leave that matter to the members of the committee to work out.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Yes, it does.

Mr. Rose: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. You said a moment ago that you were not certain whether the point of order had been completely dealt with, and perhaps I could be allowed to make one or two remarks. I suggest to Your Honour that a Chief Electoral Officer must maintain as part of his office a position of complete virtue and be undefiled by any kind of partisan politics. He seems to be contiguous, in his physical position, to the President of the Privy Council. I suggest that it might be possible for him to move around or to have some kind of mobility whereby he could advise the various parties in the House on a more equal basis than is presently the case.

The Chairman: I suggest that we have explored the point of order to the satisfaction of the committee. If arrangements of this kind are to be made, I would leave them to the members of the committee to negotiate privately.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rondeau: Mr. Chairman, as I said a minute ago, I should like to make a few remarks on clause 7(1) which stipulates that the governor in council may appoint or remove from office a returning officer. This leads us to subclauses (2) and (3).

In those subclauses, we are not told what procedure must be followed to remove a returning officer from office. Paragraphs (c) (d) and (e) provide no procedure whereby reasons can be given to the government.

This means that the governor in council alone, in practice, may appoint or remove from office a returning officer, regardless of what the complaints may be. As for me, I would have valid and justifiable complaints to put forward. No procedure is provided in the law whereby I could have a returning officer removed. This is still the prerogative of the governor in council according to the legislation submitted again this year.

Actually, these amendments to the act are incomplete for they make no provision for enabling hon. members or anyone else to bring about the removal, supported by evidence, on the strength of reasonable and proven complaints, of a returning officer who might not have performed his functions normally.

I should like the President of the Privy Council to show me how one could, with proper evidence, recommend to the governor in council the removal of a returning officer who had repeatedly failed to do his duty.

I should very much like the President of the Privy Council to enlighten us on the procedure to be followed to have a returning officer removed under clause (3) (e).

[*English*]

The Chairman: Order, please. I thought at the end of the hon. member's remarks he referred to clause 7, subclause 3. I would point out that we have not yet reached that subclause.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rondeau: I can understand your point of view, Mr. Chairman, but since clause 7 (1) provides that the governor in council may appoint a new returning officer for any electoral district in which the office of returning officer becomes vacant, I should like the President of the Privy Council to give me some explanations.

[*English*]

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, I understood the hon. member to be referring to paragraphs (a) to (f) of subclause 3. Since we are on subclause 1, apart altogether from the Special Order of the House, I wonder if this is the right time to ask the question.

Mr. Rose: Mr. Chairman, I stated earlier that I had another amendment to propose to clause 7 (1). Before I do that, I should like to congratulate government members for being here in such large numbers tonight. I think it demonstrates their keen interest in the subject of electoral reform.

I should also like to say that I anticipated the reply of the Government House Leader in negating my previous amendment and I am prepared to propose, with a great deal of magnanimity, a compromise amendment. I say it is a compromise amendment in the sense that I do not know whether my previous amendment was taken seriously. I know that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister suggested to me that I was just having fun with my previous amendment. Through you, Mr. Chairman, I would reply that, like the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, I am serious even when smiling. It was not a facetious amendment.

I think my compromise amendment recognizes that we are discussing a very thorny political point. Because of the government's reaction, I wonder if they are really sincere about ruling non-partisanship out of the vital position of Chief Electoral Officer. What partisan advantage could accrue by avoiding the appointment of returning officers by the Chief Electoral Officer, who is himself supposed to be a non-partisan appointee of the Crown? What possible advantage could accrue to the government's having the Chief Electoral Officer, in whom I have a great deal of confidence, make these appointments?

• (8:50 p.m.)

Before I read this amendment I am prepared to release it so that government members and opposition members can discuss it or at least consider it. I do not suggest that the Chief Electoral Officer should appoint people who are devoid of political experience. The appointment of electoral workers, people like poll clerks, organizers, scrutineers and district returning officers, ought to be considered. The appointment of election workers of all the parties ought to be considered. There should be appointments from the Social Credit party, the New Democratic Party, the Progressive Conservative party and the Liberal party.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rose: Because these people are interested in politics, they probably know far more about running elections than those who do not care about the electoral process. I suggest that if we appoint people who have taken an interest in one or other of our political parties or who, because of their close association with one or other political party have gained political experience, such appointments would be of advantage to the people of Canada. They ought to be appointed by the Governor in Council. I therefore move:

That clause 7 be amended by deleting subclause 1 and substituting therefor the following:

(1) The Governor in Council, upon the recommendation of the Chief Electoral Officer, shall appoint a returning officer for any new electoral district, and a new returning officer for any electoral district in which the office of returning officer becomes vacant, within the meaning of subsection

2. Such vacancy to be filled after the Chief Electoral Officer has publicly advertised the vacancy, invited applications and held open competition for the position.

I repeat what I said when speaking to my previous amendment. It is important that this electoral office should remain open and available to applicants, regardless of party, who are most competent to perform this very vital task.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, the alternative amendment of the hon. member meets neither of the principal points I raised when speaking to his previous amendment. In our electoral system we are not without experience in putting the Chief Electoral Officer in the position where he must seek out and select as between individuals in a constituency. As I said before, the Chief Electoral Officer who occupied the position at the time the law was changed indicated that he would think it most unfortunate if he were again put in the position of having to make that choice. He was prepared to shift the choice on to the shoulders of the Governor in Council.

The second point which I raised, and which the hon. member has not considered, is that an open competition of this kind, particularly in circumstances where a quick appointment may be necessary, will not be effective and could well leave one or more constituencies without returning officers. Under the system which is in vogue we have the advantage, as the Chief Electoral Officer pointed out in the passage taken from the proceedings of the committee which the hon. member read, that we can efficiently fill vacancies when, as is often the case, there is a great rush, and thus make certain that each constituency has a returning officer before an election is held.

It seems to me that the amendment meets neither of the two points I raised earlier. It does not really deal with those two substantial objections, both of which arise on the basis of experience accepted by this House, which has been the basis of the Elections Act for some time.

An hon. Member: Question.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Chairman, I was taken by surprise when you asked me whether I wanted to raise a point of order. I thought we would keep on discussing the remark made by the hon. member for Shefford when he said that there is no provision in this bill that would enable me to secure the removal of a returning officer who had resorted, for instance, to unacceptable practices.

Therefore, I believe—

[*English*]

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Chairman: Order, please. A point of order has been raised in committee and I wish to comment on it. It seems that we are involved in a dispute between two hon. members on the meaning of a clause we have not yet agreed to.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Chairman: Order, please. On reflection, it seems to me that the hon. member for Shefford was dealing with clause 7, subclause 3, and the point he has raised should be raised when we reach that subclause. At that point I will be prepared to recognize the hon. member for Trois-Rivières.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Chairman, I am under the impression that you did not understand the meaning of my remark. There was certainly no intention on my part to try to pick a quarrel with the hon. member for Shefford, far from it. He asked a question to which I replied in a very friendly way, giving him at the same time a source of references. That is all. Let us leave it at that.

[*English*]

Mr. Dinsdale: Mr. Speaker, I would support the amendment that has been moved by my hon. friend for Fraser Valley West because I think it represents the sort of compromise that is required if we are to circumvent the sensitivity that is involved in straight political appointments of this kind. The President of the Privy Council has indicated that the Chief Electoral Officer is not anxious to become involved in the process of appointing returning officers. As I understand it, under the compromise amendment put forward by the hon. member for Fraser Valley West, the ultimate responsibility lies in the hands of the Governor in Council and the Chief Electoral Officer would only be acting in an advisory capacity.

Speaking as one who has experienced eight elections, I can confirm the fact that the role of returning officer is of vital importance in ensuring the proper and efficient conduct of an election campaign. It seems to me that the Chief Electoral Officer, who has had very

close association with the returning officers and, through them, with the candidates in the constituencies of Canada, might be able to channel the experience that has been gained by those who have participated in elections by ensuring that each candidate involved in the electoral process, or the representative of each of the parties contesting a constituency in an election, is consulted. In that way they could make recommendations as to who might be the most suitable person to handle this very sensitive task. This, I think, would get around the problem which concerns all hon. members with regard to clause 7. There is an amendment which indicates that the office is now to be made permanent, subject to certain reservations. I think this is an excellent compromise. The Chief Electoral Officer can consult the candidates or the representatives of the parties who have contested the election and make his recommendation to the Governor in council. It would then be the responsibility of the Governor in Council, in the final analysis, to make a choice.

• (9:00 p.m.)

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Chairman, I rise to add what I hope will be some reasonably convincing words in support of the motion moved by the hon. member for Fraser Valley West, and favourable to what we regard as a compromise more acceptable to the President of the Privy Council than the motion we moved earlier. In reality, under the terms of this amendment, the Governor in Council still has the final say. Nevertheless, a measure of impartiality would have gone into the process of selection of these senior electoral officers.

I was a little worried earlier this evening in case the idea got around outside the chamber that there was a contest to see how many of their experienced people each political party could get hired by the Chief Electoral Officer. The point we were trying to make was this: there is nothing wrong in being partisan or in having experience of the political process on behalf of a political party. But the Chief Electoral Officer has to work with whoever is selected as a returning officer, and it seems to me he should have some say in the selection. If the President of the Privy Council would accept this amendment, I could think of a person who has been for a number of years an organizer in the Liberal party and who would make a first-class returning officer. He has never behaved in a vicious manner; he has always acted in a positive and constructive way, and he probably knows more about the election law in that province than does his returning officer.

An hon. Member: Then how is it he is a Liberal?

Mr. Benjamin: The fact that he has come up against honest competition might have helped. The election law is reviewed every eight or ten years. There is not a party in this chamber or outside which does not agree the time is long past due to place in the hands of a person in whom we all have confidence the responsibility for recommending the officers he would like to work with him. The Chief Electoral Officer might provide three choices to the Governor in Council. He might recommend two or three people after considering their abilities and holding a competition. Whoever is chosen, he will have had some say as to the calibre of the people who will fill these senior positions. If the Governor in Council, in its wisdom, was not satisfied with the recommendations, it could ask the Chief Electoral Officer to submit further names. So the point raised by the minister is met by the proposal in this amendment. We would in fact present an electoral law which finally provided for a new method of selecting the 264 people who will run and supervise our election procedures in the constituencies of Canada.

If it would make the amendment more acceptable, the word "shall" in the fourth line could be replaced by the word "may". The point is to provide an element of examination and selection by the Chief Electoral Officer prior to a recommendation to the Privy Council. We believe that here is an opportunity to make an improvement in the law, in a bipartisan manner, for the first time since 1962 or 1963—and if that would not be refreshing to the public of Canada, I do not know what would be. I urge hon. members in all quarters of the House carefully to consider this proposal.

Mr. Wahn: Mr. Chairman, I can hardly believe there has been a more important bill before the Commons this session than the present measure, one which is concerned with a vital part of the democratic process. All of us have an interest in making sure it is the best statute we can possibly enact. As an important election official, a returning officer should be non-partisan in the performance of his duties and we should do our best to ensure that this will be the case.

I do not know that I can support the amendment which has been made, because I have not had the opportunity to consider the practical difficulties which may be involved. I appreciate the extent of the problem mentioned by the President of the Privy Council. Nevertheless, I would urge that these should not be partisan appointments. There should be a method of ensuring that those appointed perform their tasks fairly. Since it is unlikely that this massive bill will get through the House this evening, I wonder whether this clause might be stood, to give hon. members an opportunity to see whether an amendment could be worked out which would be fair to all parties. It may be that we on this side will not hold office indefinitely, though it is hard for me to contemplate the possibility of losing it, except on the basis that all things change. I would like to feel that the important office of returning officer in any riding is determined on a basis which is obviously fair and acceptable to all members of the Canadian public.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, the suggestion made by the hon. member for St. Paul's commends itself in my judgment and that of my hon. friends. I hope the minister will respond to the question we asked before we conclude this matter. If he is deficient in information, I imagine he has means of getting it. If he is deficient in courtesy, I have no immediate suggestion to make.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Unfortunately, I have no record of the number of returning officers we replaced the last time the positions were declared vacant, nor do I have any record of the number replaced in 1960 when the hon. gentleman was chairman of the committee and caused all the positions to be vacated at that time.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: He was not chairman then.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I am prepared to inquire from the Chief Electoral Officer whether I can get that information from him. Perhaps we could get that information for the hon. member.

• (9:10 p.m.)

With regard to the comments of the hon. member for St. Paul's and other hon. gentlemen in regard to the importance of being able to act quickly and effectively, this is perhaps illustrated by the following figures indicating experience during the last six general election campaigns with respect to filling of vacancies in the two-week period on either side of the date the writ is issued. In 1957 there was one returning officer appointed in that period; in 1958 there were 17 returning officers appointed; in 1962 there were three; in 1963 there were 12; in 1965 there were four; in 1968 there were 14.

I think it is clear, particularly in view of the fairly strict qualifications in terms of residence and otherwise of returning officers set out later in the section, that this is a situation wherein there has to be some swiftness. In the proposal suggested in the amendment, which deals with advertising the vacancy, in the coming and going and putting of names, having them rejected, and so on, this swiftness does not exist.

I suggest that the amendment does not effectively deal with the fact that there is a need in each election campaign to act swiftly. The hon. member for Fraser Valley West commented that he had suffered no disadvantage from returning officers, whatever the existing system might be, and this seems to me the best answer. It has operated fairly and as the Chief Electoral Officer himself has said, this is the most efficient method.

Mr. Rowland: Mr. Chairman, I have a very brief intervention. I would suggest that the President of the Privy Council, in consultation with the Chief Electoral Officer and his legal advisers, consider drafting a further subsection to cover the necessity for occasionally appointing returning officers in a crisis situation through the Governor in Council, subject to the procedure outlined in this amendment being pursued after the general election is completed. I am sure that such an amendment would not be beyond his inventiveness. I hope that this suggestion, if it has not already occurred to him, will be considered and the clause stood so that he may draft such an amendment.

Mr. Otto: Mr. Chairman, I can well understand why the NDP are sponsoring this amendment, it is because there is no chance of that party ever assuming power. In 1960 the present loyal opposition were quite sure they would maintain power and they made no suggestion along the lines of this amendment. It is unfortunate that, having reached a position so devoid of hope of ever being in power, they are now supporting this amendment. However, I say to them, "Take heart; this may not be the situation forever."

I intervene in this debate because I have heard it said, on this side of the House as well as on the other, that this amendment seems to be a rational one, on the assumption that the Chief Electoral Officer wants to be burdened with making this choice, supposedly through some sort of open competition. If he were to appoint a certain number of NDP'ers or Conservatives, there would be a holocaust of criticism from the other party, and this he does not want. Where is he going to find refuge? After all, it is the Chief Electoral Officer who is now guiding the bill, with the assistance of the President of the Privy Council; I do not think it is the other way around. He does not want to be saddled with this burden.

The suggestion was made that the final choice was that of the Governor in Council. Imagine a situation where the Chief Electoral Officer has made a judicious choice of returning officers, and yet the Governor in Council—the cabinet—rejects them. This would put an officer of Parliament in confrontation with the cabinet. The fact is that the Governor in Council does not have the final choice; such suggestion is a fallacy. The choice has to be entirely the responsibility of the Chief Electoral Officer, and he does not want this responsibility. Members of the party in power have, by chance, been elected returning officers and they have been good ones. No one has ever complained that they were inefficient or that they had done something wrong. I suggest we have had a good system and that no one has devised a better one, one that does not involve confrontation between the Chief Electoral Officer and the government of Canada.

Mr. Nesbitt: Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest to the experienced and inexperienced views of a number of members who have spoken on this matter. I was particularly interested in the remarks made by the last speaker. He pointed out that since the system had worked rather well in the past, it should, if I understood him correctly, be continued. I was surprised at his remarks in view of the analogous situation described by the Minister of Justice in regard to the appointment of judges. No one wants judges appointed on a partisan basis. It has been suggested that a new system be devised whereby the bar associations recommend to the Governor in Council appointees to the bench. I do not think I have heard any disagreement from anybody to this proposal. The situation there is analogous to the one here.

This amendment suggests that the Chief Electoral Officer recommends one or two people to the Governor in Council. I cannot understand how any serious objection could be taken to this. As I say, it is similar to the proposal of the Minister of Justice in regard to the appointment of judges. I think it is a splendid idea and I cannot see why the governing party should object to it. However, under the present regime we have become accustomed to the attitude of the government that no member in any part of the House other than on the government side has any ideas of merit to put forward. There is never any disposition on the government side of the House to accept suggestions made by members in other quarters of the House.

The President of the Privy Council has very eloquently tried to explain that there might be a situation where there is no time to make an appointment. Personally, I cannot swallow this argument and I do not think anybody else can. All I can say is that the old motto of the Liberal party—power, patronage and perpetuity—has been eloquently exemplified by the President of the Privy Council and his cohorts.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take up very much time. I do not think we are going to change the system one way or the other. I suppose in respect of the returning officer of a district 50 per cent of the names in urban ridings come from sitting members and 50 per cent from the other parties. In the rural ridings they all come from those who were lucky enough to win the previous election.

As I see it—and I have had experience of several elections—those people who happen to enumerate someone land up in the headquarters of the particular parties they want to land up in. I do not think we should waste any more time. We know this is going to be a partisan matter. I do not mind something being partisan if I know about it. But I did not like that "independent" redistribution when we knew that certain judges were above partisanship but yet they carved up Bow River constituency into five separate ridings; and they were so "independent" they received a phone call from Pickersgill before it happened. That is the kind of "independence" that I like.

• (9:20 p.m.)

I do not mind partisanship. I have always believed we should be clean. The New Democratic Party is above reproach. We had them

in Saskatchewan. They were very clean fellows. We never knew of any partisanship there. The provincial treasurer graduated with me, and we were both broke together. He left with $2 million or $3 million to live elsewhere after he was provincial treasurer. All this political morality had better end now. I am ready to get on with the other business.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. member for Calgary North to enumerate the $2 million or $3 million situation in chapter and verse because if he is right I am sure he will want to lay charges, and back up his mouth with action, against anybody present or past in the government of Saskatchewan.

The Chairman: Order, please. Is the committee ready for the question?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Chairman, I usually understand what the President of the Privy Council says, but I was not sure whether he was completely turning down the suggestion of the hon. member for St. Paul's. If he did not, I should like to press that the point be considered, namely, that this clause and the amendment thereto be allowed to stand. It will not take any more time to have the vote tomorrow than to have it now. In view of the interest on all sides of the House in the possibility of there being a draft that would meet the point of view, I wonder whether the President of the Privy Council would now agree to let this clause stand.

The Chairman: Order, please. There has been a suggestion made in the committee that subclause 1 of clause 7 stand, plus the amendment moved by the hon. member for Fraser Valley West. The procedure is that such a suggestion is not in order unless there is unanimous consent. Is there such consent?

Some hon. Members: No.

The Chairman: There is not unanimous consent. Is the committee ready for the question on the amendment?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Amendment (Mr. Rose) negatived: Yeas, 31; nays, 51.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment defeated.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rondeau: Mr. Chairman, many people are certainly far from pleased with clause 7 as it now stands, even if the amendment has just been defeated.

[Mr. Woolliams.]

In my opinion, the governor in council who is responsible for appointing returning officers could find a solution that would please as many people as possible, without having to make political appointments. I think we all agree on that, since we have known our returning officers in many constituencies and since in the past we have unfortunately seen too many political appointments. And if we pass this legislation in its present form such a practice might be continued.

I have prepared an amendment which, in my opinion, might satisfy everybody, if Parliament still trusts its judges. The act clearly states that if there is a doubt about the election of a candidate, it is always possible to ask for a judicial recount. We have enough confidence in the integrity of judges to assume that recounts are made honestly.

As the office of returning officer is extremely important since the result of an election depends upon him, his integrity must be above suspicion. Moreover, he must not be a recognized politician or a low-rate politician who has become famous through dubious election practices and who is being rewarded for his services by his party.

That is certainly possible, because I have seen it myself. That is why I have had to live through elections with returning officers whose ability was doubtful but whose political past was not.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that if we have confidence in judges to make a judicial recount in an intelligent and honest manner, it would be normal when it comes to filling such an important office as that of returning officer to call upon the integrity and ability of judges.

It is also a fact that judges in a judicial district know many persons of impeccable integrity. They might therefore be better qualified to appoint returning officers. The governor in council would no longer have to rely on political say-so, tending to favour friends. Political affiliation should no longer be taken into account, but rather the fact that judges can best identify those who are involved in politics, when such an appointment has to be made.

That is why I suggest that a committee of three Superior Court judges sitting in the judicial district concerned be called upon to appoint the returning officer when there is a vacancy. If three judges in a given judicial district are in charge of appointing a returning officer, I will trust their good judgment as

they will certainly be able to find a competent individual.

This is why, Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to propose to the House the following amendment:

That clause 7(1) be amended as follows, by deleting the words "The Governor in Council" and substituting therefor "A committee of three Superior Court judges, of the judicial district concerned, appointed by the Chief Electoral Officer".

Such a committee could appoint a returning officer for any new electoral district. So, everybody would be pleased and Parliament would demonstrate that it still has confidence in the judges it has appointed.

• (9:30 p.m.)

[*English*]

The Deputy Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question?

An hon. Member: Would you please read the amendment, Mr. Chairman?

[*Translation*]

The Chairman: The member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau) moves:

That clause 7(1) be amended as follows, by deleting the words "The Governor in Council" and substituting therefor "A committee of three Superior Court judges, of the judicial district concerned, appointed by the Chief Electoral Officer,".

[*English*]

Amendment (Mr. Rondeau) negatived: Yeas, 6; nays, 59.

Subclause 1 agreed to.

[*Translation*]

The Chairman: I declare the amendment defeated.

[*English*]

On clause 7, subclause 2—*Vacancy.*

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Chairman, before we leave clause 7 I should like to direct a question to the President of the Privy Council in connection with subclause 2 which deals with vacancy. Subclause 2 reads as follows:

The office of the returning officer is not vacant unless he dies, or, with prior permission of the Chief Electoral Officer, resigns, or unless he is removed from office for cause within the meaning of subsection 3.

Could the President of the Privy Council assure the committee that he is satisfied that this provision gives sufficient leeway for a returning officer to request in writing of the Chief Electoral Officer—without going into great detail—his release by the Chief Electoral Officer from his duties? Would not the act be clearer if it were amended to indicate that a returning officer could, upon written request giving cause prior to the date of the issue of the writ, be released from his duties if the cause were satisfactory to the Chief Electoral Officer?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I understand the practice has been, when the request has been submitted either before or just after the writ has been issued, for no inquiry to be made as to the underlying reason and the resignation is accepted. After the writ, of course, there is a further consideration because the office has to be protected. But my understanding is that it is currently not a problem.

Mr. Forrestall: So you are satisfied.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I will start by admitting that my intimate knowledge of English grammar is scant, but the wording of the first part of subclause 2 seems to be, as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre put it to me earlier, a bit lousy. It reads:

The office of a returning officer is not vacant unless he dies—

Who is "he"? Is it the office, or the returning officer? Is it the office that dies, or the returning officer? Surely the office does not die, but rather the individual. I mention the point in order to reflect the opinion of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, who is highly expert in the field of grammatical construction.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I would hesitate to argue points of grammar, but it seems to me that if you refer to impersonal objects like the office, the proper pronoun would be "it" rather than "he". On that basis I think it refers to the occupant of the office; and "he", of course, under the Interpretation Act, can in the appropriate case mean "she."

Mr. Howard (Skeena): It is still lousy.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall subclause 2 carry?

Subclause 2 agreed to.

On clause 7, subclause 3—*Removal from Office.*

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a comment in response to the hon. member for Shefford who raised a question about subclause 3. I draw his attention to page 150 of the draft, clause 59, which provides for the report of the Chief Electoral Officer including every statement referred to

in subclause 2 respecting the conduct of an election or of any election officer that has been submitted to him, with such recommendations, if any, as he may see fit to make thereon. Therefore, the basis of the cause for removal would be such as is made in the report of the Chief Electoral Officer. With regard to the amendment that is being made, it strengthens the hand of the Chief Electoral Officer vis-à-vis a returning officer who may be recalcitrant in completing a revision of the boundaries of a polling division, and gives him authority to remove the recalcitrant returning officer if such should be the case. In this way, the job of revising the boundaries may be carried out effectively.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall subclause 3 carry?

Mr. Alkenbrack: Paragraph (3) reads that a returning officer may be removed from office if he—

—has at any time after his appointment, been guilty of politically partisan conduct—

Would it not be better if the provision read, "has been found guilty by a court"? Who is to judge whether he has been found guilty of improper partisan conduct?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I am advised that the phrase has been in the act for a considerable time and that there are virtually no precedents in this regard. Perhaps we can regard ourselves as having been fortunate.

Mr. Woolliams: The provision says that the Governor in Council may remove from office any returning officer who has at any time after his appointment been guilty of politically partisan conduct, whether or not in the course of the performance of his duties under this act. It seems to me it is obvious, and I think that the President of the Privy Council knows what it means. If the cabinet, or Governor in Council, found the man was partisan, he would be out; and if they found that whatever he did was proper, he would be in.

• (9:40 p.m.)

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Chairman, I think it might be appropriate, particularly in reference to the point that has been raised, to bring the attention of members of the committee to the fact that this question was not lightly dealt with by the committee. Indeed, it occupied considerable time of the committee, particularly with respect to the onus which it places on the Chief Electoral Officer in being a final judge in this matter.

[Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale).]

The final authority must be the Governor in Council, but the bill provides that the removal is on the basis of advice by the Chief Electoral Officer to the Governor in Council. Granted, the word is a permissive one; it says "may remove." I wonder if it would be wise to pass this paragraph without members of the committee being aware that in accepting the amendment we are perpetuating a system in our electoral act which places an area of judgment in the office of the Chief Electoral Officer, one that I do not particularly like to mention. I am certain that the officer in question does not particularly like to have this type of onus placed on his shoulders.

For their edification I would refer members of the committee to volume 8 of the proceedings of the Privileges and Elections Committee. I have never been able to figure out the paging of these things, but it says 8:20, 8:21, 8:22 and 8:23. This question might be considered the next time the act is to be amended, even if it is in ten years' time.

Mr. Cafik: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question of the President of the Privy Council to find out if in the event of a returning officer being removed, particularly in the case of alleged political activity following his appointment to office, he has any appeal procedures open to him.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I would think not.

Subclause 3 agreed to.

Subclause 4 agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall subclause 5 as revised carry?

On clause 7, subclause 5—*Appointment within limited period.*

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, the purpose here is to impose a sanction against any delay in making an appointment, and it states in fact that an appointment should be made within 60 days.

Subclause 5 agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall clause 7 as amended carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I apologize for being late, but on page 14 of the bill, under subclause 3(e), it says:

"has, at any time after his appointment, been guilty of...partisan conduct—"

I should like to put a question to the President of the Privy Council. What would happen if a returning officer were also engaged in provincial politics. That would

then be political partisanship. Would he have a right to do that?

[*English*]

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I think it is very likely that would be political partisanship, at whatever level it is engaged in.

Clause 7 agreed to.

The Chairman: The committee will now consider clause 8. Shall subclause—

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, I would move a motion at this stage. I move that the bill, subject to the sections which are subject to amendment, be now approved, it having been studied by the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Chairman: That procedure, in effect, as I understand it, was adopted by way of an order of the House earlier this day. Nevertheless, we should go through the clauses but without debate. That is the procedure we have adopted, namely, that the sections that were approved by the committee—and those sections, more particularly, not amended—are automatically carried. I take it that is by order of the House.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): If I could just make it clear, Mr. Chairman, it is either the sections or parts that have been sidelined, plus any part in respect of which a member, on rising, can say he has an amendment. So we are not confined to those sections or parts which are sidelined. If there is another part or section regarding which an hon. member intends to propose an amendment, it would be appropriate for him to say so at the start and then it would be considered.

Mr. Woolliams: That is a good understanding, that basically all sections where there are no amendments, by order of the House are automatically approved; and if there are amendments to be moved, other than those that are known, if hon. members now file them with the Clerk so that they be known, we can get into debate on them. But the rest of the bill is approved. Is that what we are doing right now?

The Chairman: It might be useful to remind the committee of the order adopted earlier this day. I will read its final paragraph, which I think will clarify the point raised by the hon. member for Calgary North:

> Provided that any clause, subclause or other provision referred to in paragraph two above—
>
> That is all other clauses and other provisions.
>
> —may be brought under consideration or reconsideration by any member who rises and proposes a motion to amend any such clause, subclause or other provision of the bill that may be accepted by the Chair.

In other words, all sections are open to amendment but that would be the only consideration on which a section, not lined, can be discussed in committee. It would be by way of amendment to it.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Further to that, and in order to make this determination clear, may one move an amendment to any of the clauses which are not sidelined?

Mr. Woolliams: Maybe I could shorten the procedure. Could we have a list, now, of the clauses subject to amendment? Those members who are going to move amendments should name the clauses concerned so that we know where we are. Then the rest of the bill is automatically passed and we can get on with the business of the House. That is my motion.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, may I remind the hon. member for Calgary North and other members of the committee that this matter was the subject of discussion among the parties and that the House order, which after all does govern this committee, was thoroughly worked out and agreed to unanimously. One of the suggestions, when we were discussing the matter, was that there be given in advance a list of the clauses to which hon. members might wish to speak and move amendments, but that suggestion was not agreed upon. Rather, the proposal that you have read out from the chair was what we agreed to, that we go through the clauses and call them one by one. If there is no amendment to a clause, it is carried without being put. But if a member has an amendment to make, he has a right to rise. There was no requirement in the order that advance notice be given.

Mr. Woolliams: May I speak to that?

The Chairman: I would point out to the hon. member the procedural difficulty we would encounter if we followed his suggestions. The committee is now governed by an order of the House. That order can only be changed by the House itself. If the hon. member wants to move a motion with Mr. Speaker in the chair, that is certainly a possi-

bility. But I am afraid the motion suggested by the hon. member cannot be put now.

• (9:50 p.m.)

Mr. Woolliams: May I speak to that, Mr. Chairman? I think it can be. With the greatest respect, this is a refinement of the suggestion. In its order, the House has set out those sections that are not subject to amendment and can be called, as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre said. If all members would come forward with their amendments to these sections, according to the House order, and approve those not in that category, we would probably complete 90 per cent of our work. With the greatest respect, Mr. Chairman, I suggest I am not violating any order of the House. Suppose there are 90 sections read out, and 10 are subject to amendment—we can pass 80. Surely members can get up and say what they are doing. If a certain group or party wants to deal with it clause by clause, I am ready to sit and do that. But surely we are businessmen and can run the House in a businesslike manner. I say again, we are not violating any order of the House. Those sections that are in a package may be subject to amendment in the minds of members, so let them name those sections. But let those of us who have read and studied the bill approve these clauses and get down to brass tacks.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, I share the desire of the hon. member to get the bill through all appropriate stages and focus upon this motion with the greatest possible speed, but I am subject to the agreement referred to by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. I feel I should adhere to it.

The Chairman: The committee will now consider clause 8, subclauses 1 to 5 inclusive.

Clause 8, subclauses 1 to 9 inclusive agreed to.

The Chairman: The committee will now consider clause 8, subclause 10, as amended.

On clause 8, subclause 10—*Additional election clerk.*

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, I understand that the practice referred to here has been carried on for nearly 20 years under the discretionary powers conferred upon the Chief Electoral Officer. What we are doing in this section is putting into the statute what has been practised heretofore.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, I should like to suggest an amendment to subclause 10, to delete in lines 22 and 23 the words "mentioned in schedule III". What I seek to accomplish can be done this way or it can be done with respect to a particular constituency. It can be done by seeking to amend schedule III when we get to it, but we thought it would be easier to do it this way because there may be other constituencies in the same situation. I present this amendment on behalf of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni who was concerned about this matter because of the geography of his constituency. Regretfully, he had to enter hospital today and will be there for a few days.

As the President of the Privy Council has said, the opportunity for the Chief Electoral Officer to make these decisions has existed for some time and has worked very well. But we are now embarking on a new venture in the Canada Elections Act, namely, proxy voting. Under the proxy voting structure, in certain constituencies it was felt necessary to give the elector an opportunity to apply to the returning officer or to one of the two or more election clerks who may be appointed for the constituencies named in the schedule. Comox-Alberni is not mentioned in the schedule. It is one of the constituencies within which there shall be a nomination day or polling day. The hon. member for Comox-Alberni says this is not really necessary because of the communication that exists between constituencies with regard to ballot-boxes and the like, but he felt it was necessary because of the scattered nature of the riding.

If we were to remove the reference here to schedule III, it would permit the Chief Electoral Officer to use his discretionary powers in designated constituencies to appoint an election clerk in addition to the regular election clerk already available. This would make things easier for constituents of Comox-Alberni, many of whom are fishermen and prospectors who may wish to exercise their right to the proxy vote. There may be other constituencies falling in the same category, so we felt it better to raise the matter at his juncture. Perhaps it is appropriate to do so at this time because it is close to ten o'clock and unless it is immediately acceptable to the President of the Privy Council it affords us the opportunity to hold it over. This is the reasoning behind it. It would be of great assistance to other constituencies as well as Comox-Alberni.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The point seems to be well taken, Mr. Chairman and we would be quite agreeable to the amendment.

Subclause 10 as amended agreed to.

Clause 8 as amended agreed to.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I may rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman, to get the floor on what I consider to be an extremely important amendment which I hope to move when we reach the appropriate clause? I know it will require some consideration and I took the liberty of speaking to the President of the Privy Council about it a few days ago. I also spoke to the Chief Electoral Officer about it by telephone. I would indicate in an informal way what the amendment is. It would seek to amend clause 14. In order that there may be an opportunity to examine it this evening and tomorrow morning, if I am allowed to make representations now, hon. members will be better informed tomorrow when we reach the clause. I wonder if the committee would be kind enough to give me that opportunity.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

On clause 14, subclause 4, paragraph (e)—*Disqualifications.*

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I could file the amendment now so that members would have it available. At page 24, clause 14, subclause 4, paragraph (e) reads:

(e) every person undergoing punishment as an inmate in any penal institution for the commission of any offence—

Subclause 4 provides that such persons shall not be eligible to vote at an election. As was indicated upon second reading of the bill, the purpose of the amendment is to afford, for rehabilitative and other reasons, inmates in our penal institutions the right to participate in the democratic process of elections.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if there would be a disposition on the part of the committee to seek the permission of the House to sit for perhaps an additional hour?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, I was hoping to get the floor to make that suggestion, since we only have 84 more clauses to pass.

The Chairman: Is there unanimous agreement to sit for one more hour?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Chairman: Perhaps we might proceed by not noticing the clock. The correct procedure is to rise and report progress and then seek leave to sit for an hour. But if the committee is agreed—

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I think that is agreeable, Mr. Chairman, as long as it is understood that it will be one hour and that at 11 o'clock Your Honour will notice it is ten o'clock. Also, we have to consider the position of the "late show." I wonder whether there is disposition to dispose of that as well; otherwise we shall not be finished until 11.30.

• (10:00 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Chairman: I take it that there is disposition to postpone the "late show" to another day.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Rose: On a point of clarification, Mr. Chairman, I did not hear your remarks relating to the "late show". It is my view that this interesting portion of our parliamentary procedure should be cancelled for this evening. Personally, I would be in favour of that if we agreed to extend the sitting for one hour.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Clause 9 agreed to.

The Chairman: The committee will now consider clause 10, subclause 1.

On clause 10, subclause 1—*Revision of boundaries of polling divisions.*

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, subclause 1 has been redrafted. I might say, for purposes of clarification, that it has been the subject of reference in the Auditor General's report and the redrafting has been for the purpose of meeting the financial comments which have been made.

Subclause 1 agreed to.

On clause 10, subclause 2—*Polling divisions with 250 electors.*

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, the reduction from 350 to 250 electors under paragraph (b) of subclause 2 is to allow for increases in population between the revision and the election, and to prevent too many split polls. The previous figure was 350 electors. It has been reduced to 250 to make split polls less likely.

Subclause 2 agreed to.

On clause 10, subclause 3—*Polling divisions with more than 250 electors.*

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, the explanation here is that it is possible to have a large institutional poll but, in a hospital or convalescent home where the poll is not too large, the anonymity of the vote might very well be lost. This subclause would permit the votes of such persons to be added to those of a great many others; thus there would be an attempt to preserve the anonymity of the vote.

Subclause 3 agreed to.

Clause 10 agreed to.

The Chairman: The committee will now consider clause 11.

Clause 11, subclauses 1 and 2 inclusive agreed to.

On clause 11, subclause 3—*Exceptions in certain cases.*

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, we have already referred to the question of urban polls which are still rural in nature, and to rural polls which have become part of the city. This amendment is to permit the Chief Electoral Officer to make the necessary changes.

Subclause 3 agreed to.

Subclause 4 agreed to.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I did not rise more quickly, but I wish to move an amendment to subclauses 1 and 2 of clause 11. Perhaps I might read the amendment. It is as follows:

That clause 11 be amended by:

(a) In subclause 1 after the word "more" in line 29, adding the words 'or any municipal district, or part thereof, served by postal walk.'

(b) In subclause 2, after the word 'more' in line 34, inserting the words 'or any municipal district, or part thereof, served by postal walk.'

I move this amendment on behalf of my colleague for Fraser Valley West whose suburban constituency, in common with that of other hon. members of the House, in part is still considered rural. There are portions not incorporated into a city or town even though the population is 5,000 or more. These one or more portions are in a municipal district and are looked upon as rural districts. The purpose of the amendment is to make certain that suburban areas which are not incorporated towns or cities but which are served by a postal walk, shall be declared to be urban polls rather than rural polls. One of the ramifications would be appointing two enumerators per poll, rather than one. That will probably allow a better job of enumeration to be done in those places which because of their density of population would otherwise probably be part of a city or incorporated town with a population of 5,000 or more, as defined in the act.

We felt that saying an area served by a postal walk was obviously the kind of area which is urban, even if it were in a municipal district, would allow it to be treated as such under the other terms of the bill. I hope members will agree that this amendment will be useful in a large number of constituencies where there are areas, bordering on cities or towns, which are still municipal or rural districts.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Having taken counsel in this regard, I am of the opinion that the power expressed in the clause is already broad enough to cover the objective which is sought. If, in fact, in the judgment of the Chief Electoral Officer a poll has the character of being urban, it will be so treated according to the general definition in the statute, whatever the nature of the postal service. There is power to make a declaration without the need to specify in the manner suggested. The change proposed is, therefore, already included in the power which the Chief Electoral Officer would have if this clause in its revised form were adopted.

Mr. Benjamin: Would a request have to be made, on the part of the candidate or the returning officer of the Chief Electoral Officer, to have a poll declared an urban poll, or would it be done automatically?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): My understanding is that the clause would only operate on request.

Mr. MacLean: What arrangements are made for co-ordination between federal and provincial returning officers in the designation of polling divisions? I have in mind a situation where a given area is divided, say, into ten polling divisions by the federal returning officer; then a few weeks later the provincial returning officer divides it into nine polling divisions, resulting into a conflict of boundaries and general confusion for electors. Has any thought been given to means whereby some rationale could be established which would eliminate this confusion where possible?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would draw the hon. member's attention to clause 10, subclause 2 paragraph (a), where

it states that a returning officer shall give due consideration to the polling divisions established by provincial and municipal authorities. I gather that in a practical way there is this exchange of information.

Mr. Benjamin: Can the minister tell me what part of the bill gives authority to the Chief Electoral Officer, at the request of a returning officer, to declare a poll to be urban? Is subclause 4 the one which covers the point?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Subclause 3.

Mr. Benjamin: In that case, I think we would agree to withdraw the amendment on the basis of the assurance that the power already exists.

The Chairman: Does the hon. member have leave to withdraw the amendment?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Amendment (Mr. Benjamin) withdrawn.

Clause 11 agreed to.

• (10:10 p.m.)

The Chairman: The committee will now consider clause 12.

Clause 12, subclause 1 agreed to.

On clause 12, subclause 2—*Lists of electors.*

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, I point out that this is an innovation. Hitherto it was not possible to get the lists of armed forces' electors, who will now be voting under the special voting rules. Subclause 2 will make it possible for a candidate in a constituency to get a list of names and addresses of those individuals who will be voting abroad in respect of that particular constituency.

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, in my opinion this is one of the fruits of the committee's labours of which I am very proud. I think this is a very good step toward civilianizing the whole process of taking the non-civilian vote, if I may use that contradictory expression. It might have been better if in drafting it had been spelled out that the returning officer would make a proper transmission of these documents, but this is nevertheless a distinct improvement. I believe it will make for better liaison with this sector of the electorate which so often seems to be lost sight of by those who are seeking public office.

Subclause 2 agreed to.

Subclauses 3 and 4 agreed to.

Clause 12 agreed to.

The Chairman: The committee will now consider clause 13.

On clause 13, subclause 1—*Registry and application for registration.*

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, clause 13 introduces into our system the innovation of the registration of political parties, and I think the subclauses substantially speak for themselves.

Subclause 1 agreed to.

Subclauses 2 and 3 agreed to.

On clause 13, subclause 4—*Prohibitions against registration.*

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, one of my colleagues has an amendment which is very important, if he can find it before I do. Since the government in its "wisdom" made a distinct change in number from 26 to 75, I think it was, there is now in subclause 4 (a) and (b) a prohibition, a restraint against the possibility of a political party changing its name. I think this is a bit iniquitous and is perhaps dangerous.

My colleague will speak to this matter once he finds his motion and moves it; but putting it very simply, he is seeking the deletion of paragraphs (a) and (b) of subclause 4. I would think it quite conceivable that a political party might want to change its name so as to include a name that is used by some other party. I cannot conceive of our party ever calling itself the old democrats, but if it did it would be unfortunate if a technicality in the act caused the Chief Electoral Officer to make this impossible of acceptance. Long before my time in this party, it was called the Liberal-Conservatives, though I do not think we would ever call the party that again. However, I would not want to be prohibited or restrained from so doing if we should become so frivolous.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Would the hon. member indicate in what way the change of the number of candidates from 26 to 75 would require this change?

Mr. Macquarrie: I think the mathematical fact should hit the minister fairly straight between the eyes. There is a great difference there.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Chairman, I should like to move the following amendment:

That section 4 of clause 13 be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

The Chief Electoral Officer shall not register a political party where the name of the political party includes the word "independent".

Amendment (Mr. Forrestall) negatived: Yeas, 7; nays, 34.

Subclauses 4 to 7 inclusive agreed to.

The Chairman: The committee will now consider clause 13, subclause 8.

On clause 13, subclause 8—*Deletions from registry.*

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Chairman, we have an amendment to subclause 8, for two reasons. One reason, which is not the most important, is that we consider there is a real conflict in this clause. Paragraph (b) of subclause 8 states:

> after the twenty-eighth day before polling day, delete from the registry any registered party that

Then subparagraph (ii) states:

> did not, on the twenty-eighth day before polling day at the election, have candidates officially nominated in at least seventy-five electoral districts of Canada.

Mr. Chairman, we believe there is a serious conflict here because in all but 21 constituencies nomination day closes 21 days before polling day, not 28 days before polling day. Any political party in this House or any political party which might be in existence and which is not now in this House could quite readily nominate 75 candidates in that seven-day period between the twenty-first day and the twenty-eighth day. In fact, this has been known to happen. In previous years parties now represented in this House deliberately planned nominating conventions in a short space of time in an effort to create a political impact on the public in a province or in a given part of Canada. I throw that out as an example of what has happened in the past and might happen in the future.

I suppose the point I make could be thrown out by saying that a political party would only need to advance its mass nominations by seven days in order to have sufficient candidates nominated before 28 days before polling day. But the essential point is, so far as the conflict in the figure of 75 and the number of days before polling day in which they must be nominated, is concerned, that there is a seven-day period during which candidates may still be nominated by a political party, but in the course of those seven days, the difference between 28 and 21 days, they will lose the right to have their party affiliation on the ballot even though they may have been before that time legally registered as a political party under the terms of the act. I put that point forward for the consideration of the President of the Privy Council and members of this committee, to see whether there is some way in which we can solve the problem.

• (10:20 p.m.)

Now I would like to come to the second and more pertinent point of my argument regarding the necessity for an amendment. The Standing Committee report, under recommendation No. 29, recommended that political parties in Canada wishing to endorse candidates for election to the House of Commons should be registered with the Chief Electoral Officer. In addition, any new party that wishes to be identified on the ballot paper must have candidates in at least 10 per cent of the total number of electoral districts of Canada. If my memory serves me correctly, that was a unanimous recommendation of the Standing Committee. The government in its wisdom chose not to agree with that recommendation and inserted the figure 75 instead of the figure recommended by the committee, which was 26.4 or, to round out the figure, 27, in order to retain the privilege of having the party affiliation designated on the ballot.

I appreciate to some extent the arguments put forward by the President of the Privy Council and others on second reading, that there could be a danger once this country makes provision to control election expenses, and that there would be some necessity for making safeguards to prevent frivolity of political parties such as the "rhinoceros party" or other such parties that are formed overnight or a few days before a general election in order to secure public funds.

I submit in all sincerity that the political affiliation on the ballot of a recognized political party which has properly adhered to or abided by all the regulations of this bill should be completely separate from any consideration regarding public funds or control of election expenses. I am fully prepared to agree that there is a need for a higher level of safeguard regarding the expenditure of public funds than just fielding 27 candidates, and I would not argue on that score with any member of the House. However, it seems to me that a new political party or one that is presently in existence but is not represented in this chamber—and there but for the grace of God go any of our parties two or three elections from now when one of our parties may be in the position of having less than 12 members in the House—might not have 75 candidates nominated 28 days before election day and would thus lose the privilege that they may have held for a number of years.

It seems to me there was a great deal of unanimity of feeling among members of the committee that it is an essential addition to our election law that the party affiliation be designated on the ballot. All members of the committee wanted to ensure that there be minimal obstruction to retaining that privilege. Therefore, my amendment is as follows:

That clause 13 be amended by deleting from subclause 8 paragraph (b) (ii) in line 26, the words "seventy five" and substituting therefor the words "twenty seven".

First, this complies with the unanimous recommendation of the Standing Committee which spent more hours on this bill than will committee of the whole and discussed this matter all the way from 75 down to 10 candidates in the field. In fact, I think it was even suggested that you should have 100 candidates in the field in order to retain your party affiliation on the ballot. But the committee felt that aside from any consideration of public expenditure and control of election expenses, the safeguards should be minimal so that any party with a semblance of credibility could have its party affiliation appear on the ballot.

A party that attempted to attain party affiliation on the ballot in a frivolous manner, or in a manner that would cause our electoral process to lose the esteem in which it is held, could have much difficulty in fielding even 27 candidates. I am sure many of us can think of events in past history where groups of that sort attempted to demean our electoral process or to participate in it in a frivolous manner, but they failed to field even 10, 12 or 15 candidates. I do not think 27 is too low a figure for any group to form a party, and such a party should have the privilege of having its party affiliation appear on the ballot, provided that party abides by the other provisions of the Elections Act.

I plead with the President of the Privy Council and other hon. members who spoke on second reading that there is no reason to connect this figure with control of election expenses or expenditure of public funds for electoral purposes. All of us are proud of our political affiliation. There may be times when we are not so proud in that respect, but we do not talk about them. The least we can do is make it easier for other Canadians to have that pride.

Members of a party now in this House may face great misfortune in years to come, and at that time they would still want their party affiliation to appear on the ballot. I hope the President of the Privy Council changes his mind a little bit, say by 40 degrees if not 180 degrees. If he cannot be persuaded to accept the figure of 27, let him look again at the 75 figure, because any party can have difficulty fielding 75 candidates in seven days.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, under the circumstances it seems to me that we may have something more to talk about here. Therefore, it would be good to stand clause 13(8) so that we may have further consultations and see if some agreement can be arrived at before the House sits tomorrow.

Mr. Benjamin: Would the minister seriously spend the night thinking of the number 27?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): And I suggest that the hon. member think of 75.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laflamme: Mr. Chairman, since someone would like this clause to stand, I wonder if the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald), in his discussions with the other party leaders or their spokesmen, would not be well advised to look into a question which was overlooked in committee and which has to do with the political affiliation of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Unless I am mistaken, the passage of clause 13 will mean that each candidate of a recognized party will be identified with his party. At the last election, the Speaker of the House of Commons ran as an independant and, since we have decided to indicate the names of the political parties, we have done away with any reference to the address and the occupation of the candidate. In my opinion, perhaps we should consider the possibility of making an exception in the case of the Speaker and enter him as being politically unaffiliated in order to prevent someone with the same name from running as an independent candidate in the same riding.

All political parties have realized the necessity of omitting the political affiliation of the Speaker whose name and occupation should appear instead on the ballot paper.

• (10:30 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Macdonald: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman of the committee bringing this matter to our attention. We will give it further consideration.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Chairman, I should like to commend the previous speaker for his suggestion. My impression is vague now, at

10.30 at night, but I think already we have met one of the concerns within the act in terms of the ballot. It is provided that it is not necessary that any designation be placed on the ballot in connection with the name of the candidate. That might look after one point raised by the chairman of the committee.

There is one other point which I would ask members of the committee to consider. My mind is open on this amendment and I gather the distinguished President of the Privy Council's mind is open as well, which surprises me a little. When we were discussing this question in committee there was some concern that it would permit easy access to the formation of regional parties which would be coloured as such in terms of their impact on the Canadian scene. There were several excellent reasons why the figure of 75 was suggested. While this particular section is stood overnight I would ask hon. members to think about the distinct possibility of the danger inherent in lowering the number from 75 to 27. If the number were 27 it is quite possible, for example, that we in the Maritimes could become totally fed-up with the rest of Canada and would form our own party to sit in the House. I do not think that lends itself to Canadian unity. If by the suggestion that is what we are attempting to encourage, whether we express it or not I think we should give some thought to it.

Subclause 8 stands.

Subclause 9 agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: The committee will now consider clause 14, subclause 1, as amended.

Clause 14, subclause 1—*Persons qualified as electors.*

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, to bring this amendment clearly to the attention of the committee, the basic qualifications of electors are changed in a fundamental way. First, the minimum voting age is reduced from 21 to 18 and, second, it is made perfectly clear, subject only to subclause 3, that only those who are Canadian citizens will be qualified to vote in a Canadian federal election.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Chairman, I have already dealt with this question which I feel is important and which the President of the Privy Council has already answered. However, it is essential that I raise the matter again and that I express the views of many of my colleagues.

We grant to young Canadians the right to vote at 18 and to run in an election. If we grant them that right, we must also entrust them with the resulting responsabilities.

The President of the Privy Council has explained—and I fully agree with him on that point—that the fact of lowering the legal age from 21 to 18 years of age is a provincial prerogative, as everybody knows. It would be logical, since several very serious reasons justify such a step, for the President of the Privy Council to obtain from the government the assurance that at one of the next federal-provincial conferences a dialogue will take place with the provinces to have them all reduce the legal age from 21 to 18. This is very important.

In fact, if a young man is entitled to vote or to run as a candidate at 18 or 19 years of age, he could, for instance, be prosecuted for libel, and his father's responsibility would then be involved. Many similar cases might occur.

In my opinion, logic and common sense require that the legal age be set at 18. Young people of 18 and over should be granted the rights that will come with their majority if they are given the franchise and allowed to be run as candidates in elections.

I know that the federal government cannot put such a clause in the act; however, I do think that I am expressing the wish of many of my colleagues when I ask that the government take the initiative of starting a dialogue with the provinces in order that the legal age may be set at 18 as soon as possible in all provinces.

[*English*]

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the suggestion and will bring it to the attention of my colleagues.

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, in order to assist in the progress of our work I wish to propose an amendment to subclause 4. Two of my colleagues, who are virtuous men and went home at ten o'clock not knowing we were to continue sitting for one hour, wish to move amendments to subclause 3. I would be grateful if consideration of that subclause could be stood. The purpose of my amendment to subclause 4 is to add to the list of those who would be disqualified. The group of people I have in mind—

The Chairman: Order, please. We are considering subclause 1.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the committee would agree to hearing the amendments this evening so that we could consider them overnight, even though they are out of order at this time.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

On clause 14, subclause 4—*Disqualifications.*

Mr. Macquarrie: I may be out of order, but I thought I was acting in the spirit of what we agreed to about 30 minutes ago. My proposed amendment would read, "every member of the Senate of Canada".

In speaking about this question I want to make it perfectly clear that I am not joining the crowd to my far left who are opponents of the Senate. I will join their crusade when I am 74½ years old and root for the abolition of the Senate. I think for too long in this country we have downgraded the Upper House and have not really taken cognizance of the fact that our Parliament is made up of two chambers. The Senate is an integral part of Parliament. We have been led to this conclusion by the expression "Member of Parliament" which leads us to think only of members of the Lower House. Our United States friends have done exactly the same thing. When they talk of a Congressman they think of a member of the House of Representatives, whereas they ought to be thinking of both their Houses. My amendment seeks to give full credit and precedence to our Upper House, as is done in the United Kingdom in the case of the House of Lords.

Mr. Roberts: Mr. Chairman, I regret to interrupt the hon. member but I am confused about the stage we have reached in our deliberations. I wish to offer an amendment to subclause 3, and I heard the hon. member speaking to subclause 4. I wonder if at some time I could present my amendment to subclause 3?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I apologize to the Chair if my remarks have contributed to our getting out of order.

The Chairman: We are still on subclause 1. Shall subclause 1 carry?

Subclause 1 agreed to.

Subclause 2 agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall subclause 3 carry?

An hon. Member: Stand.

[*Translation*]

Mr. De Bané: Mr. Chairman, I wish to move that this clause be struck out, and this, for reasons of law and of fact. I think that this act is a proposed reform which cannot suffer the maintenance of privileges. Indeed I think that the fact of maintaining a privilege for British subjects who entered the country before some arbitrary date is senseless.

In a country like ours made up of various ethnic groups, the way to ensure harmony is certainly not by maintaining privileges which cannot be justified neither in law nor in fact. It may be an unconscious provocation, but if we really want to reform the Elections Act, we will have to deprive them of their privileges all those who have not deemed advisable to become Canadian citizens.

Therefore, I simply move that subclause (3) of clause 14 be struck out.

• (10:40 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The hon. member for Hillsborough indicated that a number of his hon. friends would like to move amendments to this clause. I wonder whether it might be allowed to stand until tomorrow so they would have an opportunity to put those amendments when the one now before the committee has been dealt with. I might say, also, that the hon. member for Skeena has moved an amendment to clause 4 in addition to that moved by the hon. member for Hillsborough. Perhaps subject to any other amendments which may turn up to this clause, we could allow it to stand and proceed to a less controversial area of the bill.

Mr. Alkenbrack: I understood some time ago, before we agreed not to call it ten o'clock, that all those clauses which were marked by vertical lines had been agreed to.

Mr. Macquarrie: No.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The exact opposite is the situation. Those which are sidelined are not agreed to, but may be the subject of discussion.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Chairman, we jumped from subclause 4 a while ago. I was frantically trying to rewrite an amendment to subclause 3.

An hon. Member: It stands.

Mr. Roberts: The hon. member for Cochrane asked me to move, on his behalf, the amendment which the hon. member for Matane has moved.

Mr. Prud'homme: I should like to say that I agree with this amendment.

Mr. Forrestall: Would it not be useful for the leader of the House to stand the whole of clause 14 so that we might get on with a few others?

Mr. Benjamin: I would agree to that. If there are one or two further amendments to be considered overnight, I should probably throw my amendment into the hopper as well.

The Deputy Chairman: Is it agreed we accept all the amendments and proceed to the other clauses afterwards?

Mr. Benjamin: I was not clear as to the intent of the amendment moved earlier by the hon. member for Matane. Our amendment is to subclause 2. It would have the effect of delaying for a fairly short period, for a year or perhaps two years, the provision whereby British subjects who have taken out Canadian citizenship cannot vote, and thus enable these recent British subjects to cast their ballot if they meet the other qualifications of residence. However, once the act comes into force British subjects arriving in Canada would have to serve the required five years and secure their Canadian citizenship before being eligible to cast their ballot in a federal election.

It has already been represented to me by some British subjects who have arrived in Canada that one of the things they were told before departing for their new home was that after one year's residence they would be eligible to vote in elections in Canada. One person who made representations to me both by mail and by telephone lives in Ontario, and he told me that although this would not have prevented his coming to Canada, the information that had been given to him would be falsified as a result of this change in electoral law. He submitted, and I agreed, that those coming to Canada have every right to know before arriving what their rights and privileges are in this country from the very day they arrive.

I want to make it quite plain that there is no misunderstanding here. We in this party completely agree that there should no longer be in our electoral law any discrimination as to the eligibility to cast ballots as between British subjects and those of other racial or ethnic origins. This has to stop in modern Canada. However, those British subjects who arrived in Canada between June 26, 1967, and the day on which this act comes into force should still retain their right to vote as British subjects. Those who arrive in Canada subsequent to the coming into force of this legislation will know beforehand that they must serve the five-year period and become Canadian citizens before being given the federal franchise.

However, I think we should be fair to those who arrived in Canada between June 26, 1967, and the day this act comes into force, which might be next month or next year. These people could number 60,000 to 70,000, if the immigration pattern has remained fairly constant. They should not be disenfranchised because when they arrived in Canada the legislation had not been amended. Therefore, I should like to move the following motion. I regret I have only one copy. I have rewritten the amendment because I received better legal advice in the last few minutes than I did yesterday. I move:

That clause 14 be amended by deleting subclause 3 on page 24 and substituting therefor the following:

"(3) Every British subject, other than a Canadian citizen, who

(a) was qualified as an elector immediately prior to the coming into force of the provisions of this act referred to in subsection 2 of section 119, and

(b) has not, since that date, ceased to be ordinarily resident in Canada, is deemed to be qualified as an elector.

As I say, I am sorry I have only one copy. In view of this I would ask the President of the Privy Council and other members of the committee to sleep on this amendment overnight and to consider giving fair treatment to those British subjects who have arrived in Canada since June 26, 1967, and before the act is proclaimed. They will still be eligible to vote without having to wait the five-year period, but if a British subject arrives in Canada after this bill comes into force he would have to wait the five-year period before he has the federal franchise.

• (10:50 p.m.)

Mr. Prud'homme: May I point out to my friend that anyone who emigrates to Canada, be he a British subject or otherwise, knows he will be subject to any new law that might be passed in Canada. What the hon. member is suggesting is similar to the following situation. If I were to emigrate to Canada because there was no military service here, and then

suddenly this Parliament decided to vote for conscription in Canada, I might say exactly what the hon. member is trying to say about British subjects being betrayed. In this situation I would have emigrated to Canada because there was no military service and I could say that I was not subject to such a law because when I came to Canada I was told by the immigration officer that there was no military service here. This could be an analogous situation. I am sure people do not come to Canada with only this incentive.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, I would normally accept the proposition that these matters stand, but I understand we did agree to some of them. Normally I would have forgone the opportunity to put forward an idea in respect of this question, but it is close to the time at which we have agreed to see the clock and it might be worth while to put something else before the committee so that it may also be considered overnight. If the amendment of the hon. member for Matane should carry, it would not, I submit, remove the matter of privilege or relief—if one should want to put it another way—in terms of the eligibility to vote, because that situation will still prevail not as a result of the Elections Act but as a result of the Citizenship Act.

Under that act we do discriminate, as I understand it, against the male sex in favour of the female sex in certain circumstances. Normally a person must wait five years before applying for Canadian citizenship, but if a woman who has emigrated to Canada marries a Canadian citizen she has only to wait one year before she can apply for Canadian citizenship. I think that if the government wishes to deal fairly with this matter and bring it up to date, it should consider eliminating the five-year period and instituting a more reasonable period, perhaps one year, so that all people will have equality before the law in terms of citizenship and the right to vote.

While I generally agree with the proposition that equality before the law should not be based on having a privileged position, nonetheless there is a matter which I think should be raised, namely, that it is unfair to a group of people to remove from them a right they have had up until now. In fact, the committee unanimously, and the government, endorsed that concept. They simply picked a point in time—I believe it was June 25, 1968—and said that up until that time we will respect the particular position that has been afforded British subjects. But from now on there will be an entirely different situation. What the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre seeks to do is establish another point in time, and he attempts to validate it by saying we should not make the law retroactive in removing this right.

The Deputy Chairman: Is it agreed that clause 14, with the two suggested amendments, should stand except in respect of those subclauses which already have been carried?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, did I understand you to say that clause 14 would stand with the two amendments which have been proposed? I think there have been four amendments.

Mr. Forrestall: With the exception of the two clauses that were agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Together with the four suggested amendments. Shall clause 16, subclause 1, as revised, carry?

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, I hope your words "Together with the four amendments" do not preclude consideration of the two amendments of my colleague which I will ask hon. members to sleep on so that they can come back to them with their minds fresh.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if this would not be a good point at which to see the clock and call it ten o'clock.

The Deputy Chairman: Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Progress reported.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): It is my understanding that the adjournment proceedings are deferred until another day.

At 11.05 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

The House met at 2 p.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. BALDWIN—NEW UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROGRAM—PUBLISHING OF DETAILS BY PRESS PRIOR TO STATEMENT IN HOUSE

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege in respect of which I have given Your Honour notice. It relates to the extent to which a report which is to be given today by the Minister of Labour and/or accompanying material were made available to or obtained by the press some time before the minister was due to make the statement today.

To begin with, Mr. Speaker, may I say that the information I have is that the publication and also radio reports took place at a time that would indicate that this material must have been in the hands of the people who used it either last night or early this morning. We have here another instance of the extent to which matters which should be withheld until they are made public in the House are made available to outside sources.

Mr. Speaker, not in anticipation of this event but because of the gravity of the situation I read what was said yesterday in respect of the question of the pre-publication of documents and material which should be withheld until the time of presentation in the House. I have read what Your Honour said and what was said by others. I was the first person to raise the question last Friday in connection with the matter of the LeDain report.

I submit that what has happened today places a completely different picture on the situation. This is a repetition, and the situation has become so serious that Your Honour, this House and all of us must take the most careful note of what has happened and is happening as well as the effect it is having on this institution. Are Parliament and this House to be only a peg for the purpose of our being regaled by the public relations' competition of ministers and other people? Mr. Speaker, I do not like to think so. I do not like to think it is just a matter of competing political personalities, squabbling, shoving and squealing like pigs in a trough for a position of advantage. I think this is a place for grave and deliberate debate dealing with the affairs of the people of Canada.

• (2:10 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Baldwin: It may well be that the people of Canada think differently. I do not believe so. I think they rely on this place as a forum for proper intervention between the government and the people. God knows, there has been a rapid enough deterioration of the parliamentary process during the course of the last little while. Therefore this situation should be faced in the most serious way. I think this practice has to stop and I hope we are all agreed on that. I hope the government agrees that it has to stop.

Your Honour made a decision yesterday with which I am in agreement. I feel that there must be some way to deal with this situation. I am not in a position now to attach any blame to the minister. The motion I propose to move, if accepted, will give him the opportunity he should have to appear before a committee and make a statement indicating what in his view did take place. But I say that this practice must come to a stop.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baldwin: I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster (Mr. Bell):

> That the question of the manner and nature in which the report and accompanying material of the Minister of Labour in connection with unemployment insurance was obtained by or made available for the media prior to a statement of the minister in the House be referred to the Committee on Procedure and Organization and that the committee do make an interim report on this on or before June 26, 1970.

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of attention to the hon. member for Peace River and I share his views to a large degree. As Minister of Labour I could say with accuracy that the source of the information which was printed in the Toronto *Star* early edition today did not come from me, did not come from my personal staff, nor did it come from

any official or member of the Unemployment Insurance Commission. But like the hon. member for Peace River I have been a member of this House for eight years, first as a backbencher, then as a Parliamentary Secretary and recently as minister, and like the hon. member and others in this House I have a great degree of affection and respect for the traditional rights of the House of Commons.

I may be considered a traditionalist or a conservative in my view that the House of Commons has been downgraded all too frequently. I know that one of the rules of the House is that the word of an hon. gentleman is accepted without question. But this is can only remain valid if ministers and other members of the House are honest, frank and open.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mackasey: So it is tempting simply to say that as a result of investigations I have made I have found that the source of information to which the hon. gentleman quite properly takes objection did not come from my office, did not come from myself in person, and did not come from anyone associated with the Unemployment Insurance Commission, and I would then have the full right to expect that to be accepted. But since I believe that to be objective and consistent we should be frank and open, I think the House is entitled to an explanation as to how this information came to appear in the Toronto *Star*.

I think it has been customary when tabling white papers, which are a medium of communication of the government, to place an embargo on the Press Gallery and to take them into full and absolute confidence before the fact. This is not a new procedure. This is a procedure that has been in effect since time immemorial, and it is one that the Press Gallery as well as Members of Parliament respect, or should respect.

On this particular occasion, Mr. Speaker, two members representing the electronic medium contacted my department yesterday to find out whether they should pre-empt time this evening, after the fact of tabling the report, if this white paper was deemed to be of sufficient interest to the Canadian public. I felt that this was something that only they could determine. So they were invited to the Department of Labour and made acquainted with some of the highlights, under the same type of embargo that was placed on members of the Press Gallery this morning.

One of the two people thus privileged respected that embargo. The other presumably honourable gentleman presumed to take these two pamphlets and give them to a reporter of the Toronto *Star*. So I think the question of privilege is one that members of the Press Gallery should want to raise amongst themselves—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mackasey: —because, Mr. Speaker, we have a good press gallery collectively. They depend on their relationship with Members of Parliament, and to a great degree we depend on their integrity. If there is to be a breakdown in that communication because of a lack of integrity on either side, that happy relationship will come to an end.

All I can do is apologize to the House for this unhappy occurrence, this unexpected and certainly unpredictable leak.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, in light of what the minister has said about the situation, I would not be unwilling to withdraw my motion.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baldwin: I believe I have done my duty as I have seen it. The terms of the general motion which was before the House, moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, may well permit the standing committee to conduct that full and impartial inquiry which is so essential and in light of which I made the remarks that I did.

Mr. Speaker: The Chair is grateful to the hon. member for Peace River in that I am not now placed in the position where I have to make a difficult ruling. I would suggest to hon. members, in view of the fact that a motion which is very close to this one is before the Committee on Procedure and Organization, that perhaps that committee would take it upon itself to look into both situations brought to the attention of the House yesterday and today.

MR. KORCHINSKI—OPPORTUNITY TO PARTICIPATE IN DISCUSSION IN AGRICULTURAL COMMITTEE

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege which I believe affects all Members of Parlia-

ment. It arises out of the fact that I was denied, as a member of the Standing Committee on Agriculture, during consideration of Bill C-196 in a clause by clause study, by the vice-chairman of the agricultural committee who was in the chair at the time, an opportunity to participate in a discussion on a clause of the bill to which an amendment had been proposed, despite repeated requests by me directed to the Chair for recognition.

The incident arose during last night's sitting of the committee on Agriculture. An amendment had been proposed by the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner). In fairness to the chairman I should say that I was granted one opportunity to comment on the amendment, after the opening remarks by the mover of the amendment.

Subsequently the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) presented his rebuttal to the amendment, at which time certain arguments were presented which I felt should have been corrected. I requested recognition from the Chair and patiently awaited my turn for recognition. However, after points of order had been raised during which I participated, at the conclusion of my contribution to the points of order I requested that I be heard at the appropriate time on the amendment to the pertinent clause which was under discussion. The present committee system and the reporting of the proceedings do not permit me to produce the report of the proceedings, which would attest to the fact that I verbally requested recognition before the amendment was put, because the report is not yet printed.

• (2:20 p.m.)

Under the previous system where the entire membership of the House participated in clause by clause discussions it may not have been necessary for a member to rise on several occasions to present arguments for or against a particular clause of a bill because other members had an opportunity to contribute and often covered the point. You will agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that this practice was allowed and that on no occasion was a member denied the right to speak, and only when all arguments had been assessed was the question put.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Korchinski: Under our present committee system the Committee on Agriculture has on it eight members of the official opposition, which is 11 per cent of the total composition of the membership of the official opposition in the House of Commons. Because of the inability of the other 89 per cent of members to be present during committee proceedings because of commitments to other committees, the case for presenting arguments for or against a clause rests heavily on those members who comprise the committee.

In hearing evidence presented in the form of briefs there has been an arrangement worked out whereby equal opportunity has been granted to all members to participate in the questioning of witnesses. This had general approval by members of all parties in the committee. However, when the committee is charged with the responsibility of studying a bill and a clause by clause study is being carried on, the situation is somewhat different from the hearing of briefs. Because of the heavy responsibility that is placed on individual members of our party, who constitute only a small percentage of our total membership in the House, adequate opportunity should be granted for a thorough discussion of a given bill.

I was denied that opportunity to pursue an argument following a statement by the Minister of Agriculture. The vice-chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, who was in the chair at the time, showed his political bias by ignoring requests by me for recognition to speak on the particular clause and allowing himself to be guided by the persuasion of the supporters of the government to put the question.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Korchinski: The majority of the government members on the Committee on Agriculture last night were members who have displayed little interest in the grain industry and who, because of their background, have a limited knowledge of the consequences of the passage of this bill. The bulk of the government supporters appeared to have only one interest in mind, and that was the swiftest passage of the bill through committee in order that it may be brought back to the House prior to the summer adjournment. It was suggested by a member who was drafted to the committee last night that a time limit be imposed on the proceedings.

Mr. Speaker, my question of privilege is complicated by the fact that all the rules that have been drafted in the House pertain to the proceedings of the House of Commons. The rules are not drafted to take into account committee proceedings. To argue that the committee is master of its own proceedings

leaves a member, who has a greater responsibility in particular during consideration of a bill than would be imposed upon him had the proceedings been undertaken in the House, without the protection that other members have who participate in House deliberations. The House, through an order, granted me the right to sit on the committee as a member and to participate in all the deliberations and votes in that committee. By denying me the right to speak, the chairman of the day denied a ruling of the House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Korchinski: I think you will agree with me that there is now and has been in the past a feeling that Your Honour has, as have other Speakers, displayed a sense of fairness in allowing equal opportunity to all members of the House of Commons, who have the right and the duty to speak on all matters during consideration in the House or in committee.

In the House of Commons, when it is intended to impose closure on debate, proper notice is usually given. This is not the case in committees, and members of committees are then at the mercy of the majority of government supporters who are preoccupied with the idea of getting the bill out of committee and back into the House before the summer recess.

In the past I have raised other questions of privilege pertaining to the committee system. I believe I have no other recourse than to appeal to you on this occasion to display a sense of justice and allow this question of privilege. If you so rule, I would be prepared to move the following motion seconded by the hon. member for Kent-Essex (Mr. Danforth):

That the committee proceedings, particularly as they apply to the study of bills, be reviewed by the Procedure and Organization Committee in order to establish certain guidelines for the protection of all members of the committee which would be comparable to the protection afforded by Your Honour during proceedings in the House of Commons or by the chairman during proceedings in the Committee of the Whole.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean): Mr. Speaker, with respect to the point raised by the hon. member for Mackenzie concerning incidents that would have occurred at last night's regular sitting of the Committee on Agriculture, I should like to reply at least to the reference the hon. member made to my behaviour as chairman of that committee, to the effect that one of the rulings I handed down in the course of the proceedings was biased.

The hon. member claims that the chairman was not fair to the members of the opposition who wished to take part in the clause by clause discussion on Bill C-196.

I wish to point out to the House that I have never prevented anyone from availing himself of his privileges and his rights. In all fairness, however, I believe that a committee chairman must direct the debates so as to divide the time available among the committee members; more particularly, he must give every member the opportunity of expressing the views of this party as well as his own on the legislation under study. That is what I have been trying to do and that is what I will try to do again if I continue to sit as Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. When hon. members read the proceedings of last night's committee meeting and read what was said between 8 and 10:30 p.m. they will realize that opposition members and particularly the hon. member for Mackenzie had ample opportunity to express their views on the four clauses that were examined during the evening. The hon. member himself admitted that he had participated in the debate on the clause in question. He contends that I prevented him from taking a greater part in the debate, that he asked to be recognized before the question was put on the clause concerned. He may have done so and I did not see him. In any event, the member had the opportunity to talk on that clause as any other member and I do not think I failed in my duty as chairman of the committee. I do not have a guilty conscience about the work I did last night.

[*English*]

Mr. Woolliams: Don't give us that nonsense. I never heard anything like it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Mackenzie has presented his case in a very clear way and the hon. member for Lac-Saint-Jean has expounded his position in reply to the matter brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member for Mackenzie. This is a particularly difficult situation. As the hon. member for Mackenzie has quite rightly said, while our Standing Orders apply generally to our debates and proceedings in the House of Commons, there is very little said about proceedings in committees. I believe it is recognized, and the Standing Orders so provide, that the rules which apply to the governing of

debates in the House also apply to the debates which take place in committees, and members, chairmen and acting chairmen are subject to the same rules there as they are in the House of Commons.

Whether the matter might be looked into further by a committee of the House or the Committee on Procedure and Organization, as suggested by the hon. member, is another question. I assure him that I consider this as a serious matter. If hon. members agree, I should like to have an opportunity to look into it a little more closely and, if hon. members do not think it an untoward action, to have a discussion with the Clerk of the committee, receive a report from him, and perhaps look at the evidence. At that time it might be easier for the Chair to determine whether this is the kind of situation that ought to be considered by the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization. I must say that while, generally speaking, it is a commendable action for the House to refer to a committee a matter of principle on which there can be debate in the committee and a recommendation made to the House, I have always had some hesitation about suggesting that proceedings in one committee be considered by another committee. I wonder what might come of it.

• (2:30 p.m.)

The motion proposed by the hon. member is very sensible in that the hon. member does not ask that an investigation be carried out in this particular instance, but rather that the general application of our Standing Orders to committees should be studied by the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization. It may well be that hon. members might agree that this question ought to be studied by that committee. With the consent of the House I will take the matter under advisement, study the evidence and communicate with the House later on this subject.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, in connection with the ruling, there was an occasion last week of which Your Honour is aware and I have some reason to know that it is an impropriety to make critical remarks within this House about the conduct of a chairman of a committee. In the course of his remarks, the hon. member for Mackenzie made an allegation of partiality against the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Agriculture. I do not intend to propose a motion at this point in view of the ruling of the Chair, but I would like to bring this question to Your Honour's attention. In view of that allegation, and the clear rule of this House, I think the House will also have to consider the remarks of the hon. member for Mackenzie this afternoon. They are clearly against the rule.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I doubt whether we should pursue the matter. I will look into all aspects of the situation. I can assure the President of the Privy Council, the hon. member for Mackenzie and the hon. member for Lac-Saint-Jean that I will look into the situation and either reach a decision or make a ruling which might be acceptable to hon. members.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

TABLING OF WHITE PAPER—STATEMENT BY MINISTER ON NEW PROGRAM

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the government, it gives me great pleasure to table a white paper outlining a proposed new unemployment insurance program. My statement is rather brief.

The plan is the culmination of a relatively long period of consultation and study. It takes into account a number of the recommendations in the report of the Gill Committee and incorporates many representations received from labour, management and other interested groups.

The proposals contained in the white paper confirm the desire of this government to promote social policies that build the country not simply for progress but for people, people who must be adequately nourished, whose potential must be met and whose children must be well educated and, above all, people who must have jobs. The new emphasis will be on individual development coupled with adequate income support.

To this end, the plan will provide for a series of up to three interviews for all those who suffer from interruptions of earnings due to loss of work. These interviews are intended primarily to aid the individual in his search for employment. They will also help, however, to identify those persons who should not be receiving benefits.

Coverage will become universal. Some will call this an unnecessary imposition on those who apparently are secure in their employment. Perhaps they need not fear unemployment in the classical sense. But surely there is no one any more who can say with certainty that he or she will never suffer a temporary interruption of earnings.

The benefit rates are to be substantially increased in order to provide meaningful income support during the employment search or training period.

The benefit rate will be two-thirds of average wages during the qualifying period, rising to three-quarters in the later stages for persons with dependants. The maximum benefit, however, will be $100 per week.

Employee contributions will be significantly lower than at present while the employer cost will vary from well below the present costs to slightly higher, depending on their lay-off pattern. For example, the employee who earns $100 per week presently pays $1.40, this will be reduced to 79 cents under the new plan. The employer now pays $1.40 for that same employee and this rate could drop to as low as 79 cents. Persons already in the labour force excluded under the present Act will enter at a preferred contribution rate with a maximum of 50 cents per week.

Benefits will also be extended to those who suffer loss of income due to sickness, pregnancy and retirement. These benefits will be for a 15-week maximum, with the exception of the retirement benefit which will consist of a three-week lump sum.

In harmony with our intention to return to the insurance principle, certain welfare features that have crept into the plan will be discontinued. For example, the seasonal benefits as well as the provisions that permitted retired persons to draw up to 18 months of benefits will be dropped. However, eligibility will be expanded to allow those persons with as few as eight employment weeks to draw some benefit.

In addition, the government is not only proposing to help the unemployed and the less advantaged by providing an expanded system of income support during an adjustment process, it is also ready to assume the cost of extra unemployment insurance benefits when national unemployment rates exceed 4 per cent or when regional unemployment is over 4 per cent and exceeds the national average by more than 1 per cent.

[Mr. Mackasey.]

Finally, it is important to point out that the 4 per cent level is not to be taken as a rate of unemployment acceptable to the government. A benchmark of 4 per cent, based on a long term average national unemployment rate, was used to set the lower limit for government contribution. It is in no way intended to be a definition of full employment for the economy.

I cannot, Mr. Speaker, in the time allotted to me, even attempt to outline the proposals in detail. However, a measure as comprehensive as this one deserves the immediate attention of all Canadians, especially those who are in the most pressing need of a more effective unemployment insurance program. With this in mind, I would hope there might be immediate agreement among the members to refer the white paper to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my thanks to the minister for his kind co-operation and courtesy in forwarding a copy of his statement to this side of the House. This is not an unusual action for this minister. Also, I wish to commend him on his forthright and refreshing statement today concerning the matter raised by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin). His frankness and honesty should be noted by some of his colleagues.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): This is a welcome statement, Mr. Speaker, however long overdue. In fact, it is approximately eight years overdue. After much labouring "mountainous Mackasey" has brought forth not a mouse but a Trojan horse. This Trojan horse appears to be a gift to the masses. However, with this government nothing of that sort can be accepted without criticism. The white paper on higher taxation is an example.

I wish first to deal with the good aspects. Improvement and rationalization of benefits is good, as well as the reference to cleaning up the funds welfare aspects and putting emphasis on more clearcut insurance principles. Many will undoubtedly welcome the provision for payments in the case of pregnancy. Certainly, some improvement was required in this area. It will be popular. However, the committee will have to make a long and careful study of this aspect.

• (2:40 p.m.)

We also welcome the attempt to encourage employers to phase out lay-offs more carefully than is sometimes the case. Here I refer to previous comments made in the House by the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) and also the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) in reply to representations made about the matter by hon. members on this side. I refer particularly to the Hawker-Siddeley close-out in the city of Sydney which overnight put 3,000 people out of work, the Dunlop decision in Toronto, and many similar situations across the country.

At this moment, the unemployment insurance scheme has far too many weaknesses and abuses built into it. The idea proposed of three job interviews for people drawing unemployment benefits will be a step in the right direction. We wonder whether this represents the final victory of the Minister of Labour over the Minister of Manpower. The minister, quite correctly, placed emphasis on individual development. With this attention to full and meaningful employment, the minister has properly extended the perspective of this white paper to include responsibility for job placement, counselling and retraining. In doing so, he made reference to the Department of Manpower and Immigration and this is very timely.

However, I am very disappointed that he did not go further. The white paper speaks only of an efficient "pipeline" to the services and the responsibilities of the whole government, and this is not enough. If the minister is really ambitious about bringing our manpower, counselling and job opportunity efforts up to contemporary standards, the white paper should have gone much further. A counselling service under the aegis of the Unemployment Insurance Commission will be of little help if it is simply a referral service to the incompetent and inadequate Department of Manpower.

In accepting the totality of the challenge, the white paper should have either made a thorough analysis of the state of the manpower department or it should have called for an immediate and open investigation of the manpower department. This cannot be evaded. The Department of Manpower and Immigration is ultimately responsible for these services and it must be reformed. In fact, I would not hesitate to suggest that it should be reformed to the extent that this minister should be made responsible both for manpower and for unemployment insurance, because the present Minister of Manpower does not seem to have very much influence in the cabinet under this Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau).

Until we have further details we must remain cautious about the effects of this new scheme on workers who regularly undergo prolonged seasonal unemployment. While some mention is made of exempting self-employed fishermen, we must have more details than are available to us at this time before being too enthusiastic about the proposals in this area.

However, if one wants to rationalize the universality of the scheme there should be no mistake about the effect. It is a great new tax increase being imposed on very substantial numbers of Canadians, at least 1.16 million wage earners. Whether they will be satisfied with the government's proposed attempts to buy them off with sickness and pregnancy insurance remains to be seen.

This Trojan horse is being paraded before us as reform of unemployment insurance. Many will be so concerned about seeing that present abuses are eliminated that the bootleg compulsory sickness insurance scheme may be overlooked. This scheme involves compulsory sickness insurance. It may be a good thing, but it is not something that this government should embark on without long and careful discussion by the members of this House, by the members of provincial governments who might well think this matter lies within their jurisdiction, and by the Canadian public. This proposal should receive the kind of thorough-going public attention that was accorded to the previous compulsory welfare schemes—pensions, hospital insurance and medical insurance.

I wonder where the Prime Minister's statement that there will be no more medicare fiascos stands now? This compulsory sickness insurance program has all the attributes of another medicare scheme. What of the costs involved here? We are led to believe that as long as unemployment remains below 4 per cent the new fund will be self-sustaining, that it will not require assistance from the Consolidated Revenue Fund. Unemployment in this country has not been below 4 per cent, even at the best time of the year, for almost three years. This fund will require substantial amounts of money from the Consolidated Revenue Fund. Where will the fund get that money form? How much will it amount to? The government has not even given us any estimates. Does it not know? If it does not, then it is being horribly irresponsible here as

it has been in other matters. If it does know, the government is absolutely obligated to give us those estimates. The country must know what it is getting into.

It will be clear, I think, why I regard this program as a giant Trojan horse. It may very well be a pig-in-a-poke as well. I welcome the government's attempts to move positively in this area. However, I think we must insist on the most careful scrutiny and widest possible public discussion before we become committed. This discussion should take place only when all the facts are available.

One final note. The timing is rather interesting. Just before we might expect the next federal election the government promises goodies without pasting us all with the increased taxes that go with them. That is pretty blatant electioneering—and this far ahead, Mr. Speaker!

In conclusion, I am pleased to see the sizeable increase in benefits in relationship to weekly income. I am happy, too, that for the five million people covered there will be a fairly substantial reduction in weekly contributions. I am particularly pleased to see that the federal government will absorb the cost of the plan when the rate of national unemployment reaches 4 per cent. This feature should remind the Department of Finance that the high rate of unemployment which its fiscal and monetary policies have created will, as far as this plan is concerned, cost the federal government some substantial sums of money. Perhaps in the final analysis the minister and the government will reflect a little more on the implementation of fiscal and monetary policies of the sort that are causing large-scale unemployment in this country.

I also welcome the regional aspects of the plan which take into consideration the high rate of unemployment in less-favoured areas of the country. Likewise, I welcome the suggestion that this white paper be referred immediately to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration where the proposals can be studied in greater detail. I wish the minister well in his continuous battle with the millionaires row in the cabinet. In view of the comments made by the Prime Minister of this country and his callous attitude toward labour, I can only refer to that old Ukrainian folk saying: "The sheep are in trouble where the wolf is the shepherd."

[Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys).]

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, I should like first of all, on behalf of this party, to congratulate the minister for supplying us with a copy of his statement. I, too, am pleased that he made a forthright statement in the House today indicating that the confidential nature of this white paper had been breached by somebody else, not by himself. I am sure that as far as the many thousands of Canadians now unemployed, and the many more who expect to be unemployed in the near future, are concerned, as long as this government continues its 18th century policy the proposed reforms will be welcome.

I am sure many people across the country will welcome some of the reforms included in his announcement today. I am sure also that legislation is needed to protect the unemployed. But I suggest that provision of jobs would better protect the workers of the country than provisions to assist those who become unemployed, and it is the creation of such employment that should be our goal in a modern society.

The manpower policy of the government is urgently in need of reform, and perhaps the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen) will make a statement in the House about sweeping changes to be made in his policy in line with the proposals made by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) today. I also hope that the Minister of Manpower and Immigration will give consideration to the fact that the statement made today recognizes the need of the people of Canada for a social policy. I hope, therefore, he will announce how his department is going to co-ordinate its efforts with those of the Department of Labour.

I further suggest that many of the responsibilities presently assumed by the Minister of Manpower should be transferred to the Minister of Labour so as to effect better co-ordination of effort in looking after those who are unemployed and who need retraining under the manpower retraining scheme. We fully realize that under the present circumstances unemployment insurance alone does not sufficiently meet the needs of the unemployed. They need retraining. There are too many areas in the manpower department—manpower mobility is an example—which should come under the Minister of Labour so that actions could be co-ordinated. We note that many of the proposals made are proposals in respect of which this party has been urging the government to take immediate action.

• (2:50 p.m.)

As the hon. member who just spoke said, some aspects of the plan are like the universal medicare scheme. I suggest to the minister that we would congratulate him and support him wholeheartedly if he were to bring in an unemployment insurance plan similar to the medicare plan to cover all Canadians. I am sure we are pleased to see the unemployment insurance program return to the original concept of insurance protection. While it is expected that fishermen will be excluded in time, we are also pleased to hear that for the present they will still be covered under this legislation. We will be waiting with interest to see what type of legislation will be brought in to cover the fishermen.

Without question, we in this party support the concept of universal coverage. I am pleased to note in the statement today that universal coverage is one of the main points the minister makes. We welcome without hesitation the fact that people who become ill when employed and women who are pregnant, sometimes, under difficult financial circumstances, will be looked after. We welcome the fact that those people who are now excluded will be included in this comprehensive plan. There is one aspect of this scheme about which many of us wonder and which will be discussed at length during the committee hearings. We question the reason why some of the self-employed people are being left out. We welcome the fact that full-time housekeepers will be included. We agree with the idea of universal coverage and suggest that this white paper should be studied by the committee on manpower and labour so that consideration may be given to those points about which we have some questions.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Charles-Eugène Dionne (Kamouraska): Mr. Speaker, the minister's statement on the white paper includes several points which are worth emphasizing. However, as I have just seen that document and since it is referred to the committee for consideration, we will undoubtedly have the opportunity to study it thoroughly and state our views.

What has especially held my attention is the reference to universal coverage. I immediately thought of the Canadian workers, 7,000 or 8,000 of whom find work in the United States each year. For 20 years, representations have been made to the Canadian government to enable those workers to draw unemployment insurance benefits. So, if I understand the meaning of universal coverage, I presume that the provisions concerning the application of the regulations will be flexible enough for those citizens who cope, to a certain extent, with the present problem of unemployment in Canada by finding themselves a job in the United States to take advantage of the Unemployment Insurance Act.

There remains another point to be considered and which I have also noticed. It is the following statement:

> In harmony with our intention to return to the insurance principle, certain welfare features that have crept into the plan will be discontinued.

I wonder whether the Unemployment Insurance Commission should not get a new name and simply be called an insurance company, because I doubt very much that this legislation will retain any social characteristics. The first concern is to look after the fund, as insurance companies usually do. That is fine, because it is their responsibility, but social legislation must take into greater account the needs of the unemployed and not the protection of the fund. I have seen this happen thousands of times while I was involved with the labour movement and also since I have been a member of the House of Commons.

I thank the minister for having made that statement, for having tabled the white paper, which we intend to consider. However, I wish the new act will be flexible so that the unemployed, who in most cases have not had the benefit of a higher education, can understand those provisions.

[*English*]

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

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, in his comments the Minister of Labour suggested, and the suggestion seemed to find support, that the white paper he tabled should be referred to the committee. I wonder whether the House might be agreeable to giving unanimous consent to the following motion:

> That the white paper on unemployment insurance tabled this day be referred to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members have heard the motion proposed by the President of the Privy Council. Is the motion agreed to?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

ARGENTIA, NFLD.—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43, I ask the unanimous consent of the House to present a motion on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. This motion arises out of the desperate situation in which the 7,000 residents of the Argentia area have been placed by the United States government's announcement to phase down the American naval station at Argentia. The phase-down, which will be completed within 13 days, has affected the economy and prospects of the entire area. The government recognized the urgency of the situation by appointing a task force to go into the area and to report and recommend counter-economic measures. Early in May that task force reported to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. The 7,000 residents of the Argentia area, the various municipal authorities, and the Newfoundland government have not been advised what plans, if any, the government has to relieve their plight. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath):

That this House urges the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion to forthwith table under S.O. 41 the Task Force Report on Argentia which was submitted to him by the Task Force early in May, 1970, and under motions this afternoon make a statement as to the government's intention to assist this economically crippled area.

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the motion proposed by the hon. member for St. John's West. This motion can be considered only with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there such consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimity. The motion cannot be put.

CANADA LABOUR (SAFETY) CODE

AMENDMENT TO INCLUDE SHIP REPAIR WORKERS, LONGSHOREMEN, ETC.

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-223, to amend the Canada Labour (Safety) Code (Marine workers).

He said: Mr. Speaker, the only purpose of this bill is to ensure that all repair workers will be included under the legislation. There appears at the present time to be a no-man's land. I am sure that with this clarification this bill will close the gap which is evident.

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

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

AIR TRAFFIC PATTERNS, ATLANTIC PROVINCES

Question No. 461—**Mr. Thomas (Moncton):**

1. When was the committee studying air traffic patterns in the Atlantic Provinces set-up?

2. What are the specific terms of reference of the committee?

3. What is the expected date for the committee to make a final report?

4. Will the report be made public?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. A study was commissioned to Professors Stevens and Wilson of the Department of Civil Engineering of the University of New Brunswick. Work on the study was commenced late in July, 1969. The contractual relationship is with ADI Limited of Fredericton, N.B. of which Professor Stevens is a Vice President.

2. Terms of reference of the study are as follows: (a) An analysis of the existing transportation market by all modes. (b) The development of 20-year passenger traffic forecasts for all modes of transportation, including an estimate of the share of the aviation market, and the development of models for such forecasts. (c) A review of past and present air cargo traffic records, the establishment of trends and estimates of air cargo traffic twenty years in the future. (d) The development of a system of aviation services which would be compatible with the demand. (e) An examination of the compatibility of the airports system in southern New Brunswick with the future needs of aviation services, including recommendations on the development of such a system.

3. A preliminary report has just been received and is now being studied by officials of the ministry. A final report is expected by the end of July.

4. A decision has not yet been taken regarding the publication of this report.

DISPOSAL OF FERRY "PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND"

Question No. 933—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. How many tenders were received for the purchase of the ferry, *Prince Edward Island* and, what was the amount of each?

2. For what reason was this disposal handled by the CNR rather than Crown Assets Disposal Corporation?

3. What was the cost of removing and transporting the wheel house and other parts for location at the National Museum of Science and Technology at Borden, P.E.I.?

4. (a) Was any study made of the feasibility of beaching the ship at Borden for conversion to a museum and/or restaurant (b) what was the estimated cost of such a project?

5. Did the Government of Prince Edward Island make any offer for the ferry, *Prince Edward Island* and, if so, in what amount?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Transport and the National Museums of Canada as follows:

1. Eight bids were received ranging from $400 to $20,000.

2. The ferry vessels are operated by Canadian National Railways on behalf of the Government and disposal of the vessels by CNR is an extension of this role.

3. Cost $314.34 for transportation of wheel house and other parts by CNR from Borden, P.E.I., to Ottawa.

4. No, not by Department of Transport. Negotiations were carried out between the two levels of Government with a view to the Province of Prince Edward Island acquiring the vessel. Subsequently, the Province indicated that it did not want to acquire the vessel.

5. No.

TRANSPORT—PROJECTS PLANNED FOR CAPE BRETON-THE SYDNEYS

Question No. 1,293—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys):**

What projects are planned by the Department of Transport in the coming year in the constituency of Cape Breton-The Sydneys and what is the estimated cost of each project?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Sydney-South Bar, replacement of light tower and semi-automation, $40,700. Scatari light station, replacement of fog alarm building, $20,000. Louisburg light station, semi-automation, $14,000. Low Point light station, semi-automation, $16,600. Glace Bay light station, semi-automation, $7,000. Point Aconi light station, semi-automation, $6,700. Black Rock Point light station, semi-automation, $5,300. Wreck removal Point Edward, $70,000. Construction of passenger walkway between terminal and vessels at North Sydney, $150,000. Installation of 250 feet of chain link fencing at North Sydney terminal, $3,900.

VETERANS AFFAIRS—ENGAGEMENT OF CONSULTANTS

Question No. 1,494—**Mr. Robinson:**

How many consultants have been engaged by the Department of Veterans Affairs during each year 1950 to 1970 inclusive (a) what was the cost of the consultants (b) how were the consultants utilized (c) for what reasons were the consultants necessary?

Mr. Jean-Eudes Dubé (Minister of Veterans Affairs):

	(a)		(b)	(c)
1950 to 1953	No records available			
1954	1	$ 514.03	Professional advisor in planning subdivision for the construction of houses.	Qualified staff was not available.
1956	1	100.00	"	"
1959	2	6,138.90	"	"
1960	1	2,311.25	"	"
1963	1	78,972.00	Survey of Financial Management.	Outside impartial viewpoint of Department's financial practices and assistance in the implementation of the Glassco Commission Report.
1966	1	14,400.00	Assisting the Department in the planning and promotion of a National Remembrance Ceremony.	Lack of Departmental resources in the publicity and promotion field needed to provide mass coverage.

Questions

		(a)	(b)	(c)
1967	1	19,862.00	Architectural consultant on renovation of hospital.	Qualified staff was not available.
1968	4	12,230.00	Two consultants on "Books of Remembrance".	Specialized field of Heraldry.
			Two architectural consultants on renovation of hospital areas.	Qualified staff was not available.
1969	4	21,990.64	One consultant to advise regarding the contion of the land on which a house was built.	Qualified staff was not available.
			One consultant in Heraldry.	No personnel specialized in field of Heraldry.
			One consultant in interior furnishings.	Professional services.
			One consultant on anniversary ceremonies.	Qualified staff was not available.
1970	1	32,497.12	Consultant in public relations to provide counselling services, advice and technical assistance.	Specialized technical assistance required for major projects.

POLLUTION—BANNING OF PHOSPHATES

Question No. 1,497—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

How many letters, telegrams, signed protests or other communications were received by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources from January 15 to February 28, 1970, demanding legislation to ban phosphate detergents?

Mr. R. J. Orange (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Between January 15 and February 28, 1970, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources received 413 letters, telegrams, signed protests or other communications concerning legislation to ban phosphate detergents.

CONSTRUCTION OF CAUSEWAY TO LENNOX ISLAND

Question No. 1,503—**Mr. McQuaid:**

Has the Government of Canada arrived at a decision as to whether it will construct a causeway to Lennox Island and (a) if so, when will construction commence (b) if not, how soon may one be expected?

Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): No, the construction of a causeway to Lennox Island is still under consideration. It is not possible to forecast when a decision will be made.

TRANSPORT—ENGAGEMENT OF CONSULTANTS

Question No. 1,535—**Mr. Robinson:**

How many consultants have been engaged by the Department of Transport during each year 1950 to 1970 inclusive (a) what was the cost of the consultants (b) how were the consultants utilized (c) for what reasons were the consultants necessary?

[Mr. Dubé.]

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The requested information is not readily available in departmental records. To provide a complete and accurate answer would entail costly expenditures and the hiring of additional staff to undertake the large amount of work which would be required to gather this information. However, Question No. 223 (*Hansard* of December 17, 1969, page 2069) has given information on consultant studies engaged by the Department during the years 1968-69 and 1969-70.

ARGO CONSTRUCTION COMPANY LIMITED CONTRACTS

Question No. 1,603—**Mr. Alkenbrack:**

1. During the past six years have any contracts been awarded by the federal government to the Argo Construction Co. Ltd. and, if so (a) which ones (b) where is the head office of the company located (c) what is the name of the president of this company (d) what are the names of the principal shareholders (e) what are the names of all executives and members of the board of directors?

2. What are the names of the incompleted contracts and projects now being performed by Argo Construction Co. Ltd.?

3. On all these past and present contracts did the government employ their own government inspector on each and, if not, who was responsible for the inspection of these projects?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Public Works and the Dominion Bureau of Statistics as follows: 1. (a) Cowansville, Que., Phase 2, Medium Security Institution. Ste. Anne des Plaines, Que., Maximum Security Institution, Satellite No. 1. Ottawa, Ont., General Purpose Office Building, Tunney's Pasture. Mill-

haven, Ont., Maximum Security Institution, Satellite No. 1 and Service Buildings. Millhaven, Ont., Maximum Security Institution, Central Heating Plant.

*(b) The head office of the company is located at 3901 Jean Talon Street West, Town of Mount Royal, Quebec.

(c) The president of the company is H. A. Hallward.

(d) The company reports no shares held by other corporations. It is not required to report principal shareholders which are not corporations.

(e) The executives and members of the board of directors are H. G. Hallward, F. R. Bibeau, B. M. Hallward, P. R. D. MacKell and J. G. Elliot.

---

*There is no available return for an Argo Construction Co. Ltd. The above was taken from the annual return of Argo Construction Ltd., for the fiscal period ending February 28, 1969.

2. Millhaven is incomplete. Ottawa is complete with the exception of deficiencies. Although Cowansville and Ste. Anne des Plaines are technically complete corrective action arising from warranty clauses has not been entirely resolved.

3. The consultant architects employed by the Department of Public Works are responsible for the inspection of these projects. For the projects listed in Part 1 (a), the consultants are: Cowansville, Quebec, Mr. O. P. Trepanier; Ste. Anne des Plaines, Quebec, Mr. Jean Perreault; Ottawa, Ontario, Mr. Ronald Ogilvie; Millhaven, Ontario, (Satellite No. 1 and Service Buildings), J. L. Richards and Associates Ltd.; Millhaven, Ontario, (Central Heating Plant), J. L. Richards and Associates Ltd.

INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT EMPLOYMENT OF BILL WUTTUNEE

Question No. 1,707—**Mr. Howard (Skeena):**

Is Bill Wuttunee of Alberta employed by or under contract to the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and, if so (a) on what date did he enter into such employ or contractual arrangement (b) for what period of time (c) at what salary and expense allowance (d) what, in detail, are his duties?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): No, but Mr. Bill Wuttunee of Alberta was employed under a contractual arrangement to provide a consultation service. (a) February 9, 10 and 11, 1970. (b) Three days. (c) Salary at $200 per day; Expense allowance at $35 per day for three days and air fares at $248. (d) The purpose of the contract was to engage Mr. Wuttunee to ask him his opinion on some particular points connected with the review of the Indian Act.

AGRICULTURE—RESEARCH STUDIES

Question No. 1,749—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. What research studies have been carried out by, or on behalf of the Department of Agriculture during each year 1960 to 1969 inclusive?

2. What research studies are now being carried on and/or are contemplated during the next five years?

3. What was the cost of each of the research studies completed in each year 1960 to 1969 inclusive?

4. What is the estimated cost of each of the studies now in being or contemplated during the next five years?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Records do not permit the compilation of answers to these questions in their present form. Interpreting the word "studies" to be synonymous with biological research projects, the Research Branch of this Department had approximately 3,500 such projects under way in 1960. These have been grouped into larger units with the result that there are now about 1,200 projects. Approximately 120 projects are completed or discontinued each year and an equivalent number of new ones instituted. It has not been feasible to maintain the detailed cost accounting records necessary to price each project. However, in recent years projects have been grouped into activities. Costing at this level is presented in new format of the Main Estimates Blue Book.

POLLUTION—BANNING OF PHOSPHATES

Question No. 1,780—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

How many letters, telegrams, signed protests or other communications were received by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources from March 1 to April 30, 1970, demanding legislation to ban phosphate detergents?

Mr. R. J. Orange (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): From March 1 through April 30, 1970, 1,678 letters, telegrams, signed protests and other communications were received by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, concerning legislation to ban phosphate detergents.

Questions

STUDY OF BAY OF FUNDY TIDES

Question No. 1,785—**Mr. Coates:**

1. What was the final cost of the study carried out by the Atlantic Tidal Power Programming Board and, of that amount, how much was assumed by each of the governments involved?

2. Of the estimated cost of constructing the dams to harness the tides of the Bay of Fundy from a power point of view, did the Board consider the cost per kilowatt hour amortized over a 75 year period at a 1%, 2%, 3%, 4%, 5%, 6% and 7% rate of interest and, if so, what would be such costs?

3. Does the federal government, either alone or in co-operation with the Governments of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, intend to continue any form of investigation into the matter?

Mr. R. J. Orange (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): The Department of Energy, Mines and Resources reports as follows: 1. The estimated final cost of the study carried out by the Atlantic Tidal Power Programming Board is $2,257,540. Under the federal-provincial Agreement of August 1966, the federal government assumed two-thirds of this amount and the Governments of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia each assumed one-sixth.

2. Cost estimates were made for a single-effect development at Site 8.1, Economy Point to Cape Tenny in Minas Basin, for interest rates of 3, 5, 7 and 9 per cent. These preliminary estimates gave costs per kilowatt-hour of 2.8, 4.2, 5.9 and 7.8 mills respectively based on initial optimization studies. Subsequent refinements in the final optimization study for a single effect development at Site 8.1 gave a value of 5.6 mills per kilowatt-hour using a seven per cent interest rate. These estimates were based on an amortization period of 75 years.

3. No further tidal power investigations are planned by the federal government at this time.

USE OF CANADIAN FACILITIES BY WEST LINE LIMITED

Question No. 1,822—**Mr. McCleave:**

1. Is West Line Limited using Canadian facilities for its cruise vessels, including ports of call and inside waterways and, if so, which ones?

2. Are the vessels owned or chartered by West Line Limited under Canadian registry and, if so, what are the names of such vessels and which are owned by that company?

3. Has the company indicated it intends to abandon Canadian registry at any vessels and, if so, which ones?

[Mr. Orange.]

4. (a) Has the Department of Labour been advised of lock-out activity by the company and, if so, what steps has it taken (b) has the Department found that the company proposes to replace Canadian crew members with foreign crews and, if so, has it been indicated from which country such would come?

5. What restrictions, if any, govern the use of Canadian facilities by vessels of non-Canadian registry, engaged in the tourist and cruise trade on the West Coast?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Transport and Labour as follows: 1. Yes. Vessels of West Line Limited currently use Victoria, B.C. and Prince Rupert, B.C. on an unscheduled basis. Canadian waters used are Strait of Georgia, Discovery Passage, Johnson Strait, Queen Charlotte Strait, Queen Charlotte Sound, Fitzhugh Sound, Milbanke Sound, Finlayson Channel, Grenville Channel and Chatham Sound.

2. As of May 6, 1970, ships registered in Canada in the name of West Line Limited were: *Glacier Queen*, *Polar Star* and *Yukon Star*, all of Vancouver. There is no information regarding ships that may be chartered by West Line Limited.

3. On May 7, 1970, West Line Limited terminated Canadian registry on the *Polar Star* on transfer to Panamanian flag. We have no knowledge of their plans for the two ships remaining on Canadian registry.

4. (a) The Department of Labour was advised informally but was requested to take no action pending further word; (b) It is reported that the Company has hired Spanish Crews for two vessels operating out of Seattle. Other vessels owned by the Company in Canada are not operating.

5. None.

TORONTO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Question No. 1,823—**Mr. McCleave:**

1. Have the public lounge and nursery at Toronto International Airport been removed and, if so, for what purpose?

2. Is it planned to provide these facilities elsewhere at the airport and, if so, on what date?

3. (a) Is there a lounge for first-class passengers at the Airport (b) is it proposed to remove this facility?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. Yes, in order to permit work to proceed with carrying out improvements to the transborder check-in and pre-clearance facilities.

2. Yes. The nursery facilities have been relocated in the basement level adjacent to the elevator lobby, and will reopen shortly. The lounge will be reinstated early next year in the existing east court area which is to be closed in for this purpose.

3. (a) No; (b) N/A.

CONSUMER DEBT 1960-69

Question No. 1,871—**Mr. Robinson:**

What was the total consumer debt for each year 1960 to 1969 inclusive and what was the percentage increase for each year?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): The Dominion Bureau of Statistics reports that: The Dominion Bureau of Statistics publishes a monthly bulletin on "Credit Statistics" (D.B.S. Catalogue No. 61-004) which covers only that part of consumer indebtedness as measured by the balances outstanding on the books of selected holders, such as, sales finance companies, consumer loan companies, the chartered and Quebec Savings banks, life insurance companies, department stores, furniture and appliance dealers, motor vehicle dealers, other retail dealers, oil companies credit cards and Credit Unions and Caisses Populaires. The attached table shows outstanding balances and the percentage increase each year, since year end 1960. It must be emphasized however that this data on consumer credit excludes mortgages, home improvement loans, and fully secured bank loans and it does not include the sizeable volume of debt arising from inter-personal loans, professional fees owing to doctors and dentists, bills for service by hotels, and transportation and utility companies, loans from brokers and investment dealers, and credit from the use of all-purpose convenience credit cards, for which statistics are not available.

According to a special survey conducted by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and published as Catalogue No. 13-525 under the title "Incomes, Assets and Indebtedness of Non-Farm Families in Canada—1963" consumer credit accounted for about one-fifth of the Canadian family's total indebtedness while residential mortgages amounted to almost 75 per cent of the total, and other personal debt (fully-secured bank loans, home-improvement loans, medical bills, interpersonal (non-family) debt and unpaid taxes) composed the balance of five per cent.

Questions

Table showing year-end outstanding balances of selected holders of consumer credit from 1960 with annual percentage increase.

Year End	Outstanding balances (millions of dollars)	Annual Percentage Increase
1960	4,020	+ 8.9
1961	4,250	+ 5.7
1962	4,694	+ 10.4
1963	5,270	+ 12.3
1964	6,056	+ 14.9
1965	6,943	+ 14.6
1966	7,556	+ 8.8
1967	8,372	+ 10.8
1968	9,584	+ 14.3
1969	10,837	+ 13.1

Source: D.B.S. publication "Credit Statistics" (Catalogue No. 61-004).

VANCOUVER INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT—PURCHASE OF LAND

Question No. 1,881—**Mr. Goode:**

Does the Department of Transport plan to buy a part of all the Burkeville residential subdivision located on Sea Island near the Vancouver International Airport?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The Department plans to buy only that property in the Burkeville residential subdivision which is required in the relocation of the road system.

CANADIAN PRODUCTION OF STEEL IN 1969

Question No. 1,915—**Mr. Matte:**

1. How much steel did Canada produce in 1969?

2. Was this a reduction as compared to 1968, and if so, what are the reasons for this reduction?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): The Dominion Bureau of Statistics reports that: 1. Production of steel ingots in 1969 totalled 10,152,000 tons.

2. This was a reduction from the 1968 total of 11,109,000 tons. The Bureau is not in a position to state the reasons for the reduction but it should be noted that there was a strike of about three months duration at the plants of two of the major producers.

Questions

[*English*]

INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT—RETENTION OF PUBLIC RELATIONS FIRMS

Question No. 1,930—**Mr. Sulatycky:**

1. Has the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development retained or employed from time-to-time, from outside its own permanent employees, any public relations firm or person, or any advertising firm or person for any purpose in the past five years and, if so, for what purpose?

2. What are the names of such firms or persons so employed in the past two years?

3. What was the total expenditure made for the service of such persons or firms in each of the past five years?

Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. Yes. To advise the Department on matters pertaining to public relations and to organize new information programs as required.

2. Williams and Wilson Ltd., Berger, Tisdall, Clark and Leslie, Ltd., Paul Phelan and Perry Ltd., Steiner Public Relations Ltd., Jacques Guay Associates, Crockett Writers Ltd., Profile, Ltd., and Desroches, Jasmin and Associates Inc.

3. 1965-66, $14,839; 1966-67, $37,970; 1967-68, $83,340; 1968-69, $48,555.55; 1969-70, $71,079.57.

AGRICULTURE—COST OF REPORT "CANADIAN AGRICULTURE IN THE SEVENTIES"

Question No. 1,941—**Mr. Mazankowski:**

1. What were the total costs for the compilation and preparation of the report entitled "Canadian Agriculture in the Seventies"?

2. What were the total costs of printing the report?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): 1. The total cost of the Federal Task Force on Agriculture to March 31, 1970 was $622,-979. Additional cost of preparing the report for printing is estimated to be $12,274.

2. Total cost of printing the report is estimated to be $26,900.

DECLARATION OF HOLDINGS OF DEPUTY MINISTER OF ENERGY, MINES AND RESOURCES

Question No. 1,957—**Mr. Aiken:**

1. Did the government require Mr. Jack Austin to declare his holdings in resource based companies upon his appointment as Deputy Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources?

2. If so, has he been requested to dispose of such stock absolutely or place them in trust?

[Mr. Pepin.]

3. What previous federal employment has Mr. Austin had (a) what was its nature (b) for what periods?

Mr. J. E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): 1. On his own initiative, Mr. Jack Austin, prior to his appointment as Deputy Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, outlined his holdings in resource based companies.

2. On his own initiative, Mr. Austin, prior to commencing his present duties, had disposed of all his interests and those of his family in resource based companies to a Trust, with full power to the Trustees to sell any of the assets of the Trust absolutely upon such terms as the Trustees think fit. For the period of his appointment as Deputy Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, the Trustees have a positive obligation not to disclose to Mr. Austin the assets of the Trust or the nature of any transaction relating to such assets.

3. Mr. Austin was Executive Assistant to the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources from May 15, 1963, to September 24, 1965.

USE OF COMPUTERS IN PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE

Question No. 1,981—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Privy Council Office have the use of a computer in its operations and, if so, to what extent is it utilized?

2. Is the computer programmed 24 hours per day and, if not, for what reason?

3. What is the number of hours planned for utilization of the computer?

4. What has been the annual cost of computer services for each year 1960 to 1970 inclusive?

5. How many programmes are in preparation for the computer at the present time and how will each affect the efficiency of the said office?

Mr. J. E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): 1, 2 and 3. The Privy Council Office does not use a computer in its day to day operation. However, a text editing service is provided to the Secretariat of the Constitutional Conference by the Computer Services Bureau (Department of Supply and Services) through a typewriter terminal in the Conference Centre.

4. The terminal was installed in December 1969 and the annual rental is $6,852.

5. Nil.

*SASKATCHEWAN—SECOND NATIONAL PARK

Question No. 2,006—**Mr. Southam:**

Has an agreement been reached with the Saskatchewan Government for a second National Park

in that Province, and (a) if so, when will development start and where will it be located (b) if not, what are the reasons for the delay?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): The answer to the first part is, no, not applicable. Active negotiations are continuing for the acquisition of an area of shortgrass prairie in the Val Marie area of southern Saskatchewan as a national park. The precise size of the park and a mutually acceptable boundary delineation are currently being negotiated with the government of Saskatchewan.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

ENERGY, MINES AND RESOURCES—RESEARCH STUDIES

Question No. 1,515—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. What research studies have been carried out by, or on behalf of, the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources during each year 1960 to 1969 inclusive?

2. What research studies are now being carried on and/or are contemplated during the next five years?

3. What was the cost of each of the research studies completed in each year 1960 to 1969 inclusive?

4. What is the estimated cost of each of the studies now in being or contemplated during the next five years?

Return tabled.

PUBLIC SERVICE—RECREATION AND LOUNGING FACILITIES

Question No. 1,631—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. Are recreation and lounging facilities provided for male and female employees in the various departments of the public service?

2. What is the number of chairs and couches available and their ratio to the number of employees served?

Return tabled.

INCENTIVE GRANTS

Question No. 1,766—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion under the Regional Development Incentives Act authorized or provided an incentive grant to the following firms and, if so, what is the amount of each grant (a) Lance Publishing Co. Ltd., St. Vital, Manitoba (b) Lessard Machineries Inc., St. Wenceslas, Quebec (c) Olands Brewery Limited, Saint John, N.B. (d) Produits Forestiers M.P. Inc., St. Thomas Didyme, Quebec (e) S. W. Bell (1967) Ltd., Fredericton, N.B. (f) Scotian Gold Co-operative Limited, Kentville, N.S. (g) Laiterie Chagnon Ltée., Waterloo, Quebec (h) Kap Cement Limited, Kapuskasing, Ontario (i) International Cooperage Company of Canada Limited, Niagara Falls, Ontario (j) Ingraphics Limited, Winnipeg, Manitoba (k) Chemcell Limited, Montreal, Quebec (l) Canadian Ingersoll-Rand Company Ltd., Montreal, Quebec (m) Blezard Piping & Welded Products Limited, Sudbury, Ontario?

2. Who are the directors and executive officers of each firm and what is the address of each?

3. To what extent is each company non-resident or foreign-owned or controlled?

4. What is the name and country of the known non-resident ownership of each company?

Return tabled.

NET FARM INCOME

Question No. 1,810—**Mr. Yewchuk:**

1. (a) What are the figures for net farm income in the four western provinces for each of the last ten years (b) to what can the changes be attributed?

2. (a) What are the figures for net farm income in Ontario and Quebec for the past ten years and what are the reasons for the changes from year to year (b) what are the figures for net income in the Maritime Provinces for the last ten years and what are the reasons for the changes from year to year?

Return tabled.

IMPORTATION OF DAIRY PRODUCTS 1967-69

Question No. 1,883—**Mr. Gauthier:**

1. By country, what quantity of butter was imported during the years 1967, 1968 and 1969?

2. By country, what quantity of powdered milk was imported during the years 1967, 1968 and 1969?

3. By country, what quantity of cheese was imported during the years 1967, 1968 and 1969?

4. By country, what quantities of canned dairy products were imported during the years 1967, 1968 and 1969?

Return tabled.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could draw your attention to the fact that on March 12 I asked question No. 1,500 relating to the salaries of the grain commissioners, in other words, the Wheat Board. To this date there has been no answer. It seems to me that the question requires a simple answer. I draw this question to the attention of the minister in charge of the Wheat Board.

Mr. Forest: I will look into the matter, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, notices of motions Nos. 32, 192, 388, 449, 457, 459, 467, 470, 479, 483, 487, 498, 499 and 513 are acceptable to the government.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that the notices of motions enumerated by the Parliamentary Secretary be deemed to have been adopted?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

TRANSPORT TASK FORCE REPORT ON FUNCTIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Motion No. 32—**Mr. Skoberg:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the report of the task force established within the Department of Transport on the functions and responsibilities of the department and other agencies and bodies involved in the transportation industry.

Motion agreed to.

COST-BENEFIT APPROACH TO FOREIGN MILITARY MARKETING

Motion No. 192—**Mr. Skoberg:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant report by Peat, Marwick, Livingstone, USA, undertaken for the Department of Defence Production on preliminary design work for a systematic cost-benefit approach to foreign military marketing, as mentioned in answer to Question Number 1,323 of the past Session.

Motion agreed to.

SALES PROMOTION MATERIALS, MILITARY ARMS OR EQUIPMENT

Motion No. 388—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all brochures, catalogues and other sales promotion materials, including "Canadian Defence Commodities" used in the sale or advertisement of Canadian military arms or equipment to the United States, other foreign countries, groups or individuals since 1968.

Motion agreed to.

IMPORTS OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT FINANCED UNDER FOREIGN GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS

Motion No. 449—**Mr. Saltsman:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all representation received by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce on imports of machinery and equipment financed under foreign government programs as mentioned by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce in a speech delivered on April 16, 1970 to the Brantford Regional Board of Trade.

Motion agreed to.

IMPROVEMENT OF CAREER OPPORTUNITIES FOR WOMEN IN PUBLIC SERVICE

Motion No. 457—**Mr. Broadbent:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all programs and measures now being considered by the Public Service Commission to improve career opportunities for women in the public service, as indicated in answer to Question Number 1,627 and reported in *Hansard* of May 6, 1970 at pages 6625-26.

Motion agreed to.

FATTY BASIN PROJECT, USELESS INLET—TENDERS FOR CARETAKER'S POSITION

Motion No. 459—**Mr. Barnett:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of any tender called to fill the position of caretaker at the Fatty Basin project of the Fisheries Research Board, on Useless Inlet, since January 1, 1970.

Motion agreed to.

P.-Y. PEPIN STUDY OF EDITING OF SAGUENAY LAC ST.-JEAN REPORT

Motion No. 467—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study by P.-Y. Pepin undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding the editing of Saguenay Lac St.-Jean report as mentioned in answer to Question Number 897 and reported in *Hansard* of March 18, 1970 at page 5163.

Motion agreed to.

GILES BEAUDET STUDY OF PARENT RADAR STATION CONVERSION

Motion No. 470—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study by Giles Beaudet undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding the study of Parent radar station conversion as mentioned in answer to Question Number 897 and reported in *Hansard* of March 18, 1970 at page 5163.

Motion agreed to.

BENJAMIN HIGGINS REVIEW OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC PROBLEMS IN QUEBEC

Motion No. 479—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study by Benjamin Higgins undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic

Expansion regarding the study of socio-economic problems in Quebec as mentioned in answer to Question Number 897 and reported in *Hansard* of March 18, 1970 at page 5163.

Motion agreed to.

F. MARTIN REVIEW OF STUDY OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC PROBLEMS IN QUEBEC

Motion No. 483—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study by F. Martin undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding the study of socio-economic problems in Quebec as mentioned in answer to Question Number 897 and reported in *Hansard* of March 18, 1970 at page 5163.

Motion agreed to.

A. RAYNAUD REVIEW OF STUDY OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC PROBLEMS IN QUEBEC

Motion No. 487—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study by A. Raynaud undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding the study of socio-economic problems in Quebec as mentioned in answer to Question Number 897 and reported in *Hansard* of March 18, 1970 at page 5163.

Motion agreed to.

1969-70 STUDY, "CONTRACT RESEARCH EVALUATION OF 'DEPOT PROVERA'"

Motion No. 498—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study undertaken in the fiscal year 1969-70 and funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare on "Contract Research (Food and Drug Directorate) Evaluation of 'Depot Provera'".

Motion agreed to.

1968-69 STUDY, "CONTRACT RESEARCH EVALUATION OF 'DEPOT PROVERA'"

Motion No. 499—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study undertaken in the fiscal year 1968-69 and funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare on "Contract Research (Food and Drug Directorate) Evaluation of 'Depot Provera'".

Motion agreed to.

STUDY OF MERCURY CONTENT IN CANADIAN FOODS

Motion No. 513—**Mr. Harding:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the large scale survey of the mercury content in Canadian foods undertaken by the Food and Drug Directorate of the Department of National Health and Welfare as mentioned in the Departmental Press Release of May 28, 1970.

Motion agreed to.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Forest: Mr. Speaker, notices of motions Nos. 37, 339, 444, 460 and 492 are acceptable to the government, subject to the usual reservations concerning confidential papers and to the authorization of the government authorities concerned.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Subject to the reservations and conditions expressed by the Parliamentary Secretary, is it the pleasure of the House that Notices of Motions Nos. 37, 339, 444, 460 and 492 be deemed to have been adopted?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

OSHAWA AIRPORT

Motion No. 37—**Mr. Broadbent:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study by Dr. R. W. Crowley, Assistant Professor of Economics at Queen's University, regarding the Oshawa Airport prepared for the Department of Transport.

Motion agreed to.

FISHERIES AND FORESTRY RESEARCH STUDIES

Motion No. 339—**Mr. Howard (Skeena):**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the research studies undertaken by the Economics Service Branch of the Department of Fisheries and Forestry for the fiscal years 1968-69 and 1969-70 as mentioned in answer to Question Number 34 and reported in *Hansard* of Wednesday, January 14, 1970.

Motion agreed to.

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION—SELECTION OF SPECIAL AREAS

Motion No. 444—**Mr. Burton:**

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House copies of all correspondence between the Government of Canada and each of the provinces regarding the selection of special areas under the Department of Regional Economic Expansion as announced by the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion in Parliament on March 11, 1970.

Motion agreed to.

INDIAN COMMUNITY CENTRE, PRINCE RUPERT

Motion No. 460—**Mr. Howard (Skeena):**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all telegrams, correspondence and other documents exchanged between the government or any agency or branch thereof and any other person since January 1, 1963 relating to the property occupied by *HMCS Chatham* in Prince Rupert which,

for more particular identification, was set aside for use by Native Indians as a cultural and community centre.

Motion agreed to.

OWNERSHIP OF B.C. FISH CANNERIES BY INDIANS

Motion No. 492—**Mr. Howard (Skeena):**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all correspondence, telegrams and other documents exchanged between the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and any other person since January 1, 1969 relating to any aspect of the fish canning industry in B.C. and particularly to the possibility that canneries along the North Coast area may be owned, managed and operated by Native Indian people.

Motion agreed to.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Forest: Mr. Speaker, would you be kind enough to call notices of motions Nos. 166, 167, 168, 169, 193, 258, 282, 332, 381, 383, 405, 408, 445, 450, 452, 462, 463, 464, 466, 468, 469, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 480, 481, 482, 484, 485, 486, 488, 489, 490, 491, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 515 and 516?

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

[*English*]

INVESTMENT COMPANIES BILL

Motion No. 166—**Mr. Saltsman:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all letters, communications, reports, memoranda and other data received by the Government of Canada commenting on the proposed Investment Companies Bill.

Hon. Herb Gray (Minister without Portfolio): For the most part the communications received were copies of material submitted to the Senate committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce. It is considered that other communications received should be treated as confidential since they frequently contain information concerning the internal affairs of individual companies, and as a result I would ask the hon. member to consider withdrawing his motion.

Mr. Saltsman: Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

LOAN COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT

Motion No. 167—**Mr. Saltsman:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all letters, communications, reports, memoranda or other data received by the Government of Canada commenting on the proposed Loan Companies Act amendment.

Hon. Herb Gray (Minister without Portfolio): The communications which the hon. member is requesting are regarded as confidential. Their publication would impede the free flow of information, ideas and suggestions to the department and so make it more difficult for the department to carry out its duties effectively. I therefore ask the hon. member to consider withdrawing his motion.

Mr. Saltsman: Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

TRUST COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT

Motion No. 168—**Mr. Saltsman:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all letters, reports, memoranda or other data received by the Government of Canada commenting on the proposed Trust Companies Act amendment.

Hon. Herb Gray (Minister without Portfolio): My comments on the previous motion will apply to this one as well.

Mr. Saltsman: So will mine.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

CANADIAN AND BRITISH INSURANCE COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT

Motion No. 169—**Mr. Saltsman:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all letters, communications, reports, memoranda or other data received by the Government of Canada commenting on the proposed Canadian and British Insurance Companies Act amendment.

Hon. Herb Gray (Minister without Portfolio): What I have just said would also apply to this notice of motion.

Mr. Saltsman: Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

MARKETING OF CANADIAN DEFENCE PRODUCTS

Motion No. 193—**Mr. Skoberg:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant report by Kendall Associates, Ottawa, Canada, undertaken for the Department of Defence Production on the development of an effective system for collection, indexing, collation, storage, retrieval and dissemination of information for use in formulating plans and policy for the marketing of Canadian defence products, as mentioned in answer to Question Number 1,323 of the past Session.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): The Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce is willing to table copies of the consultant's study with the exception of one page which has been extracted from the study. This extraction refers to prices, and his deemed to be of a proprietary nature to the company concerned. If the hon. member accepts this reservation the minister will table this study immediately.

Mr. Skoberg: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Subject to the reservations and conditions expressed by the Parliamentary Secretary, is it the pleasure of the House that Notice No. 193 be deemed to have been adopted?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

SPECIAL DESIGNATION, LESSER SLAVE LAKE REGION

Motion No. 258—**Mr. Yewchuk:**

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House a copy of all correspondence, telegrams and all other documents exchanged between the Department of Regional Economic Expansion or any agency or division thereof, and the Government of the Province of Alberta or any agency or division thereof, pertaining to special designation for the region of Lesser Slave Lake and plans for regional economic development of that area.

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Some of the documents requested are working papers exchanged by officials and as such are privileged. If the hon. member wishes, we would be pleased to table correspondence exchanged at the ministerial level if the consent of the province of Alberta is obtained.

Mr. Speaker: Subject to the reservations and conditions expressed by the Parliamentary Secretary, is it the pleasure of the House that Notice of Motion No. 258 be deemed to have been adopted?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE AIRCRAFT USER CHARGES AND FEES

Motion No. 282—**Mr. Skoberg:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the review on user charges and fees paid by private aircraft using the facilities provided by the Department of Transport as mentioned by the Minister without Portfolio in *Hansard* of November 26, 1969 on page 1291.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, as the review on user charges and fees paid by private aircraft using the facilities provided by the Department of Transport is not yet completed, it is not possible to table a copy of it. As soon as it is completed, consideration will be given as to whether or not it is appropriate to do so.

In the circumstances, I would ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Skoberg: I ask that the motion stand.

Mr. Speaker: Stand. Notice of Motion No. 322.

Mr. Forest: No. 332.

STUDIES BY TRANSPORT POLICY AND RESEARCH BRANCH

Motion No. 322—**Mr. Skoberg:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of the research studies undertaken by the Transportation Policy and Research Branch of the Department of Transport as reported in answer to Question Number 233 in *Hansard* of December 17, 1969 at page 2069.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, notice of motion No. 332 is acceptable to the government subject to the usual reservations concerning confidential papers and to the authorization of private industry concerned.

Mr. Skoberg: Agreed, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: This answer refers to notice of motion No. 332?

Mr. Forest: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Skoberg: Mine is 322, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: There appears to be some confusion here. The Chair called motion No. 322 and the Parliamentary Secretary appears to have replied to 332. The motion which I have here is motion No. 322 in the name of the hon. member for Moose Jaw. Shall this motion stand?

Mr. Skoberg: Mr. Speaker, I do not believe he acknowledged that motion.

Mr. Forest: Mr. Speaker, we did not call 322.

Mr. McCleave: Yes, it was called.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): No, it was not called.

Motion stands.

Mr. Saltsman: Has motion No. 332 been called?

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

Mr. Saltsman: Yes. Motion No. 332 is in my name and I am not quite sure of its disposition.

Mr. Forest: Mr. Speaker, maybe I could read again the answer to motion No. 332, which is in the name of the hon. member for Waterloo.

RETENTION OF COPPER OUTPUT FOR DOMESTIC MARKETS

Motion No. 332—**Mr. Saltsman:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all directives and correspondence between the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Canadian copper producers regarding the retention of their copper output for domestic markets.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, this notice of motion is acceptable to the government, subject to the usual reservations concerning confidential papers and to the authorization of private industry concerned.

Mr. Speaker: Subject to the reservations and conditions expressed by the Parliamentary Secretary, is it the pleasure of the House that motion No. 332 deemed to have been adopted.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

FEASIBILITY STUDY ON MARGINAL DAIRY FARMING

Motion No. 381—**Mr. Skoberg:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the feasibility study on marginal dairy farming undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion in the fiscal year 1967-68, as mentioned in answer to Question Number 1,323 of the past Session excluding confidential references to individuals or individual firms.

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, the study requested was research undertaken for use by officials in programs planning and was intended solely for internal use. I would, therefore, request the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Skoberg: Mr. Speaker, I think we should know about the program planning that they have in mind, and so I call for a vote.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

RESEARCH STUDIES UNDERTAKEN BY CTC

Motion No. 383—**Mr. Skoberg:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all the research studies undertaken by the Research Division of the Canadian Transport Commission as mentioned in answer to Question Number 12 and reported in *Hansard* of February 18, 1970 at pages 3736-37.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the government will accept this motion as far as the final reports of these studies are concerned, except those that contain confidential information from industry, or that have been prepared only for internal use.

In the circumstances, I would ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Skoberg: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Motion dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

TARIFF CONCESSIONS, MICHELIN RUBBER COMPANY

Motion No. 405—**Mr. Saltsman:**

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this house a copy of the correspondence, arrangements, etc. between the Government of Canada and the Government of Nova Scotia and Michelin Rubber Company of France regarding the removal of automobile tires customs tariffs and the establishment of a tire plant in Nova Scotia.

Hon. Herb Gray (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, the correspondence in question contains confidential information about the planning and future operations of this company and it is considered that tabling of correspondence of this nature would be prejudicial to future full disclosure of such information by industry generally. However, I

would be happy to meet with the hon. member and discuss the matter with him in order to provide some background that he may find useful. In the circumstances I would request the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Saltsman: I accept that in view of the minister's co-operative attitude.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

STUDY OF URBAN PROBLEMS BY PROFESSOR LITHWICK

Motion No. 408—**Mr. Gilbert:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study of urban problems in Canada undertaken by Professor Harvey Lithwick for the Minister without Portfolio responsible for housing and urban affairs.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I move this motion on the hon. member's behalf.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the report referred to was commissioned as a working document for the internal use of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation and of the office of the minister responsible for housing. As such it is considered confidential and not in the public interest to table. In these circumstances I hope that the hon. member will be willing to withdraw the motion.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Oh, no. Let us have the question.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Transfer.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION—ESTABLISHMENT OF SPECIAL AREAS

Motion No. 445—**Mr. Burton:**

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he cause to be laid before this House a copy of all correspondence, reports, memoranda and other documents exchanged between the federal government and the governments of the provinces in consultations engaged in prior to the establishment of special areas by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I move this motion on the hon. member's behalf.

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, the correspondence requested in this motion will be tabled if the consent of the provinces concerned is obtained, under our acceptance of notice of motion No. 444. All other documents requested are working papers exchanged at the official level and as such are considered privileged. I would therefore ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I thought the Parliamentary Secretary was suggesting that the government would agree to something subject to reservations. We are prepared to accept the reservations.

Mr. Speaker: Subject to the reservations and conditions expressed by the Parliamentary Secretary, is it the pleasure of the House that notice of motion No. 445 be deemed to have been adopted?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

COMPREHENSIVE AGREEMENTS BETWEEN GOVERNMENT AND MOTOR VEHICLE COMPANIES

Motion No. 450—**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the comprehensive agreements between the Government of Canada and the motor vehicle companies referred to by the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board in *Hansard,* April 16, 1970, at page 5978.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the agreements referred to are contained in letters tabled in the House on April 25, 1965, and on September 16, 1968. The minister could forward copies to the hon. member if he wishes. In view of this the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce would ask the member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, do I understand the Parliamentary Secretary to say that the minister is prepared to forward the letters to me?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): They are already in the possession of the House.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): In that case why not table them?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): They have been tabled.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): In that case I withdraw the motion.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

REASONS FOR CLOSING DUNLOP TIRE PLANT, TORONTO

Motion No. 452—**Mr. Gilbert:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all memoranda, correspondence, etc., showing the reasons given to the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce for the closing of the Dunlop tire plant in Toronto as mentioned by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce in *Hansard* of April 30, 1970 at page 6452.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I move it for the hon. member.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce wishes to inform the hon. member that the reasons given by the company in question to the department were of an oral nature. However, two statements to the press were received by the department and these can be tabled. A third item is of an internal nature as it contains information proprietary to other companies and cannot be tabled. If this is acceptable to the member, the minister would immediately table the two items just referred to.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Subject to the reservations and conditions expressed by the Parliamentary Secretary, is it the pleasure of the House that motion No. 452 be deemed to have been adopted?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

STUDY OF EMPLOYMENT AND GROWTH OPPORTUNITIES, ARGENTIA, NFLD.

Motion No. 462—**Mr. Nystrom:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all studies and reports undertaken by the special Task Force set up in the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding employment and growth opportunities for Argentia, Newfoundland.

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, the special task force mentioned does not make studies and there is, as yet, no report available. I would therefore ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Nystrom: In that case I will withdraw it.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

STUDY OF EMPLOYMENT AND GROWTH OPPORTUNITIES, FOGO ISLAND, NFLD.

Motion No. 463—**Mr. Nystrom:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all studies and reports undertaken by the special Task Force in the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding employment and growth opportunities for Fogo Island, Newfoundland.

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, there is no special task force in the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding employment and growth opportunities for Fogo Island. I would therefore ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Nystrom: I will withdraw it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

STUDY OF EMPLOYMENT AND GROWTH OPPORTUNITIES, BELL ISLAND, NFLD.

Motion No. 464—**Mr. Nystrom:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all studies and reports undertaken by the special Task Force in the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding employment and growth opportunities for Bell Island, Newfoundland.

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, this is a similar answer. There is no special task force in the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding employment and growth opportunities for Bell Island and I would therefore ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Nystrom: I will do that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

B. G. COOK STUDY OF RESEARCH IN INFORMATION SYSTEMS

Motion No. 466—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study by B. G. Cook undertaken

for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding research in information systems as mentioned in answer to Question Number 897 and reported in *Hansard* of March 18, 1970 at page 5163.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, there are quite a few motions in the name of the hon. member for Regina East who is not able to be here today. I wonder if these could stand until he is able to be present?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I would point out that this is the last occasion before the House meets next fall on which we can respond to these motions. In the circumstances would the hon. member not prefer to have the information now?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Then I move all 20 of the hon. member's motions on his behalf.

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, in answer to motion No. 466, the services of this consultant were retained for the preparation of a computer program. This has now been incorporated in the work of the department and there is no report which could be tabled. I would therefore ask that the hon. member withdraw his motion.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

ABT STUDY OF EVALUATION OF N.B. FRED PLAN

Motion No. 468—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study by ABT Associates undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding the evaluation of N.B. FRED Plan as mentioned in answer to Question Number 897 and reported in *Hansard* of March 18, 1970 at page 5163.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I move it.

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, this study was requested in notice of motion 380, which was accepted by the government with the provision that the consent of the province concerned be obtained. I would therefore ask that the hon. member withdraw his motion.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Has the consent of the province been sought?

Mr. Speaker: Is the motion dropped?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Perhaps this one could stand.

Mr. Speaker: Motion stands.

F. BAYLISS STUDY OF NEWSTART GRAPHICS

Motion No. 469—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study by F. Bayliss undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding NewStart graphics as mentioned in answer to Question Number 897 and reported in *Hansard* of March 18, 1970 at page 5163.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I move it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, this was a service contract and there is not report. I would ask that the hon. member consent to withdraw this motion.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

CANADIAN BRITISH ENGINEERING STUDY OF GAULTOIS WATER SUPPLY

Motion No. 471—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study by Canadian British Engineering undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding the Gaultois water supply study as mentioned in answer to Question Number 897 and reported in *Hansard* of March 18, 1970 at page 5163.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I move the motion on behalf of the hon. member.

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, this is a confidential report relating in part to a private company, publication of which would be detrimental to the competitive position of the company. I would ask the hon. member, therefore, to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

Motions for Papers

CERTEC INC. CONSULTANT REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION STUDY

Motion No. 472—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study by Certec Inc. undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding the implementation study as mentioned in answer to Question Number 897 and reported in *Hansard* of March 18, 1970 at page 5163.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I move the motion on behalf of the hon. member.

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, these consultants were retained to brief senior management. There is no report suitable for tabling and I would ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

BRUCE COOK STUDY OF MAPPING SYSTEMS

Motion No. 473—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study by Bruce Cook undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding the mapping systems study as mentioned in answer to Question Number 897 and reported in *Hansard* of March 18, 1970 at page 5163.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I move the motion on behalf of the hon. member.

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, the services of this consultant were retained for computer programming. There is no report and I would ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

CREATIVE SIGHT AND SOUND LTD. STUDY OF NEWSTART AUDIO-VISUAL PROJECT

Motion No. 474—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study by Creative Sight and Sound Ltd. undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding the NewStart audio-visual project as mentioned in answer to Question Number 897 and reported in *Hansard* of March 18, 1970 at page 5163.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I move this motion on behalf of the hon. member.

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, these consultants were engaged to make a tape slide presentation on the Nova Scotia Newstart program. There is no report and I would ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

ERNST AND ERNST STUDY OF ANALYSIS OF EXPERIMENTAL PROJECTS IN HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Motion No. 475—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study by Ernst and Ernst undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding the analysis of experimental projects in human resources development as mentioned in answer to Question Number 897 and reported in *Hansard* of March 18, 1970 at page 5163.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I move this motion on behalf of the hon. member.

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, this was a contract for services of four consultants who came to Ottawa to brief senior management. There is no report which could be tabled and I would ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

ERNST AND ERNST CONSULTANT REVIEW OF PLANNING STUDY

Motion No. 476—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study by Ernst and Ernst undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding planning study as mentioned in answer to Question Number 897 and reported in *Hansard* of March 18, 1970 at page 5163.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I move this motion on behalf of the hon. member.

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, this is a continuing study and there is as yet no final report. I would ask the hon. member to withdraw this motion.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Perhaps it might stand.

Mr. Speaker: Stand.

GEORGE FRAIL STUDY OF AVON RIVER CAUSEWAY DAM

Motion No. 477—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study by George Frail undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding the project engineer, Avon River Causeway Dam as mentioned in answer to Question Number 897 and reported in *Hansard* of March 18, 1970 at page 5163.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I move this motion on behalf of the hon. member.

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, this motion relates to a contract for the services of Mr. Frail as project engineer on the Avon River Causeway Dam. As there is no report involved, I would ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

HICKLING-JOHNSTON REVIEW OF THE INTERLAKE FRED MANAGEMENT STUDY

Motion No. 478—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study by Hickling-Johnston Limited undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding the interlake FRED management study as mentioned in answer to Question Number 897 and reported in *Hansard* of March 18, 1970 at page 5163.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I move the motion on behalf of the hon. member.

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, this is a confidential study which was commissioned for the joint committee of federal and provincial officials charged with reviewing the Interlake plan. I would therefore ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Question.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

LALONDE VALOIS REVIEW OF TRANSPORTATION STUDY OF GASPÉ REGION

Motion No. 480—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study by Lalonde Valois undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding the transportation study of the Gaspé region as mentioned in answer to Question Number 897 and reported in *Hansard* of March 18, 1970 at page 5163.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I move the motion on behalf of the hon. member.

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, this is a continuing study. The final report has not yet been received and I would therefore ask the hon. member if he would withdraw his motion.

Mr. McCleave: What an abuse of parliamentary procedure!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Stand.

Mr. Speaker: Stand.

JEAN B. LANCTÔT REVIEW OF STUDY OF ADAPTIVE SERVICES TO MIGRANTS AND IMMIGRANTS

Motion No. 481—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study by Jean B. Lanctôt undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding the study of adaptive services to migrants and immigrants as mentioned in answer to Question Number 897 and reported in *Hansard* of March 18, 1970 at page 5163.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I move the motion on behalf of the hon. member.

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, the services of

these consultants were retained to brief senior management. There is no report which could be tabled and I would ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

Mr. McCleave: Another abuse of parliamentary procedure!

An hon. Member: Why should you be allowed to move these motions on behalf of somebody else?

Mr. McCleave: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, before the hon. member loses his temper, I did ask that these motions stand until the hon. member comes back but the government felt that we should go ahead with them. I would say right now, Mr. Speaker, that if the answers to the rest of the motions of the member for Regina East are like those we have been getting, perhaps we should just transfer all of them.

Mr. McCleave: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I raised it initially and I asked—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There is a point of order before the House at the present time. I believe the President of the Privy Council was seeking the floor for the purpose of addressing himself to the point of order. I would recognize the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants in a moment.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, from time to time there have been suggestions that this side of the House was not responding to questions and motions but apparently the trouble today is that we are responding too much. The fact of the matter is that when there is a motion for papers and there is no paper at all to enable us to respond to the motion, it seems to me there is no point in having it stood. The motion should be removed from the Order Paper. Equally, if there are other valid reasons, whether competitive reasons involving a private company or international negotiations, that a motion should not be accepted, it should be dealt with. I share with the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants the concern that the time of the House is being used in this way but I think he should direct his remarks to the hon. member for Regina East who put all these motions on the Order Paper in the first place.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Halifax-East Hants on a point of order.

Mr. McCleave: Mr. Speaker—

An hon. Member: Sit down!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. McCleave: I am going to insist on my rights—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! I believe the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants is rising to the same point of order. He has the floor.

Mr. McCleave: Yes, indeed I am, Mr. Speaker. As a backbencher I have listened for many days since this Parliament started this sort of thing where there are fishing expeditions, where the hook is thrown out without even any bait or without even any knowledge of anything relating to the facts.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McCleave: The result is that we have spent about 40 minutes on this exercise this afternoon and heaven only knows how many many minutes before, without any serious attempt by the person who grinds this porridge machine to be responsible or to know what is going to come forth. As a backbencher I object to this procedure very strenuously.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McCleave: I hope there can be some correction of it, sir.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, members have a perfect right to seek information. They get little enough information in this House.

An hon. Member: This is an abuse of privilege.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The only way they can get information is to put a motion on the Order Paper. The difficulty which the government finds itself in, Mr. Speaker, is not due to the fact that we have asked that these stand. The fact is that we are getting some answers today on motions that were tabled last October. The government now answers us on the last day.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): June 1.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Of the questions that were answered today, No. 37 was placed on the Order Paper on October 23, 1969. If the government would answer these questions promptly or at least within a few weeks of their being put on the Order Paper, we would not be in the position of having to stand motions because the government is not able to give us any satisfactory answer or gives some spurious answer as to why they cannot give us the information.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I wonder if hon. members want to pursue the matter.

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The point of order before the House now is that we are perhaps taking too much time on this order of business. If we pursue the matter on a point of order for another ten minutes, that ten minutes could have been used to clear up this order of business. At the same time, if hon. members consider the matter important they should be allowed to make their contribution in the next few minutes.

Mr. Fairweather: Mr. Speaker, if I could get unanimous consent I would move under Standing Order 43 that the Committee on Procedure and Organization be asked to study a more expeditious and less boring way of dealing with notices of motion for the production of papers.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, if I could get unanimous consent that the hon. gentleman's motion would be passed by unanimous consent so that we do not have to use time debating it, I would agree.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, I have sat idly by observing what I think are quite irresponsible actions on the part of the government. These motions are not debatable. We find we have smuggled into every one of them a statement apologizing for or explaining why the information is not available. The government has no right to do that at all. They have one of two procedures available: they can accept, or if they do not want to accept they can transfer for debate. There can be no explanation given; the explanation is due on the debate. In every one of these cases where the government makes an explanation there has been a definite breach of the rules, and I think this is the trouble we are facing.

Hon. members on the government side who are answering in this way have no business to do so at this stage. They can do this by correspondence or by telephone calls. But there must not be these spurious debates that have been smuggled in on both sides.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rondeau: Mr. Speaker, we have listened patiently to the arguments of all parties. I believe we should get information when we ask questions or put notices of motions on the order paper. The Créditistes certainly have not taken too much of the time of the House with notices of motions on the order paper.

I see that notice of motion No. 63 in the name of the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) has been on the order paper since November 25, 1969 and that nothing has been done about it. The Ralliement créditiste can certainly not be accused of wasting the time of the House in this field.

I will conclude by saying that whatever the number of notices of motions put on the order paper they all seem to get the same treatment.

[*English*]

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, there are two or three points that I should like to make, especially after the matter that has been raised by the newly attached Liberal member from Halifax.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McCleave: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege—

Mr. Howard (Skeena): There is no fishing expedition—

Mr. McCleave: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. McCleave: Mr. Speaker, I am rising on a question of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will the hon. member kindly resume his seat. I believe the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants is now seeking the floor on a question of privilege. He should be allowed to state his question at this time.

Mr. McCleave: Mr. Speaker, I do not mind what is poured on me by the hon. member for Skeena but I would not like it poured on my leader. I am the member for Halifax-East Hants. The hon. member may make any remark he wishes to make about me.

An hon. Member: Silly boy!

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I think that probably the shoe would fit in the other place just as well.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Howard (Skeena): It is difficult to speak in a jungle, Mr. Speaker, but I shall try.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The House will probably recognize that this point was raised ten minutes ago, and if we had accepted the suggestion of the Chair we should have completed this item of business. I doubt whether much can be gained by pursuing this matter much further. A motion has been proposed by the hon. member for Fundy-Royal but this motion cannot be put to the House under Standing Order 43 unless we have unanimous consent to revert to motions. I have to inquire whether there is unanimity in reverting to motions for the purpose of putting the motion advanced by the hon. member for Fundy-Royal.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimity.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: The motion proposed by the hon. member cannot be put. I would respectfully suggest to hon. members that perhaps we might continue with the order of business. A point of order has been raised and there has been consideration of it, which has been constructive I am sure, on the part of all parties on both sides of the House. I ask the co-operation of all hon. members to allow the Chair to pursue the business. We might be able to save a few seconds here and there in processing these notices of motions.

LA SOCIÉTÉ SOTAR REVIEW OF CANTONS DE L'EST TOURISM STUDY

Motion No. 484—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study by La Société Sotar undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding the Cantons de l'Est tourism study as mentioned in answer to Question Number 897 and reported in *Hansard* of March 18, 1970 at page 5163.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, speaking on behalf of the hon. member for Regina East may I again suggest that the remaining notices of motions in the name of the hon. member for Regina East stand. Perhaps the Parliamentary Secretary could advise him what the government wishes to do about them.

Mr. Speaker: Notices of Motions No. 484, 485, 482, 486, 488, 489, 490 and 491 in the name of the hon. member for Regina East will stand.

Motion stands.

J. C. WICKET REVIEW OF STUDY OF NUTRITIONAL LEVELS

Motion No. 485—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study by J. C. Wickett undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding the study of nutritional levels in selected population areas as mentioned in answer to Question Number 897 and reported in *Hansard* of March 18, 1970 at page 5163.

Motion stands.

M. W. MACKENZIE STUDY OF FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL COMMITTEE FOR SAINT JOHN INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

Motion No. 482—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study M. W. Mackenzie undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding the federal provincial committee for Saint John industrial complex as mentioned in answer to Question Number 897 and reported in *Hansard* of March 18, 1970 at page 5163.

Motion stands.

EASTERN DESIGNERS LIMITED REVIEW OF SAINT JOHN WATER SUPPLY STUDY

Motion No. 486—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study by Eastern Designers undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding the Saint John Water Supply Study as mentioned in answer to Question Number 897 and reported in *Hansard* of March 18, 1970 at page 5163.

Motion stands.

J. PARIKHAL REVIEW OF REGIONAL MIGRATION STUDY

Motion No. 488—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study by J. Parikhal undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding the regional migration study as mentioned in answer to Question Number 897 and reported in *Hansard* of March 18, 1970 at page 5163.

Motion stands.

MCGILL COMPUTING SCIENCES STUDY OF SYSTEM FOR GENERATING TARGET POPULATIONS

Motion No. 489—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study by McGill Computing Science Centre undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding a system for generating target populations as mentioned in answer to Question Number 897 and reported in *Hansard* of March 18, 1970 at page 5163.

Motion stands.

ALPHATEX SYSTEMS LIMITED STUDY OF COMPUTER ADDRESSING SYSTEM

Motion No. 490—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study by Alphatex Systems Limited undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding the computer addressing system as mentioned in answer to Question Number 897 and reported in *Hansard* of March 18, 1970 at page 5163.

Motion stands.

SHAWINIGAN ENGINEERING LTD. REVIEW OF SAINT JOHN WATER SUPPLY STUDY

Motion No. 491—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study by Shawinigan Engineering Ltd. undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding the Saint John Water Supply Study as mentioned in answer to Question Number 897 and reported in *Hansard* of March 18, 1970 at page 5163.

Motion stands.

1968-69 STUDY OF EFFECT OF OESTROGEN-PROGESTIN COMPOUNDS

Motion No. 493—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study undertaken in the fiscal year 1968-69 funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare on "The Effect of Oestrogen-progestin Compounds on Platelet Surface Reactions in Women of Childbearing Age".

Mr. Stanley Haidasz (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, in view of the circumstances involving in the hon. member's motion and since the hon. member was communicated with by letter from the minister, the hon. member may wish to withdraw motion No. 493 standing in her name as well as Motions Nos. 494, 495, 496, 497, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510 and 511.

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, in view of the explanation given by the Parliamentary Secretary and since the studies have not yet been completed, I should like to ask that these notices of motions remain on the order paper until fall, in the hope that the studies will be completed.

Mr. Speaker: Stand.

Motion stands.

1969-70 STUDY OF EFFECT OF OESTROGEN-PROGESTIN COMPOUNDS

Motion No. 494—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study undertaken in the fiscal year 1969-70 funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare on "The Effect of Oestrogen-progestin Compounds on Platelet Surface Reactions in Women of Childbearing Age".

Motion stands.

STUDY OF THERMAL METHOD OF BIRTH CONTROL

Motion No. 495—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study "Causes et conséquences démographiques, économiques et sociales de la pratique de la méthode thermique de régulation des naissances" funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare in the fiscal year 1969-70.

Motion stands.

1970-71 STUDY, "PROJET DE RECHERCHE AUPRÈS DU MILIEU DÉFAVORISÉ URBAIN QUÉBÉCOIS"

Motion No. 496—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study undertaken by Le Centre de Planification Familiale, Montréal in the fiscal year 1970-71 funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare on "Projet de recherche auprès du milieu défavorisé urbain Québécois".

Motion stands.

1969-70 STUDY, "PROJET DE RECHERCHE AUPRÈS DU MILIEU DÉFAVORISÉ URBAIN QUÉBÉCOIS"

Motion No. 497—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study undertaken by Le Centre de Planification Familiale, Montreal, in the fiscal year 1969-70 funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare on "Projet de recherche auprès du milieu défavorisé urbain Québécois".

Motion stands.

Motions for Papers

1969-70 STUDY, "PHYSIOLOGICAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF ORAL CONTRACEPTIVE MEDICATION"

Motion No. 500—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study undertaken by the Jewish General and Montreal General Hospitals in the fiscal year 1969-70 funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare on the "Physiological and Psychological Aspects of Oral Contraceptive Medication".

Motion stands.

1968-69 STUDY, "PHYSIOLOGICAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF ORAL CONTRACEPTIVE MEDICATION"

Motion No. 501—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study undertaken by the Jewish General and Montreal General Hospitals in the fiscal year 1968-69 funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare on the "Physiological and Psychological Aspects of Oral Contraceptive Medication".

Motion stands.

1969-70 STUDY, "EVALUATION OF RESULTS OF GENETIC COUNSELLING"

Motion No. 502—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study undertaken by the Montreal Children's Hospital (McGill) in the fiscal year 1969-70 funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare on the "Evaluation of Results of Genetic Counselling".

Motion stands.

1968-69 STUDY, "EVALUATION OF RESULTS OF GENETIC COUNSELLING"

Motion No. 503—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study undertaken by the Montreal Children's Hospital (McGill) in the fiscal year 1968-69 funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare on the "Evaluation of Results of Genetic Counselling".

Motion stands.

1967-68 STUDY, "EVALUATION OF RESULTS OF GENETIC COUNSELLING"

Motion No. 504—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study undertaken by the Montreal Children's Hospital (McGill) in the fiscal year 1967-68 funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare on the "Evaluation of Results of Genetic Counselling".

Motion stands.

[Mrs. MacInnis.]

1966-67 STUDY, "EVALUATION OF RESULTS OF GENETIC COUNSELLING"

Motion No. 505—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study undertaken by the Montreal Children's Hospital (McGill) in the fiscal year 1966-67 funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare on the "Evaluation of Results of Genetic Counselling".

Motion stands.

1969-70 STUDY, "AN EXPERIMENT IN COMMUNITY HEALTH CARE"

Motion No. 506—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of a study undertaken by Toronto General Hospital (University of Toronto) in the fiscal year 1969-70 on "An Experiment in Community Health Care: The Evaluation of Voluntary Family Planning (a) the need; (b) the desire; (c) the effect", funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare.

Motion stands.

1968-69 STUDY, "AN EXPERIMENT IN COMMUNITY HEALTH CARE"

Motion No. 507—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of a study undertaken by Toronto General Hospital (University of Toronto) in the fiscal year 1968-69 on "An Experiment in Community Health Care: The Evaluation of Voluntary Family Planning (a) the need; (b) the desire; (c) the effect", funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare.

Motion stands.

1967-68 STUDY, "AN EXPERIMENT IN COMMUNITY HEALTH CARE"

Motion No. 508—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of a study undertaken by Toronto General Hospital (University of Toronto) in the fiscal year 1967-68 on "An Experiment in Community Health Care: The Evaluation of Voluntary Family Planning (a) the need; (b) the desire; (c) the effect", funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare.

Motion stands.

1969-70 STUDY OF SOCIAL AND MEDICAL FACTORS OF WOMEN ATTENDING FAMILY PLANNING CLINIC

Motion No. 509—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study undertaken by the University of British Columbia in the fiscal year 1969-70 funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare on "Social and Medical Factors of Women Attending Vancouver Family Planning Clinic and a Group of Women not Attending a Family Planning Clinic in two areas of the City of Vancouver".

Motion stands.

1968-69 STUDY OF SOCIAL AND MEDICAL FACTORS OF WOMEN ATTENDING FAMILY PLANNING CLINIC

Motion No. 510—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study undertaken by the University of British Columbia in the fiscal year 1968-69 funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare on "Social and Medical Factors of Women Attending Vancouver Family Planning Clinic and a Group of Women not Attending a Family Planning Clinic in two areas of the City of Vancouver".

Motion stands.

STUDY OF EFFECT OF ORAL CONTRACEPTIVES ON FOLATE METABOLISM

Motion No. 511—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study undertaken by St. Boniface General Hospital in the fiscal year 1969-70 funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare on "The Effect of Oral Contraceptives on Folate Metabolism as Related to the Outcome of Subsequent Pregnancies".

Motion stands.

STUDIES UNDER HEALTH GRANT PROJECT 605-7-510

Motion No. 512—**Mr. Harding:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all studies prepared under National Health Grant Project 605-7-510 of 1969.

Mr. Stanley Haidasz (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, in view of the circumstances involving this motion and since the hon. member was communicated with by letter from the minister, I would ask him to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Harding: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the research has not been completed on this matter, and I would ask that the motion stand until the fall. I hope that the research will then be completed and that a report will be available.

Mr. Speaker: Stand.

SPEECH BY DIRECTOR OF RCMP SECURITY AND INTELLIGENCE BRANCH

Motion No. 515—**Mr. Orlikow:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the speech delivered to the Canadian Society for Industrial Security, in Toronto, by John K. Starnes, Director of the RCMP's Security and Intelligence Branch.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Solicitor General I am advised that there is no text of the remarks and that the remarks in fact were made in private and were given from notes. On that basis I wonder if the hon. member would agree to withdraw his motion?

Mr. Orlikow: I would if the notes could be provided to me, Mr. Speaker; otherwise I would not agree.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

GOVERNMENT SUBMISSIONS TO ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Motion No. 516—**Mr. Saltsman:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the submission by the Canadian Government to the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development recently regarding Canada's future growth projections.

Hon. Herb Gray (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, the submission to the OECD regarding Canada's future growth projections was a confidential working document used in the preparation of the Report of the OECD on Growth Prospects for the 1970's, which will shortly be published in full by the organization. It has not been the practice of member countries to publish their individual submissions. In view of these circumstances, I ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Saltsman: Agreed, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the Chair should add a comment to the point of order raised by the hon. member for Peace River, which was of a different nature. Over the years the practice has developed under which a brief statement is made by the Parliamentary Secretary responding in the name of the minister or by the minister himself in explaining why a motion is accepted, refused, or to be transferred for debate. It has been understood from time to time by hon. members following this practice that it was actually saving time, because objections were taken by hon. members asking the questions or giving notice on the notice paper to the effect that no reason is given for the actions taken by the government.

I agree with the hon. member for Peace River that these explanations sometimes have

become a little too long and if there was some way to ask those who prepare the comments that explain the decision taken by the government to be briefer I think it would be helpful all around. I think perhaps the comments made also by private members who have brought forward these notices of motions should also be somewhat briefer. Practically every time these notices of motions are considered arguments occur between the government side and private members putting their motions. I would suggest that my remarks be taken into account next fall.

Mr. Baldwin: I think 60 words for each side should be enough.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining notices of motions stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—POSITION OF SIX PER CENT WAGE INCREASE GUIDELINE—MEETING SUGGESTED BY LABOUR CONGRESS

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Finance whether, in view of the rejection by the Canadian Labour Congress of the guideline proposal put forward by the Prices and Incomes Commission, the 6 per cent guideline of the government is still the policy of the government? If so, does the government propose to take any measures to implement it?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, it is still the policy of the government.

Mr. Stanfield: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the government propose to take any measures to implement this policy, or does it intend simply to leave it to the Prices and Incomes Commission to administer what perhaps might be regarded as one of the central responsibilities of the government?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, the government at the proper moment accepts its responsibilities. We have agreed with the guideline, as have other governments, and the Prices and Incomes Commission will be watching to see whether there is adherence to the guideline.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, we do not need a commission to watch that, the way things are now. My final supplementary is this: in view of the rejection of the proposal and in view of the proposal made by the Canadian Labour Congress that the government should convene a meeting of industry, labour and government to consider an appropriate course of conduct, does the government propose to convene such a meeting?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, organized labour has come a little late in making this proposal. This is the same proposal which was made by the Prices and Incomes Commission last fall and which labour refused to accept at that particular time.

Mr. Stanfield: So the government is not going ahead.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, insasmuch as the Canadian Labour Congress, following a meeting with the Prices and Incomes Commission, described voluntary restraints as being basically unsound, highly inequitable and totally unworkable and proposed that the government rather than the Prices and Incomes Commission convene a meeting between business and labour to work out more realistic and co-operative programs to deal with economic problems in Canada, did I understand the minister to say that the minister on the part of the government is rejecting this proposal for the convening of a meeting with labour and industry?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, the government is considering this proposal. We have a Prices and Incomes Commission which has been trying to do exactly this for quite some time. Labour has refused to co-operate.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A supplementary question. In view of the fact that the Prices and Incomes Commission is a commission of inquiry appointed under the Inquiries Act and is not an administrative body and the power lies with the government, is the government prepared to convene such a conference which labour has indicated it is prepared to attend?

Mr. Benson: As I said in answer to the previous question, Mr. Speaker, the government is considering the matter. We have a Prices and Incomes Commission which tried to convene such a conference. Labour refused to attend.

INFLATION—RESTRAINT ON WAGES AND RESTRAINT ON OTHER FORMS OF INCOME

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): A supplementary question. Was the Chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission expressing government policy when he told the officials of the Canadian Labour Congress that if they would co-operate—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have to interrupt the hon. member. The hon. member knows that the rules do not allow him to ask whether a statement made outside of this House by an official is government policy. The hon. member can ask the question directly without reference to the statement.

Mr. Orlikow: I will repeat my question. Can the Minister of Finance state whether the government is working on policies which will put tighter limits on the incomes of executives, professional people, stockholders and real estate operators in line with the policy of restraint on wages?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): That is a pretty broad question, Mr. Speaker. It deals with a great many matters. The government is, of course, studying the reasonableness of charges, etc., by all groups. Indeed, the Prices and Incomes Commission at their conference received certain assurances from certain groups mentioned by the hon. member.

Mr. Orlikow: A supplementary question. In view of the often expressed views of the Canadian Labour Congress that the policies of the government are aimed directly at them, is the minister prepared to make a statement indicating how forms of income other than wages can be restrained at the same time wages are restrained?

Mr. Benson: A good many statements have been made over the past few months with respect to this question. I will be glad to consider the question raised by the hon. member.

[*Translation*]

FINANCE

INTEREST RATE ON RECENT GOVERNMENT BOND ISSUE

Mr. Henry Latulippe (Compton): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Finance.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Would he tell the House why the government is putting on the market $525 million worth of bonds at interest rates varying between 6.58 and 7.49 per cent?

Would he also tell the House why the government could not have redeemed the bonds becoming due on July 1st with the magnificent budget surpluses, in order to reduce our national debt?

Mr. Speaker: The member will admit, I am sure, that his interesting question is rather argumentative. I doubt that it is in order.

[*English*]

DRUGS

LEDAIN COMMISSION INTERIM REPORT—TYPE OF INQUIRY INTO LEAK

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): My question is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In view of the fact it was stated yesterday an inquiry is being conducted with reference to the LeDain Commission Report leak, I ask the minister who is conducting the inquiry? Which personnel are conducting what type of inquiry?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): The agency that will conduct the inquiry has not yet been decided.

Mr. Stanfield: Don't hurry!

Mr. Munro: I expect that decision will be made prior to the end of the week, Mr. Speaker. In the interval, I wish to advise that I and my staff are conducting preliminary investigations to ascertain the presence of all copies of the report. We have just about completed the record of where they are.

Mr. Woolliams: A supplementary question. I was wondering if the minister was having trouble with his conscience. This is an inquiry. We are entitled to know how many of his staff are looking into this, what they are doing and who they are contacting.

Mr. Munro: Mr. Speaker, two of my staff are contacting each and every one who has received a copy of the report in order to identify the location of these copies. This type of study is now going on.

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): My supplementary question relates to the very frank disclosure made earlier today by the Minister of Labour. Will the Minister of National Health and Welfare make a similar disclosure in order to end all the uncertainty—

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. A. D. Alkenbrack (Frontenac-Lennox and Addington): A supplementary question. In view of this investigation, will the minister at the same time investigate the obvious and flagrant collusion between three partners, *Time* magazine, the *Globe and Mail* and the Liberal party, as evidenced by the lucrative full-page ad—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

ARGENTIA, NFLD.—INQUIRY AS TO SPECIAL COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West): My question is directed to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. Can the minister state whether the special report of the committee appointed to investigate the Argentia situation has been received by him and whether it is being studied by the cabinet?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Yes, Mr. Speaker. We have received the report. It is under consideration by the cabinet. I hope that very soon we will know the decision of the government.

Mr. Carter: A supplementary. Will the minister give an undertaking that the report will be presented to the House before the proposed date of adjournment, June 26?

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): I think so, Mr. Speaker.

TAXATION

WHITE PAPER ON REFORM—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON CHANGES IN PROPOSALS

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): My question is directed to the Minister of Finance. In light of the minister's letter to the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs on Thursday last, I directed a question to the Prime Minister. Will the minister now make a statement indicating what changes he or the government has decided to make to the white paper on taxation in order to avoid unnecessary consideration by the public and the committee in those areas where changes have been made?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I do not think the minister should make that kind of a statement now. If he is going to make a statement, I suggest it should be made on motions.

[Mr. Thompson.]

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the government has not made decisions with regard to changes in the white paper. It is considering a great many matters in the white paper, as are two parliamentary committees. We are looking forward to receiving representations from the parliamentary committee in front of which I will be appearing, I hope, before the hearings are concluded.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): A supplementary question. If the minister is taking that attitude, how does he explain the position that the surplus that will be available is now going to be much smaller?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member's supplementary question is argumentative.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

BRITISH COLUMBIA—INVESTIGATION OF ADEQUACY OF CARE OF HOSPITAL PATIENTS

Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West): My question is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Is the minister aware of certain difficulties with regard to patient care in British Columbia and the widespread concern expressed by the British Columbia Medical Association, registered nurses, hospital workers and others because of final cutbacks? Will the minister make an early statement on motions as to whether he is prepared to send experts from his department to British Columbia to investigate the situation and ensure optimum patient care?

Mr. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member is aware that under the Hospital Insurance Act this is a primary responsibility of the province, the cost of which we share in terms of roughly 50 per cent after we receive an accounting from them. There is some question as to how far the federal government can go with regard to intervening in matters such as the one referred to by the hon. member. I will look into the matter and consider making a more complete statement later.

Mr. Rose: A supplementary question. When the minister is considering his statement with regard to the question I raised earlier, will he also consider stating whether the government has any intention of establishing national medical standards of patient care along the

lines recommended by the federal task force? Will he consider making these standards part and parcel of any future federal-provincial agreements?

Mr. Speaker: Order. It seems to me the hon. member's supplementary is rather in the form of a representation which he can assume will be noted by the minister.

[*Translation*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

REQUEST FOR EMERGENCY DEBATE ON GOVERNMENT DAIRY POLICY

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the President of the Privy Council.

In view of the fact that the 25,000 manufacturing milk producers who signed the petition tabled in this House on February 18, 1970, have asked that an emergency debate be held on the government dairy policy, and that, as a member, I signed that petition, I therefore ask the President of the Privy Council whether the debate requested will be held before the House adjourns?

Hon. Donald Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, it will depend on the progress made. If all the legislation discussed with the House leaders is passed, it might be possible to hold, before June 26, the debate mentioned by the member.

[*Later:*]

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, so as to complete the question asked by the hon. member for Bellechasse, I should like to direct a supplementary question to the President of the Privy Council.

Since the farmers' petition was found acceptable by the House in accordance with Standing Orders, since moreover the President of the Privy Council has just replied to the hon. member for Bellechasse that the requested debate would depend on the time available and finally, since parliamentary business is planned in agreement with the various parties, is the President of the Privy Council prepared to commit himself to deal with this matter with the representatives of the opposition parties, so that this debate may take place before the end of this session?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to discuss the matter with the representatives of the other parties, but I emphasize that we should conclude first the business of the House.

[*English*]

POLLUTION

ATHABASCA RIVER—ASSISTANCE TO ALBERTA IN INVESTIGATING OIL SPILL

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. In view of the fact that the government of Alberta is now engaged in arranging for a committee of investigation into the oil spill in the Athabasca River, would the federal government be prepared to assist both financially and technically? I ask this question because of the very considerable involvement of the federal government in the northern territories in connection with pipeline construction, river crossings and so on which so deeply concern us all. Would the government of Canada be prepared to co-operate and assist with this investigation?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I think we would be willing to co-operate with the Alberta government. They have been co-operating with us on this issue. I should like to inform hon. members of the House that the situation seems to be under control at the present time. The flow of oil has been stopped with booms, and so on, and I think plans are now being made to leave the area since the problem has almost been solved.

REPRESENTATIONS TO INTERNATIONAL BODY RESPECTING OIL SPILLS

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs dealing with the same subject of oil spills. My question relates to the sighting of 1,400 miles of polluted ocean by the explorer Thor Heyerdahl. In view of this, and in view of the increasingly numerous oil spills taking place both on land and in the water, is the minister or the government giving consideration to raising the subject at the United Nations or before some other international organization immediately?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Canadian government has taken a number of initiatives in this field. First of all, we are one of the sponsors of a major conference that is

being held under the auspices of the United Nations in Stockholm in 1972 dealing with all problems of world environment. In Brussels, the Minister of Transport attempted to get more stringent international regulations governing oil spills; and the Food and Agriculture Organization is holding a technical conference in Rome in December, 1970, on marine pollution and its effects on living resources and fishing. This conference will be chaired by the Deputy Minister of Fisheries of Canada.

Mr. Aiken: A further supplementary question. Has the government yet established a plan or proposal to submit to the international organization for the control of oil pollution on the high seas?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, we have made a number of proposals along these lines. I can think of nothing more comprehensive than what we have proposed. I think anything less comprehensive would not meet the bill.

PUBLIC WORKS

TORONTO—COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION ON PROJECT METRO

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question that I have directed both to the Secretary of State and the Minister of Transport. My question relates to a matter I raised with both ministers about a week ago, which they took as notice. My question is: How much longer does the government intend to hold up commencement of construction on Project Metro in Toronto?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I deny the allegation, which I am sure is not intentional, contained in the hon. member's question. I should like to know what it is that we are doing to hold up the project. As far as I am aware, no impediment has been placed in the way.

Mr. Nesbitt: A supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I should have taken some exception to the question asked by the hon. member, which was in the form of an allegation rather than a question. The hon. member might be allowed a real question by way of a supplementary.

Mr. Nesbitt: Would the Minister of Transport inform the House how soon it is expected work will start on project Metro in Toronto?

[Mr. Sharp.]

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Speaker, the information I have is that this is a joint venture, in the first instance, between Canadian National and Canadian Pacific Railways. These two bodies are now working out the detailed plans. I repeat that except for the Canadian National advising us of their progress, we have not placed any impediment in the way. Indeed, we have been co-operating with them with regard to the transportation aspects of the project, particularly the establishment, quite possibly, of a downtown air terminal in the complex.

Mr. Nesbitt: A supplementary question. Has the minister had any discussion with his colleague the Secretary of State with respect to the substantial interest in this project of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation? Is it approval of this project by the Corporation that is holding up construction?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

BASIS OF GROWTH RATE FORECAST BY OECD

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Finance a question relating to the very disappointing forecast of growth for Canada made by the OECD for the current year, namely a growth rate of 2½ per cent, considerably lower than the forecast made by the minister himself. Is this due to the slowdown in our economy being greater than the minister had anticipated, or does it reflect the considered opinion of the OECD advisers with regard to the effect of the floating rate of the dollar on the growth rate of Canada?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I do not think it reflects the effect of the floating dollar, because when OECD were engaging in this consideration they had no knowledge that the dollar was going to be floated. We are looking at our own forecast, but I would be glad to report to my hon. friend after I have had more opportunity to examine the OECD figures, since I returned to the House only yesterday.

Mr. Stanfield: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. When the minister completes his survey of the situation, would he make a statement to the House indicating what measures he proposes the government should take to effect a less disappointing result, in view of the disastrous employment consequences that

this slow rate of growth will mean to Canadians? Would the minister make such statement at his earliest convenience?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, not necessarily agreeing with the Leader of the Opposition's speech, I will certainly consider any suggestions he may make.

Mr. Barney Danson (York North): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. May I ask the Minister of Finance, when he makes his study of the OECD report, whether he would also take note of their encouraging long-range projections for Canada and relate them to the very wise measures now being taken, measures which, although they might have short-term detrimental effects, promise long-term gains?

Mr. Stanfield: A further supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker: Order. It seems to me that at this point we are entering the field of argument. I think we should pass on to the next question.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a very short supplementary question. Will the Minister of Finance bear in mind some very wise advice given by an economist of former days, that in the long run we will all be dead.

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

PUBLIC WORKS

FUTURE USE OF VACATED KINGSTON LAKESHORE LAND

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, could I ask a question of the Minister of Transport. Last Friday, June 12, in the absence of the minister I asked a question relating to certain lakeshore lands that had been vacated by industry in Kingston, Ontario. I asked whether the federal government would undertake to assert its interest in the land, if it has any, and would make sure that the land is not handed over to a private developer but is used for the construction of some public recreational facility. The Minister of Public Works undertook to draw this question to the attention of the Minister of Transport. I do not know whether or not the minister has any information about this today.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Public Works did call this to my attention. I can report in a preliminary way that we are investigating the matter. There is some question as to the degree of the federal presence in that area. We have received a number of representations and I can assure the hon. member and the House that the public interest certainly will be taken into account, if indeed we have any authority in the area. Secondly, I shall be glad to give a more detailed report when current investigations are more complete.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary arising out of the fact that I was informed, I believe yesterday afternoon, that the provincial government has handed the municipality what might be termed a quit-claim of its interest. Would the minister be good enough to look into that aspect of the question to make sure that federally we do not do the same thing.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member's supplementary is a representation.

BROADCASTING

PROVISION OF SECOND TELEVISION CHANNEL IN SYDNEY, N.S.

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State. It is further to previous questions I posed on the same subject. Is the hon. gentleman in a position to advise what progress is being made in respect of the series of meetings between the CBC, CTV, CRTC and Cape Breton Broadcasters concerning the provision of a second television channel in the Cape Breton area which could serve other regions as well.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I have not received further information since the hon. member asked me that question, Mr. Speaker, but I will be pleased to ask the CBC how those negotiations stand.

[*English*]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

CABINET ENDORSEMENT OF WHITE PAPER—SIX PER CENT GUIDELINE

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Labour whether, before presenting his white paper on unemployment

insurance, he obtained clearance from the Minister of Finance with regard to going beyond a 6 per cent increase?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, before I announced the white paper I obtained clearance from the members of the cabinet. It is a good document and they endorsed it entirely.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister of Labour if a 32 per cent increase is not a violation of the announced policy of the Minister of Finance who a moment ago said the government did agree to the 6 per cent increase. Will the minister, on behalf of organized labour, ask his colleagues to refrain from blaming labour for any violation of the 6 per cent guideline when his own department is doing likewise.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

INCLUSION OF OPTOMETRIC SERVICES UNDER MEDICARE

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In view of the hardship imposed on Canadians living outside the larger urban centres by the shortage of ophthalmological services, and in light of the consensus on the matter achieved by the provinces participating in medicare, would the minister now assure the House that equal access to eye infraction care will be made available to all Canadians through optometric services being covered by the medicare program?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member did refer to what we require in terms of a consensus from the provinces. We will be having a meeting shortly, within the next couple of months, with the provincial health ministers at which we will again canvass for a consensus. As the hon. member knows, there have been changes of government in at least two of the provinces fairly recently and if a widespread consensus does occur the government will have to consider extended coverage under medicare.

Mr. Dinsdale: Mr. Speaker, do I take from the minister's remarks that optometric services would be considered provided all provinces participating in medicare achieve a consensus on this point?

Mr. Munro: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is very largely true; but as the hon. member knows we have not been really prepared to discuss extended coverage under medicare until all provinces are, in fact, in medicare under its present terms and conditions. That is not the case as of yet.

Mr. Dinsdale: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I wish to bring to the attention of hon. members that we will shortly run out of time, and perhaps at this point we should limit the supplementaries.

POLLUTION

WINNIPEG RIVER—SOURCE OF MERCURY CONTAMINATION

Mr. E. B. Osler (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries. In view of the reported discovery of serious mercury pollution and death of fish in the Winnipeg River immediately below Kenora, Ontario, what steps have been taken to pinpoint the source of the pollution and to stop it? I see that the minister has left.

SHIPPING

REPLACEMENT FOR MV "PATRICK MORRIS"

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Transport if he is in a position to report what tangible result his efforts to date have had in alleviating the acute shortage of transportation on the Gulf of St. Lawrence between Newfoundland and Nova Scotia.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I can report on the next phase of the negotiations. Last week I indicated that we were dealing with a firm in Norway. Representatives of that company have now come to Canada. We have indicated we are prepared to enter into what is known as a bare-boat charter with them but it does involve these technical changes to which I referred. These are being discussed with officials of the department. I hope that an agreement will be reached within the next 24 hours.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, does the minister propose to proceed with the interim plan to use barges on the Cabot Strait?

Mr. Jamieson: If necessary we will. We have located a couple in New York which we think will be suitable. The problem is obtaining a type of barge which will fit the facility at the end of the strait. I hope with the

acquisition of the vessels which we should get as quickly as possible, and the changes that will be made, this will not be necessary.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

ORAL CONTRACEPTIVES—STEPS TO PROTECT WOMEN AGAINST POSSIBLE DANGERS

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In view of the fact that the United States Food and Drug administration has now made it mandatory to put danger warnings on each package of contraceptive pills so that medical advice can be sought immediately by the patient, what steps are being taken to protect Canadian women who take these pills?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I did answer a similar question by the hon. member a few weeks ago. The Food and Drug Directorate sends out detailed directions and warnings which it feels are appropriate to all the doctors across the country concerning the way in which the pill should be handled, and the advice to be given to women who, in the doctor's opinion, require the pill. This program is being stepped up. There are other precautionary warnings given in the directions which go with the pill. If the hon. member is referring to the warning on the outside of the packages and so on, that is a matter now under study by a committee of Canadian experts. This committee is providing me with advice and, as I stated to the House last week, I expect the report of the committee very shortly. When I say "very shortly" I am speaking in terms of two or three weeks.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

ALLEGED MAFIA "CONTRACT" ON LIFE OF ONTARIO LEGISLATURE MEMBER—CO-OPERATION IN INVESTIGATION BY RCMP

Mr. Doug Rowland (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Acting Solicitor General or in his absence to the Acting Prime Minister. In light of the allegations that a member of the provincial legislature of Ontario has had a "contract" let on his life by the Mafia, and in light of the fact that the Ontario Provincial Police and Metropolitan Toronto police forces are taking these allegations very seriously, can the minister give assurance to this House that the RCMP is actively engaged in investigating the allegation in the hope of protecting the life of this member?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Well, Mr. Speaker, this primarily is the responsibility I suppose of the Attorney General of Ontario. If the co-operation of the RCMP is required it will be forthcoming.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

INVESTIGATION OF CRASH OF CF-5 AIRCRAFT

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpeque): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of National Defence. Has the minister anything to tell the House regarding the unfortunate crash of the CF-5 aircraft yesterday while undergoing a flight test which is part of its acceptance trials? What sort of inquiry has been set up to determine the liability surrounding the matter, if any?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I join the hon. member in expressing regret at this accident. All I can say is that the investigation was started this morning and we are looking first of all into the accident itself. We are also investigating the liability as to who is responsible.

CF PROGRAM

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): I wonder if the minister could tell us whether, owing to the short range of this aircraft, it has now been decided that the aircraft to be used for training under the CF program are to be mothballed?

Mr. Cadieux (Labelle): I contest the allegation that this aircraft has a short range. I hope my hon. friend knows that it can be ferried across the Atlantic. The range is relatively short, but it is relatively long also.

[*Translation*]

THE CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

QUEBEC—NEGOTIATIONS RESPECTING AMENDMENT OF SECTION 128 OF BRITISH NORTH AMERICA ACT

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice.

Can the minister tell the House whether the Quebec government, up to now, has opened discussions regarding the form of the oath of allegiance, and whether a request for amending it has been submitted to him officially with regard to section 128 of the British North America Act?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I did not quite catch the question of the hon. member. I shall read it tomorrow in *Hansard* and if an answer is required, I will reply.

Mr. La Salle: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Joliette rises on a point of order. It might be easier for him to repeat his question.

Mr. La Salle: Mr. Speaker, I believe I heard the minister say that he had not understood my question. Therefore, I shall repeat it.

I was asking the minister whether the Quebec government, up to now, had opened discussions with him concerning the form of the oath of allegiance and whether a request for amending the constitution, with regard to section 128 of the BNA Act had been submitted by the Quebec government?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): No, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

AIR TRANSPORT

USE OF FORMER CLINTON ARMED FORCES BASE FOR TRAINING SCHOOL

Mr. R. E. McKinley (Huron): I should like to ask the Minister of Transport how soon he thinks his department may be able to make a decision on whether or not they will be able to utilize the former Canadian Forces Base in Clinton for the new air services training school to be used by his and other federal departments?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): The hon. member was good enough to bring this matter to my attention some time ago. I have asked the officials of my department to take a look at it. It involves two other matters having to do with the possibility of combined training by our department and by one or two others. I have not received any late report on it but I will get it for the hon. member as soon as I possibly can.

Mr. McKinley: I wonder if the minister would have a conference with his friend, the Minister of National Defence, because I understand that some of the fixtures are being moved off the base, something which the minister promised me would not be done prior to the phase-out?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

[Mr. La Salle.]

HEALTH AND WELFARE

NEED FOR RESTRICTIONS ON USE OF MEDICATIONS CONTAINING PHENACETIN

Mr. Allen B. Sulatycky (Rocky Mountain): My question is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In view of the fact that University Hospital in Edmonton this week prohibited the use of any medication containing phenacetin, and in view of the fact that there has been evidence that this drug is harmful to the kidneys, will the minister undertake a study to determine whether restrictions on the public use of this drug are necessary?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Yes, Mr. Speaker. With reference to this particular drug, I did announce that a committee of the Food and Drug Directorate, the Canadian Medical Association and other experts had been brought together here to determine what further action should be taken with respect to it. I would advise that, in the meantime, a strong cautionary warning is being issued along with this particular drug.

LABOUR RELATIONS

EMERGENCY LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING RIGHTS FOR NOVA SCOTIA FISHERMEN

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. It is based partly on the fact that tomorrow morning at ten o'clock in the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia 45 people, mostly fishermen, are to arraigned and are liable to be sent to prison for contravening an injunction. In light of the fact that this incident arose out of their fundamental struggle for recognition as collective bargaining agents, something that has been available to most members of the labour force for 35 to 40 years, and the minister may have an opportunity to deal with this because—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is the hon. member asking a question? He has had the floor for a while now.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Like most hon. members, I have listened attentively and have learned that one must lay a base for the question one puts. I am just coming to the question now. Would the minister be prepared, because of the crucial nature of the situation, to introduce emergency legislation to provide these people with the opportunity to obtain collective bargaining rights?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Because of the persuasiveness of the hon. gentleman some weeks ago, I did agree to set up an industrial inquiry commission into the propriety of extending collective bargaining rights to this particular group of employees. The terms of reference may or may not be under federal jurisdiction. In the interval, I must point out that if these men have run afoul of the law they cannot expect the Minister of Labour to do anything about this alleged disrespect of the law which will be ascertained tomorrow. Since the matter is before the court, it would be highly presumptuous of me to indicate whether or not I favour their actions.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I wonder if the minister is aware that Mr. Justice Green, the industrial inquiry commissioner, appeared to act as if he favoured one of the parties—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question, of course, is out of order on many counts.

[*Translation*]

INDUSTRY

AMENDMENT OF CUSTOMS TARIFF TO PROTECT SHOE MANUFACTURERS

Mr. Roland Godin (Portneuf): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Minister of National Revenue.

Since a brief addressed by the Association of Canadian Shoe Manufacturers to all hon. members indicates that from 1956 to 1969, the Canadian population has increased by 33 per cent, while the imports of shoes increased by 568 per cent, could the minister tell us if he is contemplating a review of the customs tariff in order to remedy the serious effects of this situation on the workers of this industry?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister of National Revenue): This does not come under the jurisdiction of the Minister of National Revenue, Mr. Speaker, but under that of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce to whom I shall convey the hon. member's question.

[*English*]

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

INVESTIGATION OF FREIGHT TRAIN DERAILMENTS IN NEWFOUNDLAND

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): My question is directed to the Minister of Transport. Can he report now on the evidence of deterioration of rail lines in Newfoundland, as he indicated he would do in answer to the question of the hon. member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador on June 5?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): I am sorry, would the hon. member repeat the question?

Mr. Marshall: Could the minister report on the evidence of deterioration of rail lines in Newfoundland and the resulting danger of accidents arising from this deterioration? He indicated on June 5 he would do this.

Mr. Jamieson: I referred the matter to the Canadian Transport Commission which has the authority and the personnel for carrying out such investigations. To my knowledge, no report has been received from them. I will make inquiries. If it has been received, I will make it available to the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe and to the hon. member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

• (4:20 p.m.)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CANADA ELECTIONS ACT

MEASURE TO CONSOLIDATE AND REVISE

The House resumed from Tuesday, June 16 consideration in committee of Bill C-215, respecting the franchise of electors and the election of members to the House of Commons—Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale)—Mr. Faulkner in the chair.

The Chairman: Order, please. The House is again in committee of the whole on Bill C-215, respecting the franchise of electors and the election of members to the House of Commons. When the committee rose last evening, subclause 3 of clause 14 was under consideration with an amendment by the hon. member for Matane. Before proceeding, I might point out that subclause 8 of clause 13 was allowed to stand. We are, therefore, now considering subclause 3 of clause 14, which may be found on page 24 of the bill. The question now before the committee is the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Matane, which is as follows:

That subclause (3) of clause 14 be deleted.

On Clause 14, subclause 3—*Certain British subjects deemed Electors.*

[*Translation*]

Mr. De Bané: Mr. Chairman, as I was saying yesterday at the end of the sitting, my amendment is based on the following considerations: A federal Parliament such as ours must not be the champion of any nationality and indulge in any discrimination.

What is the present situation? We are granting privileges to a particular group, the British subjects, whatever their country of origin. As for immigtants from other countries, we demand of them that they become Canadian citizens if they want to vote.

Today, there are about a million and a half British subjects who did not ever deign to become Canadian citizens even though they have been living in Canada for many years. Besides, I wonder why they should become Canadian citizens since they enjoy the same rights as all Canadians. The preferential treatment they enjoy under this clause is found in other legislation, in other fields—even administrative—including the public service for instance where preference is given to Canadian citizens or British subjects.

In my opinion, the only way to check nationalism and intolerance by one group towards another is for the government not to favour one over another. The federal government must pass legislation which does not favour any ethnic group.

Obviously, the most important argument is this: We would not want to give preferential treatment to one group over another. However, there is another even more important: Parliament should not deprive certain persons of the rights they already have.

I would say to my hon. colleagues that no British subject would be denied the right to vote at the next federal election, if he is willing in the meantime, to take the necessary steps to become a Canadian citizen.

Indeed, under the bill now under consideration, any British subject enjoying the right to vote in 1968 would still have that privilege. Consequently, all those who were entitled to vote in 1968 and who at the next federal election would have been in Canada at least five years and wish to obtain their Canadian citizenship would have the right to vote.

I say frankly that this section seems to stem directly or indirectly from the conquest, and I hope we have all forgotten it. What we want, it is to build together a country where all the people will be equal, where one group is not given preference over another, where, in particular, French Canadians will not come up against a certain kind of provocation, though undoubtedly unconscious. In my opinion, Canada will not be able to survive unless it becomes the champion of equality between all ethnic groups.

Of course, it is but a detail without any significance to put one group before another. But I think that in a country like Canada where nationalist feelings are quite strong, it would be sheer folly not to heed all these small details in which, finally, some want to find a justification for their intolerance.

This is why I believe that Canadian citizens alone should have the franchise and that British subjects who have been living here for many years, and who are an asset to the country, should take the necessary steps in order to become citizens like the rest of us.

[*English*]

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, I am interested in the hon. gentleman's supporting statements on his proposed amendment. I cannot believe that if the bill as presented or as the committee has recommended—and there is a slight difference here—should be enacted into law, the survival of Canada would really be seriously endangered. I think that was a bit extreme. Nor can I believe it is a vicious exercise in discrimination, or a recollection of the conquest.

I am not so concerned about the fact that citizens of another nation, another jurisdiction, namely, the United Kingdom, should find it in a sense easier to obtain the franchise here than others. I think there is another aspect to it to which the hon. gentleman does not advert and that is the fact that this is one part of a reciprocal arrangement. There are Canadians in Britain who will be voting tomorrow, because the United Kingdom parliament has extended this right to them.

Mr. Pepin: Some might be elected.

Mr. Macquarrie: Indeed, as the minister mentions, some may be elected members of the United Kingdom parliament.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): For Labour.

Mr. Macquarrie: There was a concept at one time that we might be able to extend, through the Commonwealth, a great generality of citizenship, and in modern days that we could have an expression as in the days of Rome, *civis Romanus sum*, indicating that a man from the very remotest region could be a

Roman citizen equal in status to the residents of that eternal city. Unfortunately, that has not developed, but there are still parts of the Commonwealth which grant this reciprocal right to Canadians.

The other day I read that the Prime Minister has become an enthusiast for the Commonwealth. I think that is a fine thing. I am not one of those who criticize people because they change their mind. It indicates that, in this regard, he has a mature point of view.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Macquarrie: Can we not, even in committee, have a little cessation of interruptions?

The concept of the Commonwealth is surely meaningful. It is certainly a unique political organization. We do have rights that, for instance, are extended to our diplomats. There is a subtle difference between an ambassador and a high commissioner. Could this not be recognized in the realm of the franchise? Perhaps instead of rushing against this, we might, within the Commonwealth lead in internationalizing the concept of citizenship. This might be a fine thing. I am never happy when I see people trying to turn Canada inwards in any of these matters. So, I would be content with the way this provision appears in the bill. I think the government made a little alteration and not an improvement. I would not want anyone who believes that this distinction should remain to think that it is to perpetuate discrimination. It is rather a development in sustaining a reciprocal recognition which transcends nationalism and, to that extent, surely is not totally bad.

• (4:30 p.m.)

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, the disposition of the government was to accept the amendment to the act proposed by the committee. I acknowledge that there is a difference in formulation, but I am not sure how substantial the difference is. I think it is much the same as was recommended by the committee. From a personal standpoint, I am inclined to accept the committee's recommendation because it is not desirable to take the franchise away from anyone who previously had it and who has remained in Canada. On the other hand, I recognize that there has been a discrimination in favour of immigrants to Canada from the British Isles—indeed from the Indian subcontinent and elsewhere, which historically happens to have been part of the British Commonwealth. This is a recognition by the committee that discrimination in Canada in favour of those immigrants is not to continue but, rather, that the class to be entitled to exercise the franchise, not being Canadian citizens, is to be frozen, in effect, as of June 26, 1967. The class may be reduced from time to time by an individual losing continuous residence in Canada.

Under the circumstances, I would recognize that there is a wide difference of opinion among hon. members on this particular subject. As the representative of the government, at this point my disposition would be not to vote personally on this question but to leave it to the decision of the committee as a whole whether this particular subsection should be amended or whether it should be accepted in full.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, we didn't have a full opportunity last evening to deal with this because the hour was getting late and there was a disposition to explore other matters.

I am not generally disposed to support the amendment before us as proposed by the member from Matane. I do not believe in the principle of confining and restricting the franchise or of removing it from people who previously had it, albeit they may have received it by way of a bilateral agreement with another country or may think themselves in a position of privilege vis-à-vis other people in Canada who are not British subjects. Nevertheless, the principal point that I wish to make, and on which I found our opinion, is that we should not confine the area within which the franchise should be applicable but rather we should be concerned about expanding it. It is from that point of view that I cannot support the proposed amendment.

I suggest that we might be better advised to say that any adult over 18 years of age having been ordinarily resident in Canada for the past year, whether or not that person is a Canadian citizen, should be entitled to vote. A year's continuous residence is the provision we use with respect to British subjects, so we could expand it to apply to people from other countries. People who have been ordinarily resident in Canada for the period of a year would be contributing to Canada, would be governed by our laws and would be paying taxes for the upkeep of services and facilities within the nation. By virtue of the provisions of the Citizenship Act, which I hope will be amended, these people would have to wait for five years before applying to become Canadi-

an citizens and thus becoming eligible to vote. If we were to enlarge the franchise to include everyone, Canadian citizen or otherwise, who has been in the country for one year, it would be a more generous action than that proposed by the amendment before us.

We should tie in with this provision the proposition that those individuals who do not take Canadian citizenship when they are eligible for it would lose the franchise. Something along this line would be far more acceptable and in the spirit of the relationship between Parliament and the people who pay the taxes.

Mr. Stewart (Cochrane): Mr. Chairman, I welcome the opportunity to say a few words because I am very much in favour of the amendment. It is precisely the amendment that I proposed in a private member's bill, as did a few other members in this Parliament. I believe this is a very simple question and, frankly, I cannot understand anyone who would downgrade Canadian citizenship. Either a person is proud of being a Canadian or he is not, and if he is not interested in becoming a citizen, then I cannot understand why he would want to vote.

I am very surprised that my good friend the member for Hillsborough would mention reciprocity. I do not think he would vote in the election tomorrow if he were living in the United Kingdom. I cannot understand any Canadian who would vote in that election unless he wanted to be part of that country. I cannot understand, either, why anyone would want to run for Parliament in the United Kingdom unless he wanted to live there and become a British citizen. Conversely, I cannot understand why anyone from the British Isles or elsewhere in the Commonwealth, who does not want to become a citizen of this country, should have the right to vote here or to be a candidate in an election. It is as simple as that to me, and I would urge members of the House to vote in favour of striking that particular portion from the bill before us.

I am a little surprised that the committee would come up with this particular suggestion. I would be more in favour of the proposal of the hon. member for Skeena than what is before us in this bill. A British subject who was here in 1967 has had plenty of opportunity to become a Canadian citizen, more so than someone who has only been here a year prior to an election and may desire citizenship. From that point of view, I certainly agree with the hon. member for Skeena far more than with this bill that is now before us. I say that people who have been in Canada and who have had the privilege of voting before becoming Canadian citizens, should never have had it. It was a mistake and we should remedy that mistake in this bill. If they are interested in casting their ballot, they have the next two or three years in which to take out citizenship. If they are not interested in becoming Canadians, there is no reason in the world why they should want to vote or be a candidate in an election. I think it is a great thing to be a Canadian citizen and it seems to me that these people should feel that way too.

[Mr. Howard (Skeena).]

• (4:40 p.m.)

I wonder how many members have discussed this matter with people from other countries. I have discussed it with members of the diplomatic corp who could not understand why anyone would want to vote in this country unless he were a citizen. It seems to me this illustrates the peculiar way of thinking we have in Canada when it comes to things like patriotism and love of country. This idea of wanting to be part of something else and hanging on to apron strings is an idea which I am very much against. I believe that if we are to be the kind of nation we wish to be, we should be proud of being Canadians and should consider Canadian citizenship as something very special. It should be a great privilege for someone to vote. If we consider it in that light, there is no reason why anyone who wishes to live here, even though he may be a British subject, should not want to be part of this country and a citizen of this country. If a man does not want that, he should not have the rights that go with citizenship. I encourage every hon. member to vote in favour of this amendment to strike out that particular paragraph which makes an exception in favour of the British citizen.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment of the hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané), as well as the remarks of the hon. member or Cochrane (Mr. Stewart) and of others to the effect that non Canadians should not be given the franchise.

I myself introduced a bill to that effect twice in the House and I should like to see clause 14(3) deleted, so that the franchise be given only to true Canadian citizens.

If we deem all British subjects qualified as electors, we automatically recognize that Canada is still a British colony. Everywhere and in every situation we are wont to talk about Canadian sovereignty and autonomy. I think we should adopt immediately a measure granting the franchise to every Canadian citizen.

I know someone born in the United States who is probably 50 years old now. He has been living in Canada since the age of two and yet has never applied for Canadian citizenship. He is however considered as a Canadian. But because he is not a Canadian citizen he does not have the franchise under the act.

I think that a British citizen who comes to Canada should be granted the franchise only if, as any other immigrant, he becomes a Canadian citizen.

This is why I support the amendment of the hon. member for Matane, asking for the removal of clause 14(3).

[*English*]

Mr. Deachman: Mr. Chairman, clause 14(3) attempts to deal with an old problem. It attempts to settle a growing feeling on the part of Canadians that the vote in Canadian general elections ought to be reserved to Canadian citizens. This feeling became increasingly evident during the great period of postwar immigration. The idea has also become very popular among younger Canadians. We took some steps in this direction when passing the Citizenship Act of 1942, for example, which established who is a Canadian citizen. That act made it essential for anyone who wished to become a Canadian to apply for Canadian citizenship. It included a provision saying that a British subject who had been living in Canada for five years before the coming into force of the act would automatically become a Canadian citizen.

However, the dual nature of Canadian voting remained enshrined within the Elections Act. It has remained there to this day, much to the annoyance of the hundreds of thousands of immigrants who have come to this country from non-Commonwealth countries and who, while waiting their five years to become Canadian citizens, saw other people coming from Commonwealth countries enjoy the privilege of participating in federal elections, even though they had been here for only one year. It is, therefore, reasonable for us to see expressed in amendments to the Elections Act a desire to cure an old anomaly. The trouble is that the bill would not do that. The act we are considering simply entrenches the rights of a class of non-Canadian citizens who will have the privilege of voting until they die. It says that every British subject, other than a Canadian citizen, who was qualified as an elector on June 25, 1968 is deemed to be qualified as an elector.

This provision simply means that a person, let us say, who was 21 years old at the last election and qualified to vote, may continue to vote without ever becoming a Canadian citizen for as long as he lives, perhaps for 40, 50 or 60 years or more. So, if we pass this clause, we shall be creating two classes of British subjects in Canada, namely, those who by virtue of this act will be allowed to vote from now until they die, and those other British subjects who will not have the privilege of voting until they become Canadian citizens. In addition, we would have a third class of Canadian citizens who would have the vote. I sympathize with those who believe that the vote should be reserved to Canadians. I believe that is what we ought to be doing.

On the other hand, I do not feel that by passing any clause of this bill we ought to cut off people from the franchise who now have the right to vote. I am not in favour of taking away immediately the right of those who have enjoyed the franchise. I think there is a way around the difficulty, and that way was hinted at by the hon. member for Skeena who spoke a few moments ago. He suggested that we should provide those who have enjoyed the privilege of voting by virtue of their British citizenship with the opportunity to become Canadian citizens, and that we should not disenfranchise them by accepting certain amendments. I, therefore, wish to propose an amendment to subclause 3, by substituting for line 10 on page 24 of the bill the following:

> will be deemed to be qualified as an elector for a period not exceeding five years from the date of proclamation of this act.

Simply put, that means this: every British subject who is not a Canadian citizen and who was qualified as an elector on June 25, 1968, will be deemed to be qualified as an elector for a period not exceeding five years from the date of the proclamation of this Act. By accepting this amendment we shall take no voting rights away from anybody. We shall provide ample opportunity for British citizens to vote in by-elections which may occur between now and the time of the next general election, to vote in the next general election and vote perhaps in the election

beyond that. But the warning is clear in the act. They will be asked to acquire Canadian citizenship, as is now the case for Poles, Germans and so on, many hundreds and thousands of whom live in my constituency. They will be asked to acquire their citizenship in order to vote in the next federal election.

• (4:50 p.m.)

I appeal to those who wish to strike out subclause 3 not to strike it out and deprive some people of their vote. That is not what Canadians want. We do not want to do something vindictive to those people who have come here and who have been given that privilege. Let us recognize that Canadians want the vote to be fair. Let us issue the warning within the Act. These people should be given an opportunity to become Canadian citizens and, after a reasonable lapse of time in which to acquire their citizenship, to vote.

The Chairman: Order, please. Perhaps my remarks now will help to clarify what I anticipate the point of order might be. This amendment moved by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra is an amendment to subclause 3. The committee is now considering an amendment to subclause 3. I therefore cannot put this amendment. As I understand it, what is before the committee is not an amendment to an amendment, but rather a subsequent amendment to subclause 3, assuming the amendment now before the committee does not carry. I ask the hon. member to withhold this amendment. In the course of time, he will have a chance to put his amendment and the committee can then vote on it.

There is a further complication. I have been advised that a number of members wish to move amendments. I wish to make a suggestion as to procedure with which the committee might agree. We could deal with the amendment now before us, namely that subclause 3 be deleted, and in turn deal with the amendments as they come forward. We have ample time. We can hear as many amendments and speeches as hon. members wish. There is no restriction to the committee of the whole. Every member will have the right to speak or move an amendment. He will not be restricted in any way. I ask the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra to withhold his amendment. I am prepared to recognize the hon. member at a subsequent time when he can move the amendment. Meanwhile, we will continue the debate on the amendment of the hon. member for Matane.

[Mr. Deachman.]

Mr. Howard (Skeena): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. In committee of the whole it is difficult to follow other than the course set out in the rules, namely that we must deal with the motion before us, the motion to amend. I am not trying to put thoughts in the mind of the hon. member for Matane or to interpret what he meant. It may well be that on this or any other amendment that may be before us the mover and seconder will be prepared to adjust their thinking if we could reach a more agreeable amendment, one that might have wider support. We preclude ourselves from doing that if we follow the normal course of voting on several amendments. If we assume, for the sake of argument, that the amendment of the hon. member for Matane is carried that will preclude any subsequent amendments. The committee will have made a decision on that particular subject.

It is true that this proposal was studied by the standing committee. Possibly there might be agreement, after a short period of time, on suggestions about alternative amendments. Presumably we will not in any event get through this bill by six o'clock. The matter could stand over. We could then have an ad hoc committee meeting of those who have an interest in this matter to see whether there could be some agreement. The committee must be concerned about the right of Canadians to vote in order to choose their Parliament. Party differences and individual differences should transcend the rigidity of the rules. To a large extent, the rules were developed to deal with matters other than election law. I think the President of the Privy Council said that election law is the one law that is exempted from the Order in Council structure of government. All of the details are spelled out in the act because of its vital importance to our democratic institution.

An alternate and more agreeable way of dealing with this might be to have the matter stand. We could then listen to suggestions regarding amendments that individuals might have. Possibly at this meeting agreement could be reached on the divergent views and we could then come to a conclusion.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): With regard to the point raised by the hon. member for Skeena, I agree with the wisdom of his suggestion. The hon. member for Hillsborough mentioned last night that at least one of his colleagues will move an amendment on this particular point. Perhaps we might follow a

procedure just short of that followed by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra, namely when hon. members are speaking to this particular amendment they could indicate alternatives that they will propose. We would then in effect have the full platter before us. As mentioned by the hon. member for Skeena, it is unlikely that we will complete the bill this evening. Once we have heard the full range of suggestions on this particular clause, we might go on to the subsequent one. This will offer the possibility of having discussions to see if general agreement can be reached.

Mr. Macquarrie: Without creating a precedent, I wish to say that I think the minister is speaking with wisdom.

The Chairman: If the amendment is mentioned in the course of hon. member's remarks, it creates no difficulty, as long as it is clear that the amendment having been discussed, mentioned and argued, should not then be put. Otherwise, we will have a whole series of amendments before the committee simultaneously. That is inconsistent with our practice. If it is agreed in committee that hon. members speak and mention the sort of amendment they wish to move, the members of the committee can then get together independent of the committee of the whole to work out a compromise that is acceptable. I will consider the amendments as being mentioned and not being put.

Mr. Dinsdale: Mr. Chairman, I was going to make some comments on the point of order raised by the hon. member for Skeena. However, that has now been obviated by the wise decision of Your Honour. I do have an amendment that I intended to put before the committee this afternoon. In light of the comments that have been made, it might have that element of compromise that is so important in reaching decisions in this Parliament, particularly where those decisions lie in the area of a controversial or politically sensitive subject.

I agree wholeheartedly with the hon. member for Hillsborough when he pointed out that the amendment before the committee is entirely negative. He suggested that in this day and age of the global village, to use the McLuhan phrase, and the fact that the Commonwealth of Nations is the only realistic international body that is able to operate because it is established on the same basis of values and political traditions, rather than moving in a negative direction and retreating to nationalistic chauvinism that was more appropriate in the 19th century than in the 20th century, we should move in a more positive direction. The hon. member for Skeena spoke in somewhat the same terms. He indicated that his opposition to the present motion is that it is restrictive rather than expansive.

• (5:00 p.m.)

I am sure all members of the committee agree that the right of the franchise is one of the most important ingredients of our democratic system, as well as being one of the most cherished rights of the citizens of this country. We must always remember that the institutions that we have followed in this high court of public opinion have been derived almost in total from the Mother of Parliaments at Westminster. However, in the early stages of the evolutionary process which has brought our system of responsible democracy to its present level of development, the franchise was restricted.

Since that time, every move in the direction of changing the franchise has been to expand the right of exercising the vote. It is interesting to note that in almost every case there has been a certain degree of controversy surrounding such changes. Even when the right to vote was extended to the women of Canada, as it was in other countries with democratic procedures, the change was not agreed to without some degree of controversy.

Looking at clause 14 in total, the major change proposed is in the direction of extending the franchise, of making it available to Canadians of 18 years of age. The proposal in subclause 3 is, of course, in exactly the opposite direction. For the first time in the history of Parliament and its decennial dealings with the Canada Elections Act, we are moving in a negative direction and removing voting privileges that were once extended to certain groups in this country.

I am sure that the substantial weight of opinion in this House is toward accentuating the positive rather than the negative, and with this in mind I am going to make a suggestion that can be put into the mill of the ad hoc committee that will consider a compromise solution to this question. My suggestion is in the form of an amendment to subclause 3 of clause 14 and is in the following words, which are substituted for the present subclause:

(3) Every British subject, Commonwealth citizen, and citizen of France who has landed immigrant status and who has lived continuously in Canada

for a period of one year following the granting of landed immigrant status is deemed to be qualified as an elector.

I realize the hon. member for Skeena has suggested that a privilege similar to this be extended to all landed immigrants in Canada, and this is a step that the members of the committee might want to take. I think the special privileges that have been granted to British subjects up to the present time derive from the fact that our political institutions in Canada are based substantially on the traditions that emanate from the Mother of Parliaments. Indeed, the Mother of Parliaments has been the creative source of most of the democratic parliamentary institutions around the world.

We in Canada also have another mother country, France, and in recent years there has been a desire on the part of large numbers of Canadians to establish creative contact with France. It has already been mentioned that reciprocal privileges are granted in other Commonwealth nations with respect to Commonwealth citizenship. It seems to me that these are the values that should be emphasized in a day and age that is becoming a bit of a nationalistic jungle, at a time when the world is becoming a veritable whispering gallery. I trust that the members of this committee will move in a positive direction rather than negative.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laflamme: Mr. Chairman, I only wish to point out that in committee we unanimously agreed on principle to require that a person be a Canadian citizen in order to have the right to vote.

As for the vested interests of citizens who enjoyed certain rights on a reciprocal basis, all that is needed is to make a few amendments for the future.

As far as I am concerned, I would have supported the unanimous decision reached by the members of the committee. However, the committee of the whole has before it some interesting suggestions, among them the one made by the hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané) who defines the principle to which, I believe, all members of the committee have agreed. For the implementation of this suggestion, the hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra (Mr. Deachman) suggested a moment ago that those who, to date, have enjoyed their franchise without being Canadian citizens should be granted a five-year period—one can really not quarrel with that if one shares the opinion of the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Stewart) that Canadian citizenship must mean something—in order to become Canadian citizens, and this without prejudice to rights that were exercised by those who were residents of Canada during election periods. A five-year period, in my opinion, is fair, and will allow all those who up to now have enjoyed the advantages of Canadian life to take the required steps to acquire Canadian citizenship. The five-year period would be sufficient. I consider this would be fair and equitable for all concerned.

As for me, if the motion of the member for Matane is put before that of the member for Vancouver-Quadra which is more logical, I will vote against the first but in favour of the second so as to develop an orderly and logical procedure giving all Canadians the rights they used to have in the past, should a general election be called a year after the coming into force of this legislation, or should some citizens still be without their certificate of citizenship.

• (5:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. MacRae: Mr. Chairman, it has been said of some public figure about whom I read that he was dragged kicking and screaming into the 20th century. Someone may accuse me of the same thing in respect of the amendment I intend to present. I believe very strongly in the British Commonwealth of Nations. I have always had a feeling for the British tradition. My own people have lived in this country for 200 years, in the same province as the hon. member for Matane, who proposed an amendment a while ago and the hon. member who just spoke. I cannot accept the fact that our British Commonwealth is disintegrating; perhaps it is, but I cannot accept that. I should like to think that this great association of nations to which we belong can and should continue. I was very pleased to read in the press recently that our Prime Minister is being considered as a great Commonwealth man. I think that is wonderful. I had not realized this. I thought that perhaps he leaned more toward a narrow nationalism. I am grateful that he has taken this position.

The hon. member for Hillsborough very eloquently pointed out that what we have had up until this particular point is a situation whereby every British subject other than a Canadian citizen ordinarily resident in Canada for the 12 months immediately

preceding the polling day of an election is qualified to vote. That is a reciprocal arrangement which we have with a number of countries in the British Commonwealth such as the United Kingdom, which was specifically mentioned by the hon. member for Hillsborough, New Zealand, Australia and a number of the Caribbean countries. I think that if a citizen of one of these nations comes to Canada, has been here a year and is interested in our institutions and our country he should have an inducement to stay and enrich this country.

There are many things I could say. I listened with interest to the points made by the hon. gentleman who just spoke. I do not agree with him but to use an old cliché may I say that I would defend to the death his right to have his opinion and express it in this, the highest court of the country. At the appropriate time it is my intention to move the following amendment:

Resolved that Clause 14(3) be deleted and the following substituted:

(3) Every British subject, other than a Canadian citizen who has been ordinarily resident in Canada for the twelve months immediately preceding polling day at such election, is qualified as an elector.

That is the law as it presently stands and this is the intent of my motion when it is moved.

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a few words in this debate. I strongly support the amendment moved by the hon. member for Matane. Since he presented his amendment, we have had a proposed amendment by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra. While the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra an improvement in the text of the law at present, I still feel it is not as good as the proposal put forward by the hon. member for Matane. I do not think it is as good as the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Matane because it perpetuates a privileged position given to certain people in Canada for five years. In the five-year period, we could have two general elections. We had general elections in 1962, 1963 and 1965. There were three general elections in a period of four years. It is certain that within the five-year period which would elapse after the proclamation of this bill there would be one election and it is possible, if there should be a minority government, that there would be another general election.

I support the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Matane. If it should be defeated, I would seriously consider supporting the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra. I would certainly support it in preference to what is now in the text of the law. I believe it is deplorable that we give the right to vote to people who do not have sufficient interest in this country to become citizens. In this way, we give the right to vote to people who have pledged allegiance to another country. This is an indication that there is still a vestige of colonialism in our laws. This should be changed quickly. We should be consistent and logical in this matter. It is very unfair to other immigrants who know just as much or more about Canada. There are immigrants from the United States, from Maine, Vermont or New York State, who come to live here in towns and cities which they have visited for many years. They do not have the same privilege. We should be consistent in this regard.

Another reason I support the amendment of the hon. member for Matane is that the type of exception which is proposed in the law complicates the compiling of the electoral list. Can anyone imagine an enumerator going from door to door asking people whether they are Canadians and, if the answer is no, having to ask them whether they were eligible to vote as of June 25, 1968. The person being interviewed would have to remember whether he was here at that time, and whether the members of his family were here at that time, in order to determine whether or not they were eligible to vote on June 25, 1968. I suggest that such a provision in our law leads to much confusion and difficulty in respect of compiling a sound electoral list.

I should like to refer for a moment to some of the remarks made by some of the other participants in this discussion. The hon. member for Hillsborough discussed the problem as if it just meant that persons from the United Kingdom would have the right to vote in Canadian elections without having Canadian citizenship. I presume that was merely an oversight. It is in fact the case that people from all Commonwealth countries have this right, including I believe people from Ireland. I think such a provision was placed in the law at one time. The hon. member also referred to reciprocity. It is true that Canadians can vote in the United Kingdom under reciprocal arrangements, but this is not true in respect of all Commonwealth countries. I am led to believe, for example, that in India a Canadian cannot vote unless he is a citizen of India, although a citizen of India can vote in Canada with one year's residence.

Another thing I should like to point out is that very often the government of Canada has serious disagreements with the government of the United Kingdom and also the governments of other Commonwealth countries. For example, I might refer to the Suez crisis or the situation last year in which Britain, at the NATO conference, opposed our move to withdraw troops from Europe. There are other instances to which I could refer in which the government of this country has had a disagreement with the government of the United Kingdom or the governments of other countries in the Commonwealth. Therefore, I believe it is important that those people who have the right to vote are the people who have made a commitment to Canada by taking out Canadian citizenship.

I was also surprised by the remarks made by the hon. member for Skeena and the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre. As I recall it, these two members have always strongly opposed situations in which non-Canadians have a majority participation in Canadian companies. Time and time again, I have heard them speak against situations in which Canadian corporations were controlled by persons who are not Canadian citizens. They continuously put forward the proposal that at least 51 per cent ownership should be by Canadian citizens. Yet, in this debate they are proposing that we continue a situation for a while whereby we give the vote, which in my opinion is more important, to some people who have not given the commitment to become Canadian citizens. I am wondering how they resolve that inconsistency in their thinking. Where is the logic in that particular course of action? The hon. member for Brandon-Souris has said we should accentuate the positive. I agree with him. In my view, the positive approach is to support Canadian citizenship. Canadian citizenship should be the governing rule for voting in this country. When a person takes out that citizenship, he makes a commitment to this country before any other country. This is his primary interest.

• (5:20 p.m.)

Mr. Dinsdale: Would the hon. member permit a question? How does he reconcile his narrow definition of nationalism and citizenship with his espousal of world federalism?

Mr. Allmand: I would much sooner have a world government, but until we have it I do not want people who are not citizens voting in my country and determining what the policy of my country should be.

[Mr. Allmand.]

Mr. Benjamin: This is hardly a good example.

Mr. Allmand: I wonder if the hon. member would take the same position with respect to foreign ownership. It has been said, perhaps by him and the hon. member for Skeena, that because these people have acquired rights we should recognize them. Would he take the same position with respect to non-Canadians owning Canadian companies and running Canadian unions? I doubt that he would. I wonder where he finds the arguments to support the position which he is now taking in the House? As I said, I will support in the first instance the amendment of the hon. member for Matane, because I think it is the most logical one. It brings consistency to our Elections Act. But if it is defeated, I would support the amendment of the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra which is I think a great improvement over the text we have at present.

Mr. Benjamin: As you will recall, Mr. Chairman, last night I also threw an amendment into this hopper on the assumption that if the bill were to continue to contain the principle which it has now this would be retroactive legislation which would not be proper in our electoral law or any other kind of law for that matter. I will not repeat my remarks of last night and I hope hon. members will read them for whatever they might be worth.

May I say that the remarks of the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce are hardly relevant to an election law since corporations do not vote. They might try to buy elections with large contributions to one or more political parties, but they do not cast ballots. So, it is hardly relevant what one's position might be on foreign ownership as compared to one's position on immigrants or Canadian citizens being eligible to vote in a federal election.

Mr. Allmand: Would the hon. member permit a question? Do I understand the hon. member correctly? Did he state that it is all right for non-citizens to vote in Canadian elections but it is not all right for them to own parts of Canadian industry or Canadian corporations?

Mr. Benjamin: I do not know what that has to do with it. What I am trying to say is that the principle I prefer is the one stated earlier by the hon. member for Skeena. Why do we worry about whether or not these people are

from the British Commonwealth or from France? Why cannot any landed immigrant, once he is resident in Canada for 12 months, cast his ballot? If he has not taken out his citizenship within the five-year period, he would lose his franchise? It seems to me to be going the whole route of eligibility to vote in a federal election. My own personal preference is for the concept of the hon. member for Skeena. I also have sympathy for the concept espoused by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra. If the principle put forward by the hon. member for Skeena is not accepted and the principle contained in the bill is left as it is, I will want to move my amendment at the appropriate time to ensure that the legislation is not retroactive in its effect but the restrictions therein would not take effect until the proclamation of this bill.

I cannot support the amendment of the hon. member for Matane because it is even more restrictive than the retroactive principle contained in the bill. I hope the committee will accept the suggestion of the hon. member for Skeena, unless by some miracle we are able to come up with something with which most, if not all, would agree.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ouellet: Mr. Chairman, at first I would like to say that I am in favour of deleting clause 14 (3) and this for four reasons. Firstly, I regard it as discriminatory. Secondly, I regard it as negative. Thirdly, in a certain sense I regard it as too generous. Fourthly, I regard it quite simply as impossible to apply and quite embarrassing.

I think Parliament should pass fairer acts which would assure equality to everyone. However it seems to me that subclause (3) is really discriminatory and favours one group over the others.

I suggest that subclause (3) smells of discrimination. Such preferential treatment is to be rejected and should not, most of all, be perpetuated by Parliament. It is all the more discriminatory since the standing committee which has looked into this matter was forced to compromise.

The simple fact that the committee has recommended to set a time limit to the exercise of that privilege is the very proof that there is discrimination and that more and more Canadians, and more and more members of Parliament especially, want to put an end to it.

Here is a second reason why the amendment should be turned down: it is completely negative. Indeed, it does not encourage, by any means, the people affected by those clauses to become Canadian citizens.

Is it necessary to remind the House, Mr. Chairman, that there are in the neighborhood of one million and a half British subjects in Canada?

Many of them have been living here for several years. It may be because our laws allowed them to live here as privileged citizens that they did not take the trouble to become Canadian citizens.

In my opinion, we are doing all of us a disservice by perpetuating such a situation under to subclause (3) of clause 14. On the contrary, I think it should be kept in mind that a legislation on citizenship will very shortly be introduced in Parliament, and that it will most likely tend to reduce many of the privileges granted to certain groups of immigrants.

I will now refer to the remarks made yesterday by my colleague for Skeena (Mr. Howard), who said that we do, and I quote:

> —discriminate against the male sex in favour of the female sex. Normally a person must wait five years before applying for Canadian citizenship, but if a woman who has emigrated to Canada marries a Canadian citizen, she has only to wait one year before she can apply for Canadian citizenship.

It is obvious that when the government introduces its citizenship bill, it will try to eliminate those anomalies. To me there is no excuse for waiting several months pending the introduction of the citizenship bill, before correcting the situation.

Coming back to the remarks of the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard), I would say, contrary to what he claimed, that we should use the handicaps afflicting some immigrants more than others in Canada as an incentive for taking every opportunity to make everybody equal before the law.

I consider that this clause is negative and that it should be deleted. I also think it is too generous. Several times, members have pointed out that a British subject settled in Canada, who would go to another Commonwealth country to live, could avail himself of his right to vote in that country.

First of all, there is a correction to be made. True, this right exists in certain Commonwealth countries, but it has been revoked in others.

I have been using the word "right" for the past few minutes and I am just wondering

whether we are not exaggerating when we speak of vested rights for the benefit of British subjects.

Rather, I think that it is not a question of right but a privilege granted to British subjects, allowing them to vote in Canada, and that if the Parliament of Canada were to revoke this privilege, it would not be a violation of an individual's right, but nothing more than the Canadian government wanting to introduce a legislation better adapted to the Canadian reality and the requirements of a specifically Canadian citizenship.

One of my colleagues mentioned besides that the voting right or privilege had been withdrawn in some countries, in India for instance. There are also other Commonwealth countries, I think, who deprived British subjects of voting privileges.

In any event, I wish to indicate to my colleagues that despite the existence of a reciprocal right in some countries, those are the facts: Canadian immigration in those Commonwealth countries is much lower than that of citizens of Great Britain or other countries in Canada.

• (5:30 p.m.)

That, of course, works against us, Canadians, but it works in favour of the immigrants from those countries.

Fourth, I should like to say that subclause (3) seems very difficult to apply and extremely ackward. In fact, at the time of general elections, there will be two kinds of British subjects, namely: those who have qualified as voters before June 25, 1968, and those who arrived in Canada after that date.

Now, it may happen that in the same family, the father, the mother and two children are allowed to vote, because they have qualified as voters before June 25, while some other children in the family might not be allowed to do so, because on June 25, 1968 they had not yet qualified as voters.

So, you see what difficulties the enumerators will encounter when visiting certain homes to set up the voters list.

To my mind, instead of trying to pass a watered down act, as suggested by the member for Vancouver-Quadra (Mr. Deachman), we must settle the question once and for all and have the courage to say: We recognize in the right to vote as sacred and priceless right to which only Canadians are entitled in this country.

[Mr. Ouellet.]

I will be extremely disappointed if the proposal put forward by my colleague for Matane (Mr. De Bané) is defeated. It is up to us to make decisions on bills. It is not up to us to take the necessary steps to facilitate the application of this type of legislation to a special group, and to spare certain feelings.

I feel the proposal of the member for Vancouver-Quadra applies to all immigrants, whether British subjects or not, since, after five years, an immigrant can apply for Canadian citizenship and I am under the impression that it is running with the hare and hunting with the hounds rather than settling the matter once and for all, as the hon. member for Matane has suggested.

In concluding, Mr. Chairman, I will allow myself a short reference to the remarks by the hon. member for Brandon Souris (Mr. Dinsdale), who made an undoubtedly generous and very worthy suggestion. I do not believe that granting the right to vote to the French people living in Canada would be a way of solving the problem. We should try in Canada to legislate for Canadians. We may have pleasant memories and an infinite gratitude for those we usually call "the people from our two mother countries" but I believe the deepest and growing yearnings of most Canadians are the following: We want to live in a really distinctive country, in a country having no ties with other countries, whatever the origin of its citizens. Let's legislate for the good of the Canadian people.

[*English*]

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, it is going to be an interesting process stating one's preferences over several amendments with which we are not formally seized. I think this debate has gone into some pretty fundamental fields. I do not get the feeling that we are actually discussing colonialism, as the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce seemed to suggest. That is not in my mind at the moment, nor do I think there is anyone here, as we grapple with this very difficult problem, who holds any belief other than that Canadian citizenship is a proud and cherished right. But we are dealing with a problem that was not of our making, but one which, as legislators in 1970, we have inherited.

As hon. members know it was a long, long time in this country before we had any such creature as a Canadian citizen. Indeed, the country was 70 years of age before we had a Citizenship Act. While it is all right to say that when people come to a jurisdiction they

should accept the legislation of that jurisdiction, there is nevertheless some sort of obligation, and surely we don't scorn moral obligations as being trifling, to a group of people who came here on the clear understanding that in reference to the right to vote they were in a particular category. I think when we reach a stage where we come to the conclusion that this right, once extended, even though perhaps inappropriately extended, the least we can do is provide for some transition period. Surely in equity, in fairness, this is something that would commend itself. To that extent, I would be reluctant to support the suggestion of the hon. member for Matane, who proposed the first amendment. I think the drastic removal of rights which have been given and accepted in good faith would not be an appropriate course of action.

• (5:40 p.m.)

I am not at all reluctant to accept the idea that we should move toward Canadian citizenship as being the criteria, and I think at another time we should look at our Citizenship Act. As it stands now, people have to wait too long before becoming eligible for citizenship. We have been too careless and casual in advancing the virtues of full citizenship.

There are thousands of Canadian citizens who never thought that the formality of moving from the status of British subject resident in Canada to that of Canadian citizen had not, ipso facto, been taken through the exercise of the franchise given them. So we have to move with an eye to equitable treatment of people who were given that right. As I see it, it has nothing to do with superiority or discrimination or anything of that kind. It just happens that, in the wisdom of our forefathers, rights were vested and now we have to divest, to rearrange, to alter. Let us achieve this in a manner somewhat less drastic and perhaps a little more considerate than is suggested in this amendment.

This is not at all incompatible with the suggestion made by the hon. member for Brandon-Souris. My plea is for one last effort, not at restricting the Commonwealth reciprocation in this deal, but at trying to expand it. I do not think the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce was listening. I specifically said I was not referring to the United Kingdom, but I did mention some countries which extend this reciprocation to us and some which do not. I expressed the hope that we might try to broaden that base.

As to the merits of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra and the document presented by the minister, I think perhaps in the long run the aim is not dissimilar. Perhaps I should be asking forgiveness for defending the government point of view over that of a member, but I think perhaps the bill that we have before us is a little more positive. You do not hang up an administrative Damocles sword and say "In five years you had better be a citizen or else." Instead you say, as the bill has it, "These rights have been accepted and satisfied up to a certain point; henceforth there is another category."

Mr. Deachman: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. Macquarrie: Delighted.

Mr. Deachman: Does he agree that it would be desirable to set up two classes of British subject, as would be done by the amendment proposed in the bill? Does he look forward to that as a good way of settling the question before the House, that there be two classes of British citizen in Canada, one with voting privileges and one without? This is what will happen if this measure is adopted.

Mr. Macquarrie: I suppose, under the hon. member's suggestion, those who did not follow his example and stayed in the country would be in a different class from those who did, so you would have two classes.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that we can arrive at some equitable and just solution. I think in this committee of the whole we are maintaining the atmosphere which prevailed in the standing committee, and that was very good. All of us are trying to broaden the franchise, to iron out any inequities and to give to as many people as possible the right to vote. We are not thinking of colonialism or discrimination. If I might be pardoned a personal note, my ancestors came to this part of the world in a prison boat, not very gently manned by the authorities of Westminster, so it is not with any sympathy for Westminster—

An hon. Member: For sheep stealing?

Mr. Macquarrie: No, it was not sheep stealing. It was something that happened at Culloden. If any hon. members from Quebec think unkindly of James Wolfe, perhaps they could check what my ancestors thought of that ruthless gentleman.

Mr. Cafik: I would like to make a few comments in respect of the amendment before the House, Mr. Chairman. I was very

impressed by the contribution made by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra. Although his amendment is not before us at the moment, I think it is a very useful suggestion.

I believe in the principle that a person should be a citizen in order to cast a vote in this country. None the less I am concerned, as are many members, with the thought of disenfranchising those who have grown accustomed to casting their ballot here. For that reason, I would be inclined to support the position taken by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra and if the amendment before the House is not passed, I shall certainly support the amendment to which I have referred.

I should, however, like to make one point. Clause 14 subclause (3) of the bill reads:

Every British subject other than a Canadian citizen—

I would prefer that the words "British subject" be struck out and be replaced by the word "person". I do not see any reason why we should sanctify, as it were, the term "British subject" in the act itself. The word "person" would achieve the same objective without having overtones of creating a preferential class of people in this country.

If the amendment before us now does not pass, I would urge everyone to support the amendment that the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra is waiting to move.

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Chairman, I shall try to be unusually brief. I was somewhat amused a few minutes ago to hear the hon. member for Hillsborough tell us about the wisdom of our fathers. As a university professor, he must know there are a lot of young Canadians who do not believe in the wisdom of their fathers but who want to revolutionize everything. There are a lot of older Canadian citizens as well who feel there must be changes if we want to establish, once and for all, the identity of this country called Canada.

That is one of the reasons I shall vote for the amendment of the member for Matane. In my estimation, the correct procedure is to decide right now that those who are Canadian citizens have the right to vote. In a few months we can amend the Citizenship Act to provide that somebody who has lived here for a year or two years can become a Canadian citizen. In that way everybody will have the right to vote. I think the majority of Canadians have made up their minds that it is high time we had something concrete to establish our Canadian identity.

[Mr. Cafik.]

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mongrain: I am not against all the amendments that have been proposed. There is a lot of value in them, but I think the right way to proceed is to decide now that Canadian citizens will have the right to vote and then to amend the Citizenship Act as soon as possible to lower the five-year period to 12 or 18 months. A good many hon. members spoke about discrimination. There is surely some kind of discrimination on the part of some Commonwealth countries. If I understand correctly, 26 countries belong to the Commonwealth but only eight grant this right to Canadians. Of those eight, only two are major countries, the others being very, very small countries. Moreover, among those eight countries, two will not give to Canadians the right to be a candidate. A Canadian may vote, but he may not be a candidate. I think that, indeed, constitutes some kind of discrimination and I think we should stop that once and for all.

• (5:50 p.m.)

I am sure that the majority of young Canadians—and when I speak of young Canadians I speak of those who are young at heart, I do not refer to age because some young Canadians are grey haired—are yearning for the Canadian identity to be established. This is one way of establishing it and this is one way of convincing immigrants who come here that Canadianism means something, that it is not a privilege reserved to a few but a right they will need to win by proving over a certain time that they are good Canadians. For those reasons, I support what the hon. member for Matane has moved.

I have been pleased to see this debate going forward smoothly without any racist or Jingoist overtones, such as one might witness in a debate of this kind. I will vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Matane. I respect the spirit of some of the other amendments which have been brought forward. I repeat, I think we ought to do it this way. We ought to give the right of the vote to Canadian citizens and, as early as possible, amend our Citizenship Act.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Chairman, I intend to say a few words on the amendment moved by the hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané). I was thrilled by the speeches made by the hon. member from Matane, the hon. member for Papineau (Mr. Ouellet) and the hon. member

for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (Mr. Allmand). It is with a sense of pride that I want to support the amendment moved by my colleague from Matane.

When a Canadian, proud to be one, reads clause 14 (1), he cannot but be satisfied.

In fact, it reads and I quote:

Every man and woman who
a) has attained the age of eighteen years, and
b) is a Canadian citizen,
is qualified as an elector.

The condition stated in the first paragraph is the age of 18 years.

In subclause (3) one reads:

Every British subject, other than a Canadian citizen who
a) was qualified as an elector—

I shall not repeat the eloquent words spoken by the hon. member for Papineau but I certainly echo them.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that in a democracy two basic conditions have to be satisfied for one to exercice his franchise. The first condition is to be 18 years of age and the second is to be a Canadian citizen. Once these two conditions are fulfilled, one can express one's opinion and take part in the election of the government of Canada.

In my view, the provisions relating to British subjects are remains of colonialism which deal a blow to our pride as Canadians and which help to increase misunderstanding and intolerance in Canada.

I believe that as members of Parliament, we have a duty to promote in every possible way the proud awareness of our country. We must delete in our laws, whenever the opportunity arises, the traces of a colonialism which has become long ago a thing of the past.

It is with pride and pleasure that I support the amendment introduced by the hon. member for Matane which has already received the support of other hon. members I hope it will be passed by the House, thus proving it is truly the House of Commons of Canada.

[*English*]

Mr. Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo): Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to take up much of the time of the committee. I see I have only two minutes left in which to speak. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate. I suppose, as a member of the group that were Canada's first citizens, a group that did not have the right to vote until 1960, I can say it is only correct that the right to vote should be given only to those who are Canadian citizens.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo): The hon. member for Cochrane and the hon. member for Matane have stated this position clearly. It is a great thing to be a Canadian and I believe that the intent of the amendment advanced by the hon. member for Matane is right. Surely, only those who become Canadian citizens or are Canadian citizens should have the right to vote. You know, we lived under an old system of colonialism. We were told, "You are Indian boys; be nice; run along back to your reserves, like good boys." That was an aspect of colonialism and we are at present discussing the vestiges of colonialism. Surely, we have grown out of that and can take our place in the world.

Mr. Nesbitt: Not by the way some are talking.

Mr. Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo): Surely, if we have grown up, we should say that the right to vote in this country ought to be limited to those who are Canadian citizens.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Chairman, I was about to call it 6 o'clock so as to be the first to take the floor when the debate resumes.

[*English*]

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, before we rise for the evening could I put on the record the business for the remainder of this week? Tomorrow, as indicated, will be the last allotted day for this period, and I draw the attention of hon. members to the motions that will be up for consideration during the course of the day. On Friday the order will be as follows: the first item will be Government Order No. 70, Bill C-187, respecting the Northern Inland Waters and the motion to concur in the Senate amendment. The second item will be Government Order 95, Bill C-212, the Northern omnibus bill. Third will be Government Order No. 100, Bill C-218, the amendment to the Aeronautics Act.

If we make progress on these bills during the course of Friday's sitting, the following will be the tentative order of business: Government Order No. 40, Bill C-158, the Nuclear Liability Bill and Government Order 75, Bill C-190, the National Energy Board Act Bill.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, before concluding his announcement, I wonder if the President of the Privy Council could give us some indication of the business for next week, with particular reference to the amendments to the Fisheries Act?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Yes, Mr. Speaker. The intention would be to call the Elections Act again on Monday and, basically, to stay on the Elections Act until we complete it. We cannot be definite as to the time of calling the Fisheries Act, but I would be prepared to call it during the course of the week. However, I think we should try to finish the Elections Act first.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a Message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate have passed the following bills to which the concurrence of this House is desired:

Bill S-23, An Act to postpone the expiration of certain provisions of An Act to amend the Canada Shipping Act.

Bill S-25, An Act respecting Hudson's Bay Company.

At six o'clock the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, June 18, 1970

The House met at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN SPEAKER'S GALLERY OF CERTAIN COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTARY REPRESENTATIVES AND SHRI M. S. BHARTI OF INDIA'S LOK SABHA

Mr. Speaker: I should like to draw the attention of hon. members to the presence in the Speaker's Gallery of a group of representatives from the Commonwealth parliaments of Malaysia, Singapore and Hong Kong. These parliamentarians are with us in Canada as guests of the Canadian branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association.

I should also like to mention the presence in the gallery of Shri M. S. Bharti, a distinguished and highly respected member of India's Lok Sabha.

I am sure that all hon. members would want me, on their behalf, to express the wish that the visit to Ottawa and to Canada of these very distinguished friendly parliamentarians will be pleasant, fruitful and rewarding.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF HON. JOHN VOLPE, UNITED STATES SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, may I call to the attention of hon. members the presence in the gallery of a most distinguished visitor from the United States, the former governor of the state of Massachusetts, now Secretary of Transportation in the United States cabinet, the Hon. John Volpe.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (2:10 p.m.)

PRESENCE IN SPEAKER'S GALLERY OF PREMIER SMALLWOOD AND NEWFOUNDLAND DELEGATION

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, while we are drawing your attention to distinguished visitors, may I draw attention to the presence in your gallery of a very distinguished delegation from our newest province, Newfoundland, headed by the Premier of that province.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I understand the hon. member for Crowfoot has an announcement to make about matters even more mundane.

SOFTBALL GAME BETWEEN MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT AND PROTECTIVE STAFF

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, I regret to inform you and the House that the ball game played last night between the Members of Parliament and the protective staff was won by the Members of Parliament. I say I regret to inform you of this, and in the circumstances I would urge you to consider granting these unsung heroes of the House a 6 per cent wage increase which would perhaps provide them with a greater incentive to do a better job in the ball game and also in protecting Members of Parliament.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

HOUSE OF COMMONS

MOTION TO EXTEND HOURS OF SITTING

Mr. Speaker: The Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Lang), for Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale), seconded by Mr. Jamieson, moves:

That upon the adoption of this motion, and continuing in effect until Friday, June 26, 1970—

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker:

—the ordinary hours of sitting and daily adjournment shall be—

Is the Leader of the Opposition rising on a point of order?

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order in regard to the putting of this motion today. I do not wish to indicate that we object to the motion passing if it can be

properly put on the understanding that it will be effective only until the 26th of this month. But I am raising a point of order because of the question of principle involved and the precedent that the putting of this motion today would establish.

The government is attempting to use what I might refer to quite properly as an opposition day for the purpose of transacting other government business. An opposition motion on an allotted day is defined to be a proceeding in the business of supply under Standing Order 58(2), which reads as follows:

> For the purposes of this order, the business of supply shall consist of motions to concur in interim supply, main estimates and supplementary or final estimates; motions to restore or reinstate any item in the estimates; motions to introduce or pass at all stages any bill or bills based thereon; and opposition motions that under this order may be considered on allotted days.

Standing Order 58(12) reads:

> On any day or days appointed for the consideration of any business under the provisions of this Standing Order, that order of business shall have precedence over all other government business in such sitting or sittings.

It follows, Sir, that the motion standing in the name of the President of the Privy Council is subservient to the opposition motion and the proceedings thereon under this rule. The opposition motion and the proceedings thereon are deemed to constitute part of the government's business of supply and to have precedence "over all other government business in such sitting." I raise this question, Sir, as a question of principle in order to avoid an unfortunate precedent being established at this time.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, with respect, I submit that violation of the business for this day so far as the opposition is concerned does not really take effect unless we spend unlimited time debating this motion. If we deal with it quickly, then the opposition day comes into effect the minute Orders of the Day are called. Perhaps this is a bit of hair-splitting, but it is not the first time that has been done in this place.

I rise to say that we do not object to the motion itself. We would certainly join in the objection of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) if debate on this motion goes on and we do not get to the business set down for today, but surely that will not happen.

There are two points I wish to make. First, if we get to the business set down for the day soon, as I trust we will, I wonder whether we are doing ourselves a favour by adding an hour to this day's sitting. I have in mind the fact that there could be about five recorded votes tonight. Although the Order Paper says they are to start at 9.45 p.m. I imagine that if the time of adjournment is changed to 11 o'clock, those votes will not commence until 10.45 p.m. That would mean we would be here until almost midnight taking those five votes. For that reason I believe it would be better to have this motion come into effect tomorrow, whenever it may be passed.

Second, if this additional time is to be added between now and a week from Friday we suggest to the government that there are some things that are not planned for these few days that might be worked in, such as action on the question of veterans matters on which we are all agreed, the tabling of the Canada Development Corporation Bill, and the disposing of Bill C-196. There are two or three such items that I suggest could be dealt with in the extra time. We hope that Parkinson's law will not apply and that the extra time will not be spent on matters that we would deal with anyway even if the hours of sitting were not extended. We are not opposed to the motion, but I share the spirit of what the Leader of the Opposition said, that it ought not to cut into the opposition's time for today.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, as for us, we do not object to the motion introduced by the President of the Privy Council but we would have liked to defer the study of Bill C-215 which, besides requiring a lot of the time of the House, will prevent the government from bringing forward legislation it wanted the House to pass before adjournment.

I also wish to point out it is the second time the President of the Privy Council chooses an opposition day to present such motions. In fact, it will be recalled that on last February 17, he made a similar proposal in order to deprive the Créditistes of an allotted day under Standing Orders. The present arrangements were arrived at after long negotiations, but we would not like the procedure to be maintained so that we would have to fight for our rights whenever we make opposition motions under Standing Orders.

[*English*]

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I think that the spirit of

moving the motion at this time was largely with the view that there would probably be limited discussion on it in view of the discussions which have already been held. I think it is perfectly correct under the rules that we entertain at this time a procedural motion before other matters are proceeded with. The point made by the Leader of the Opposition is one which probably deserves some further consideration in due course, but at this time I think the motion should be put so that we can proceed with the extended hours.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, this motion has been brought forward today, an opposition day, and I can only reiterate my fundamental objection to this being done today in light of the representations made by the Leader of the Opposition and other speakers. In my view it is not only contrary to the spirit but to the letter of Standing Order 58(12) which, if the matter requires any further elaboration, reads as follows:

On any day or days appointed for the consideration of any business under the provisions of this Standing Order—

This deals entirely with supply.

—that order of business shall have precedence over all other government business in such sitting or sittings.

• (2:20 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, this motion for accelerated sittings is nothing but government business. It is a government motion. It is not one from the opposition in any way. The Minister without Portfolio from Saskatoon-Humboldt may purse his lips in disapproval all he wants. This is strictly a government proposal. In light of the circumstances, I object to this being done on an opposition day near the end of the session.

The government can use what happens today as a precedent on some future occasion to bring in a similar motion dealing with House business, which may be controversial or otherwise and which will eat into the rights of the opposition. It is not a question of quantum. I dismiss with contempt any suggestion that if the Opposition wants time to discuss its business, this order provides for an additional hour for that to be done. That is a red herring, Mr. Speaker, because this need not apply in the future. It is a question of what type of business the government can bring forward on an opposition day. This is our day, if I may say so as a member of the opposition and as a member of the procedure committee. I recall all the great statements, the professions of good faith and so on, members speaking on behalf of the government when Standing Order 58 was brought in.

I have no objection to the extended sittings but I have a fundamental objection to the motion to extend the hours being brought forward today. Hon. members may have all sorts of arguments about the merit of extended sittings. I must say, however, that I object fundamentally to the government choosing this particular occasion to bring forward this motion. I say, finally, that it is quite contrary not only to the spirit but to the letter of Standing Order 58(12) to do so and therefore should not be allowed by Your Honour.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member for York South rising on the point of order?

Mr. Lewis: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest to hon. members that we really ought not to pursue the procedural aspect of the matter much longer. However, if the hon. member thinks he has a valid and valuable contribution to make, we will hear him.

Mr. David Lewis (York South): I hope it is both, Mr. Speaker. All I want to say is that there is no need to indulge in lengthy argument. If the President of the Privy Council would either assure the House or amend his motion so that it would not apply to today, the whole problem would disappear and we would not need to take any more time on this procedural argument.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I quite agree to that change. Therefore the motion would be effective as of tomorrow.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, with due respect, this is not my point.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I quite agree with the Leader of the Opposition. That is not his point and that is certainly not the way I understood his argument. His argument is based more on a question of principle and propriety and, as the hon. member for Edmonton West said, the matter of an hour's gain or an hour's loss is not necessarily the substance of the argument which has been proposed by the Leader of the Opposition in opposition to the motion.

Motion to Extend Hours of Sitting

I suggest, with respect, to hon. members who have raised this point of order that the arguments brought forth are arguments in opposition to the motion itself. It seems to me that the motion should be put and that hon. members have brought arguments against it to the effect that in their view the motion should not be put and they would like to vote against it.

Some hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members can say no, but that is my interpretation of the situation. Hon. members suggest that this motion is—

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): That is not the substance of it.

Mr. Speaker: —government business. Obviously it is not government business. We are on routine proceedings and, as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has quite rightly pointed out, we do not reach government business until orders of the day are called. These are routine proceedings and on routine proceedings this motion is quite in order. Hon. members may object to it. They may think that it is improper to bring it in at this time and that it may cause problems in future. That may very well be. However, so far as the Chair is concerned the motion is in order. It is submitted at the proper time and it therefore has to be put at this time.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council) moved:

That upon the adoption of this motion, and continuing in effect until Friday, June 26, 1970, the ordinary hours of sitting and daily adjournment shall be as follows:

Mondays	from 11.00 a.m. to 1.00 p.m. from 2.00 p.m. to 6.00 p.m. and from 8.00 p.m. to 11.00 p.m.
Tuesdays and Thursdays	from 2.00 p.m. to 6.00 p.m. and from 8.00 p.m. to 11.00 p.m.
Wednesdays	from 2.00 p.m. to 6.00 p.m. and from 8.00 p.m. to 10.00 p.m.
Fridays	from 11.00 a.m. to 1.00 p.m. and from 2.00 p.m. to 6.00 p.m.

That on Mondays, Government Orders shall be the first order of business taken up at 11.00 a.m. and that the daily Routine Proceedings be called at 2.00 p.m. on Mondays.

That the hour ordinarily provided for Private Members' Business on Friday shall be devoted to Government Business.

That proceedings on an adjournment motion, if any, on Mondays, Tuesdays or Thursdays under Standing Order 40(1) shall be deferred until 11.00 p.m.

That when it is provided in any Standing Order that the business under consideration shall be forthwith disposed of or concluded in any sitting, the hour of daily adjournment for that purpose shall be as stated in part one of this order.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the President of the Privy Council has said that the motion need not come into effect today and in view of the fact it will come into effect today unless it is amended, possibly the simplest way out of this would be to have the motion stand until tomorrow morning when it would pass in matter of seconds.

Mr. Stanfield: I want to make it very clear, Mr. Speaker, that I have no objection to the hours proposed by the minister. My objection was simply on a question of principle. If the motion was put on any other day I would have no objection to it being passed forthwith.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): On the point of order, the motion has been put and discussed at great length. Why not finish it today and agree that it shall apply as of tomorrow?

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to extending the hours. However, I think the question that has been raised should be resolved by the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization as to the proper method of handling such motions on an opposition day. With this particular motion no harm is being done because there is no objection to the motion. However, if we set a precedent that on an opposition day the government can call a very controversial motion which the House will want to debate, the government could very effectively prevent the opposition making use of a day which has been allocated to it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): In this instance, this is the last day to discuss supply. It is a very important day from the standpoint of the opposition. In the case of the motion now before the House, there is no desire to debate it extensively or even to debate it at all.

I suggest to Your Honour and to the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization that some thought should be given to this matter so that what we are doing today does not become a precedent. Otherwise, on an opposition day in the future the government can call a motion, debate that motion the entire day, even by putting up its own mem-

bers, and prevent the opposition utilizing a day that has been set aside to discuss a specific matter of importance to the opposition.

We agree to this motion going through, but I hope this will not be accepted as a precedent and that Your Honour and the committee will look into the matter. The object would be, of course, to make it impossible in future to prevent the opposition from utilizing the too few days set aside for the discussion of questions in which it is particularly interested.

• (2:30 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: The suggestion now made by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands follows a similar suggestion made by other hon. members. I am not sure that the members of the Committee on Procedure and Organization are altogether anxious to have another problem passed on to them; it seems to me that during the last few weeks we have from day to day passed on quite a number of our problems to them. But the suggestion is a valuable one and it might well be that the members of the committee, who are among the senior members of the House, would wish to consider the matter to which the Leader of the Opposition has also alluded.

This having been said, I must remind hon. members that the motion has been put, and I have therefore to ask whether it is the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MacInnis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, arising from the wording of the motion, since the terms of the motion would require the House to sit on a statutory holiday I should like to seek the guidance of the Chair on whether it is a proper motion or not.

Mr. Speaker: The motion does not apply to a statutory holiday. If the House does not sit on that day I am sure it would not be expected that the terms of the motion should apply. I would not think that the point is well taken.

Mr. MacInnis: Further to the point of order, Mr. Speaker, you say that the motion does not involve sitting on a statutory holiday. Why has the government included the only Wednesday left between now and June 26 as one of the sitting days?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that the motion was set down on June 11 but at the request of the opposition it was not moved earlier this week.

Mr. Bell: It was not delayed at our request.

Mr. Stanfield: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I happen to know that the house leader of my party suggested to the President of the Privy Council that the motion be put yesterday.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): As to that, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that the hon. gentleman is not the only member of the opposition and his is not the only opposition party.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

MEASURES TO CREATE EMPLOYMENT—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): I ask the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion under Standing Order 43 and base my reason for so doing on the following facts. During May, unemployment increased from 5.6 per cent to 6.2 per cent of the work force, seasonally adjusted, the culmination of a steady rise during the past six months and an increase of 127,000 during the past year. I might point out that the government has taken pains to assert on many occasions that the seasonally adjusted figure is the only one which gives a proper picture of the labour situation in the country.

What is particularly alarming is the government's refusal to introduce measures to lower costs and prices so that products can be sold more easily against foreign competition, both in Canada and abroad, and produce more jobs. Specifically the government has refused to: 1. Introduce tax incentives to (a) increase productivity, and (b) keep price increases within the government's 2½ per cent guideline. 2. Provide penalties for exceeding the 2½ per cent guideline. 3. Strongly indicate to the lending institutions that interest rates can and should be lowered well below today's levels. 4. The Prime Minister to hold a private meeting with the leaders of organized labour to persuade them of the urgent need for labour to play its part in keeping products competitive and thus able to produce jobs. 5. Announce a program to assist exporters to maintain their present level of sales in view of the handicap imposed by the floating exchange rate.

I therefore move under Standing Order 43:

That this important matter be referred to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration to consider and to report thereon to the House before June 26.

Gold Mining Industry

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether, as members, we should not raise objection to the hon. member taking the time of the House on an opposition day.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, the opposition is always glad to hear words of wisdom and words of truth, and they hope the government will react to them in a sensible manner.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members know that the motion can be put to the House only if there is unanimous consent. Is there such unanimity?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimous consent. The motion cannot be put.

[*Translation*]

INDUSTRY

GOLD MINES—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Oza Tétrault (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to move the adjournment of the House under Standing Order 43 in order to discuss immediately the measures to be taken to improve the situation of gold mines in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the study of the Gold Mining Assistance Act warrants an emergency debate in order to clarify the situation.

If they are to plan their activities, mining companies, miners and municipalities which depend on gold mining operations need to know fairly soon what position the government will adopt.

For this reason, the House should tackle this problem immediately, thus enabling hon. members to express their views to the government.

Mr. Speaker: I must point out to the hon. member that the motion which he has put to the House under Standing Order 43 should effectively have been moved under Standing Order 26. The hon. member has made a motion for the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a national and urgent matter, but such an adjournment must normally be moved under Standing Order 26.

[Mr. Hees.]

However, in order to avoid complications, I will simply ask hon. members if they agree that the motion should now be put.

Some hon. Members: No.

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimous consent, therefore the motion of the hon. member for Villeneuve cannot be put to the House.

[*English*]

CANADA SHIPPING ACT

AMENDMENT TO POSTPONE EXPIRATION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport) moved the first reading of Bill S-23 (from the Senate), to postpone the expiration of certain provisions of an Act to amend the Canada Shipping Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

HUDSON'S BAY COMPANY

ESTABLISHMENT AS CANADIAN CORPORATION

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs) moved the first reading of Bill S-25 (from the Senate), respecting Hudson's Bay Company.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—RATE OF UNEMPLOYMENT—OECD GROWTH RATE FORECAST—MEASURES TO INCREASE EMPLOYMENT

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to ask the Prime Minister, in view of the figures published by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics showing the seasonally adjusted rate of unemployment to be 6.2 per cent as of May 23, whether he considers that this rate of unemployment is essential to the fight against inflation or whether he proposes to announce measures to increase employment in Canada.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): The answer to the first question is no and the answer to the second is that we have already announced such measures.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, in view of the forecast by the OECD that the growth rate in Canada will be about 2½ per cent this year, which is well below the growth rate required to prevent the rate of unemployment increasing, does the Prime Minister intend to announce any new measures or is he content with the measures the government is following now as an ample method to cope with unemployment in this country?

Mr. Trudeau: No, Mr. Speaker. We are trying to improve on our methods.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, could the Prime Minister indicate to the House whether or not he or the Minister of Finance will make a statement in the House within a day or two, following these very alarming figures in association with the OECD forecast which indicate a very cruel rate of unemployment in this country? Is the Prime Minister prepared himself or through a responsible minister to indicate to the House precisely what the government proposes to do about this very high rate of unemployment?

Mr. Trudeau: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition wants the minister to participate in any kind of debate on this question the minister has assured me that he would be prepared to do so later in the day if the opposition in its use of this day wants to raise the subject.

An hon Member: We will.

Mr. Trudeau: If the House prefers a short answer to this question I am prepared to try to deal with it now.

ENERGY

UNITED STATES POSITION RESPECTING CONTINENTAL POLICY—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON CANADIAN POLICY

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. About two weeks ago the minister undertook to ascertain from the government of the United States whether the statements contained in the letter from the White House signed by an aide to President Nixon represented government policy, particularly the sentence in the President's letter which reads:

> The national security of the United States requires the conclusion of a comprehensive agreement with Canada with respect to all energy matters and the imposition of some quantitative limitations on the entry of Canadian petroleum pending the conclusion of such a pact.

I want to ask the minister, now that he has had adequate time, whether or not he has ascertained from the government of the United States whether the sentence I have just quoted represents government policy and what response the minister has made to that?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, this statement was a letter from an aide in the White House to a group of 25 Senators who were objecting to the cut-back in Canadian oil imports. There are patent mistakes in the letter itself as it refers to an insecure supply in eastern Canada when almost 70 per cent of our supply in eastern Canada comes from Venezuela which in another context the United States has deemed to be a secure source of supply. So there is a patent conflict there. We have had no official advice concerning whether or not this represents anybody's view other than the particular aide who wrote the letter.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact the letter came from the President's office and indicates that the restriction being placed on the import of Canadian oil is being used as a lever, to use a polite word, on Canada to agree to an energy package policy, is the minister now telling us he has not made any inquiries of the United States government to ascertain whether or not that statement in the letter from the White House represents the policy of the government of the United States, and if he has not made any inquiry why has he not done so as he promised he would?

Mr. Greene: With regard to the particulars of the inquiry, I will refer that to my colleague the Secretary of State for External Affairs who deals in such matters. In respect of the question of leverage I might point out to my hon. friend that there was some provision made as recently as yesterday for a slackening of the quotas and for providing extra quotas. If this was meant to be leverage, then it is peculiar that the quotas were slackened as of yesterday.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement which the minister made both at Denver, Colorado, and more recently in Ottawa in respect of Canada's energy policy, would the minister undertake before the House recesses to make a statement on motions regarding Canada's energy policy in

order that we may see whether or not his actions support his change of opinion with respect to this policy matter?

Mr. Greene: Well, Mr. Speaker, Canada's energy policy is an extremely complex one which includes many statutes. Certainly a statement on motions could at best be a very cursory and inadequate review of Canada's energy policies, even though given by myself.

INCREASED U.S. OIL IMPORTS—EFFECT ON CANADIAN EXPORTS

Mr. P. M. Mahoney (Calgary South): Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources advise us to what extent the 100,000 barrels a day increase in crude oil imports indicated yesterday by the United States for the last half of 1970 will affect Canadian exports to that country?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, the available quantities under the 100,000 barrels that were announced will in my understanding be allocated by the oil appeal board to those areas where there is a critical situation existing in respect of refining. So it is difficult to say how much of it will be specifically allocated to Canada, but I am confident that hardship cases of our customers will be met so that some portion of that quota will come to Canada.

[*Translation*]

VIOLENT DEMONSTRATIONS

MONTREAL—PROTEST BY FRONT DE LIBÉRATION POPULAIRE—MEASURES TO PREVENT DISORDER

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) a question. Could he tell the House if steps have been taken to prevent disorder which might follow in the wake of the demonstration planned by the Front de libération populaire for July 1 next, in front of the Canada Manpower Centre Building, corner of Bleury and Dorchester Streets, in Montreal?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I was not aware of any plans for such a demonstration. I have not received a personal invitation, but I will ask the Solicitor General to keep me posted in this regard.

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

[*English*]

DRUGS

PARTICIPATION OF MEMBERS IN BRIEFING PRIOR TO TABLING OF LEDAIN COMMISSION REPORT—COURT CASE MORATORIUM

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of National Health and Welfare—I know he is dying to hear my question—in respect of the LeDain commission report. Is the LeDain commission still subject to the Trudeau veto or has the government now approved a confidential briefing period for the press from which Members of Parliament will be excluded and will this briefing take place tomorrow prior to the opening of the House at eleven o'clock?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am sure the hon. member will recognize that the question is not asked in terms which might make it acceptable to the Chair.

Mr. Woolliams: Well, Your Honour, I am sorry that we are all so supersensitive, but there has been some veto. The question is very clear. Will there be a briefing of the press tomorrow, prior to the sitting at eleven o'clock, from which members of Parliament will be excluded?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the LeDain report will be tabled tomorrow. After the question period I intend to discuss with the House leaders of the opposition parties the arrangements for the briefing and the proposals we have in that regard. We shall discuss how best in our view the opposition spokesmen can be included in that briefing, if that is a satisfactory arrangement.

Mr. Woolliams: Do I gather from the minister's answer that when he discusses this with the House Leaders of the various parties he will discuss the right of Members of Parliament to be at the briefing concerning which he had a notice on the board today?

Mr. Munro: That subject matter no doubt will come up in the discussion, Mr. Speaker. I do feel, however, that it could be the type of briefing that is a lock-in situation and that all the parties could be amply represented so that they may be in a position to respond to the report. That would probably accomplish both purposes in terms of having the press briefed and still having the rights of members protected.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, just to be clear on that, will Members of Parliament, if there is a briefing session held, be invited on the same terms and conditions that pertained in respect of the tax white paper when Members of Parliament were briefed?

Mr. Munro: Mr. Speaker, I have already indicated that that is a matter which will be included in the discussion I will be having with the House Leaders. I shall make a decision after that discussion takes place.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask one further supplementary and direct it to the Minister of Justice. In light of the confusion, would the government consider placing a moratorium on all pending charges and trials at all court levels so that young people involved with what are characterized as soft drugs will not be punished by laws that may be changed or incarcerated in prisons while awaiting trial?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. member would like to put that question to me tomorrow.

Mr. Woolliams: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the minister's reply.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I just wondered whether the hon. member might prefer to put that question to me tomorrow.

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister of National Health and Welfare bring the House up to date concerning what caused the complete right-about-face between his speech last night and his remarks in the House today?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): My question is pretty close to the one asked by the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings, but not quite.

An hon. Member: We know who did it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Chair did not recognize the question as an acceptable one. The hon. member might have a supplementary to the previous questions.

Mr. Nowlan: My question is supplementary to the previous line of questioning on this subject. Was the minister on pot or full of gas when he made his speech in Hamilton last night?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Munro: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege regarding the allegations of some hon. members opposite concerning what I said last night. I never made the statement that I am alleged to have made about the report not being tabled until well into the summer.

An hon. Member: We heard it.

Mr. Munro: The source of the statement was a local radio station. They checked their tapes and agreed there was an inaccuracy.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: That is absolutely wrong.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Hees: On a point of order—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have to bring to the attention of hon. members that we will soon be running out of time. The hon. member may have a point of order but I suggest to hon. members that we should then go on to another subject.

Mr. Hees: This will be very brief, Mr. Speaker. I ask the minister: should we believe what we heard over CBC radio this morning or what he said just now?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

An hon. Member: It was on the eight o'clock news this morning.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Hees: Yes, I heard it on the eight o'clock CBC news.

An hon. Member: Everybody else was listening.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Fairweather: This is incredible.

Mr. Greene: You were not quite awake, George.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Chair has recognized the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

An hon. Member: What a minister, what a cabinet!

An hon. Member: You are lying.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Nowlan: On the minister's question of privilege—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Chair has recognized the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. I have to rule that there is no question of privilege. This is a debate on what was said and what was not said. It cannot be raised as a question of privilege.

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am not sure whether the minister was referring to me, but I did ask him a question about his speech last night. Let us be quiet and get this clarified for the record. The minister stood in his place and said he did not say what I heard him say with my own ears in his own voice. I would like to clarify this question of privilege. Is the minister prepared to stand in the House today and deny that there was a recording of his voice saying among other things that the LeDain report would be tabled or made public some time this summer? Does he deny that I heard that?

Mr. Munro: Yes, I deny that.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

An hon. Member: You are not telling the truth.

Mr. Fairweather: Whose voice was it?

Mr. Munro: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. The tape was checked—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The minister has stated his point. He rose on a question of privilege. Other hon. members spoke on the previous point of order and on the question of privilege. I would think that nothing will be gained by pursuing this further and using the full 40 minutes for raising points of order and questions of privilege on the same point. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

Mr. Fairweather: We are dealing with a man who cannot tell the truth.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): The truth has to come out.

CANADA PENSION PLAN

PAYMENT OF BENEFITS TO SURVIVORS OF DECEASED CONTRIBUTORS LACKING SOCIAL INSURANCE NUMBERS

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare which, I wish to assure you, Mr. Speaker, is on another subject. On May 25 I asked him a question concerning a number of survivors who were unable to collect their benefits under the Canada Pension Plan because the deceased contributors, in most cases self employed persons, had failed to obtain a social insurance number. The minister assured me the matter would be looked into, and he was hopeful it would be corrected. I wonder if he can now indicate that this has been done?

[Mr. Speaker.]

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Yes, Mr. Speaker, it has been done.

[*Translation*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF MINISTER OF EDUCATION AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS OF GABON

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of the House the presence in the galleries of Mr. Okinda, Gabon's Minister of Education and Cultural Affairs.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

PROPOSED RECOGNITION OF COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Can the minister, now that we are reaching the end of the session, give us a report on how the negotiations are going with the People's Republic of China with a view to exchanging diplomatic missions?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): So far as I know they are continuing. We are waiting for the Chinese representative to make another appointment with our ambassador in Stockholm. We expect that the appointment will be made in due course. I am afraid there is very little I can do about it. As I have said on many occasions, the Chinese are very patient and I think we have to be the same way.

Mr. Nesbitt: The mysterious East, Mr. Speaker. I wish to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether the exchange that he has indicated is likely to take place soon indicates that Canada will be withdrawing recognition from Taiwan?

Mr. Sharp: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have made it quite clear on a number of occasions that we have a one-China policy now, and we will have a one-China policy in the future.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): You used to have a two-China policy.

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Does this mean that Canada will be asking the Taiwan ambassador to withdraw from Canada, and has he been informed of this clearly?

Mr. Sharp: Since we have a one-China policy we will recognize one government of China and we will not recognize two. I think that the ambassador from Taiwan, if we are successful in the negotiations, will recognize the facts.

[*Translation*]

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

QUEBEC—REQUEST FOR FEDERAL AID IN REBUILDING OF GASPÉ HIGHWAY

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Public Works.

As Forillon park is located at the tip of the Gaspé peninsula, will the government share in the cost of restoring the Gaspé belt highway? Its present state does not allow full development of tourist resources and involves some risks as to traffic safety.

Has the federal government been asked for assistance by the Quebec government to finance restoration of this highway?

[*English*]

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, because of the agreements that have already been undertaken, I think that this is a question that might more properly be directed to my colleague, the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Abitibi on a supplementary question.

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my supplementary question to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion this time and ask him whether the Quebec government has asked the federal government to meet part of the cost restoring a belt highway in the Gaspé peninsula following the development of Forillon park.

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, negotiations are still under way. In fact, we are entering new negotiations under the FRED program for the Lower St. Lawrence area. That matter will undoubtedly be brought up during the negotiations, but neither a decision nor a formal request has been made.

[*English*]

COMMUNICATIONS

TELESAT CANADA—BIDS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF SATELLITE

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Communications. Can the minister inform the House as to the status of the bidding between the American Hughes Aerospace Company and the RCA Corporation of Canada for the building of the communications satellite for Telesat Canada, and if any decision has been reached on this serious problem?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): There have been two bids, Mr. Speaker. There has been no decision.

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Prime Minister. It is in connection with the problems faced by the Minister of National Health and Welfare and the Secretary of State. Would he kindly inform the House whether there was any brainwashing during the noon-hour cabinet meeting?

Mr. MacInnis: There couldn't be. There are no brains.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—POSITION OF PROVINCES ON SIX PER CENT WAGE INCREASE GUIDELINE

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, it is not only the weather that is hot and muggy. May I ask a question of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. In view of the fact that several days ago the Prime Minister of the province of Quebec rejected the 6 per cent guideline for wage increases, and in view of the fact that the Premier of Ontario was reported yesterday in one of the Toronto evening papers as rejecting it as unworkable without price controls, would the minister inform the House whether the government or the Prices and Incomes Commission are

reconsidering their policy and are considering other approaches to the problem of fighting inflation?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, rather than base our policies on news reports, I discussed this matter with the Chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission yesterday who, following the meeting of finance ministers in Winnipeg the previous week, is still awaiting reactions from a number of provinces as to their support for the guideline policy, which we hope will be forthcoming, and at that time we will have a further statement to make.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, from the minister's answer I gather that information which I think was given on the floor of the House to the effect, that the provincial finance ministers had agreed to the 6 per cent guideline was wrong, and that information is still expected from the various provinces. Will the minister undertake to make a statement to the House when the information is received?

Mr. Basford: Well, Mr. Speaker, at the finance ministers' meeting, as the communiqué indicates, there was a very wide measure of support expressed by the provincial ministers for the policy. But a number of them, quite properly, had to report to their Prime Ministers and their cabinets, and we are still awaiting reactions from some of the provinces.

[*Later:*]

INFLATION—SIX PER CENT WAGE INCREASE GUIDELINE—PROPOSED COMPULSORY LABOUR COURTS

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs whether he or any other member of the government has been in communication with the government of Saskatchewan about that province's proposal for compulsory labour courts to enforce the 6 per cent guideline?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): I have not, but whether there has been communication with the Prices and Incomes Commission or with the Department of Finance I do not know. I will inquire.

[Mr. Lewis.]

DRUGS

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON STEPS TO CONTROL PRICES

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, I also have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. In view of the urgency of the problem, particularly with reference to the continuing high cost of drugs for old age pensioners, would the minister make a statement on motions before Parliament adjourns for the summer outlining the steps he is taking to deal with this problem?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I made a speech last Wednesday, and I am disappointed the hon. member has not read it, in which I indicated what we are doing.

Mr. Dinsdale: A supplementary question. Before the summer recess would the minister report to the House on the results of his meeting with the provincial ministers?

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that the official opposition critic on consumer affairs does not realize the meeting was with provincial officials.

CANADA ASSISTANCE PLAN

REFUSAL OF CASH BENEFITS BY BRITISH COLUMBIA MINISTER

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. As I now have evidence that British Columbia's welfare minister Gaglardi has issued a directive to welfare officers to issue food vouchers only, for a two week period, to those involved in labour disputes, and as the federal minister has declared this action to be contrary to the provisions of the Canada Assistance Plan, will he now take action to enforce the law and assure that those entitled to its benefits will receive them?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the recipients of notices of the nature that the hon. member has just described are in the process of being interviewed. If what the hon. member says turns out to be the case, I will have to take up the matter again with the provincial minister of welfare to ascertain whether he has breached the provisions of the Canada Assistance Plan, and thereby not enti-

tled to federal sharing. However, there is one major difficulty here, and I am sure the hon. member recognizes it. If the federal government should take action of this kind we could be impairing the health and welfare of a lot of other people in British Columbia who are now receiving payments. If we cut back our share they may also be denied help, and that would be unfortunate.

Mrs. MacInnis: A supplementary question. Has the minister set a deadline, and has the British Columbia minister been warned that federal funds will be cut off should he not meet that deadline?

Mr. Munro: No deadline has yet been set because I am not personally satisfied, from the investigation of the cases we have before us, that there has been real deprivation that would constitute a blatant breach of the Canada Assistance Plan provisions. Until I am satisfied of that, I do not think we are confronted with a problem of setting deadlines.

CORNWALL—REFUSAL OF BENEFITS TO WORKERS ON STRIKE

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. A couple of weeks ago I drew the minister's attention to a similar incident in Cornwall where those involved in a labour dispute were not only being denied welfare but even food vouchers, and I gave the minister a copy of a telegram I had received. I wonder whether he has had an opportunity to ascertain whether or not the situation has been corrected, and what action he is taking?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I did look into that matter. It was reported to the provincial agencies and I believe that situation has corrected itself. I would advise the leader of the NDP that I do not believe the welfare agencies in Ontario have adopted a practice similar to the one referred to by the previous speaker so far as B.C. is concerned.

PRIVILEGE

APOLOGIES TO MINISTER FOR COMMENTS CONCERNING TABLING OF LEDAIN COMMISSION REPORT

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I owe the Minister of National Health and Welfare an apology for comments I made from my seat. I have been buffaloed by the electronic highway. I thought I heard the minister say on the CBC this morning that the LeDain Commission report would not be tabled until the fall. I understand that the CBC has apologized to the minister, and I can do no less.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Oza Tétrault (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I have a question—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I apologize for having to interrupt the hon. member for Villeneuve, but another hon. member is asking to be recognized on a question of privilege.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings on a question of privilege.

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, in view of what the hon. member for Fundy-Royal has just said, I must say that I have not been informed by the CBC just exactly what the transcript reveals but naturally, if the transcript does not prove that the minister said what I said he said, I would certainly apologize to him. It was my firm conviction that he had, but if he did not say it—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

An hon. Member: You must not have heard it, George.

Mr. Hees: I heard it, but if he says he did not say it, I apologize.

Mr. Munro: I wish to thank—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

[*Translation*]

HOUSING

DECREASE IN STARTS—MEASURES TO PROMOTE CONSTRUCTION

Mr. Oza Tétrault (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the minister in charge of housing.

According to the figures released by the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, there has been a decrease of 40 per cent in the construction of dwellings during the first four months of 1970. Can the minister indi-

cate which steps he intends to take to correct that situation, particularly in the province of Quebec?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Villeneuve will recognize that his question has a rather broad range. It seems to me that a question of this kind normally requires a general statement, which can also be made on motions. I therefore suggest to the minister to indicate to the House whether he intends to make such a statement.

QUEBEC—STUDY OF LACK OF HOUSING

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

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Lotbinière wish to ask a supplementary question?

Mr. André Fortin: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

I should like to ask the Minister without Portfolio in charge of housing if his department is now studying problems caused by the housing shortage in Quebec, in co-operation with the Quebec government, and if so, will the House be informed about the findings of such studies?

[*English*]

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, the officials in CMHC are studying these matters at all times. I made reference to these questions in the special debate which took place in the House last week. Of course, there is collaboration and discussion between all provinces on these matters.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a supplementary question.

In view of the official figures given by the hon. member for Villeneuve, I should like to ask the minister in charge of housing if, account being taken of the concern he shares with civil servants about the housing situation in Quebec, special attention is given to this important problem?

[*English*]

Mr. Andras: Yes, Mr. Speaker, special attention is being given to it. I might say that in the province of Quebec, due to preoccupation with other matters during the month of May, the public housing funds allocated there were not used at the rate they ordinarily would have been. However, this situation has been remedied now and I think you will see considerable increase in the number of low income housing starts in that province.

SECOND PHASE OF EXPERIMENTAL HOUSING

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact the minister stated a short while ago that he would be making a statement on motions with regard to the second phase of the experimental housing fund of $200 million before the recess, is it the intention of the minister to make that statement on the second phase of experimental housing shortly?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I cannot remember committing myself to make a statement on motions, but if that is the case I would be prepared to do it before the House rises. However, there will be an announcement within the next few days with regard to the second phase of the $200 million.

GRAIN

ADOPTION OF PROTEIN STANDARD AMENDMENT TO CANADA GRAIN ACT PRIOR TO PASSING BILL C-196

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to take advantage of the harmonious atmosphere of the House to ask a constructive question of the Minister of Agriculture, who is not far away. I should like to ask, because the adjournment of this session is drawing close without any certainty that Bill C-196 will become law, whether the minister will consult with the other parties in the House with a view to securing unanimous approval for the introduction and immediate passage without debate of an interim bill to authorize the government to establish protein grading of wheat? I believe this is a very important matter.

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, as you know there are provisions in Bill C-196 to amend the statutory grades, but there are several other very essential amendments to the Canada Grains Act contained within Bill C-196. I would suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that the best thing he could do for the farmers of Canada would be to encourage his members to expedite passage of this bill.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

BARLEY—MEETING OF AUSTRALIAN PRICE TO JAPAN

Mr. George Muir (Lisgar): My supplementary question is for the Minister without Portfolio from Saskatoon-Humboldt. Could the minister inform the House if it is the intention of the Wheat Board to meet the Australian sale price on malting barley to Japan, in order that we can expect increased sales of that grade of barley to that country?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): I would have to inquire from the Wheat Board about their policy in this regard, Mr. Speaker. Their general policy, of course, is to be competitive and, as a result of this, very large movements of barley are in fact taking place.

WHEAT—METHOD OF ALLOCATING BOXCARS

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question also for the Minister without Portfolio from Saskatoon-Humboldt. Now that the railways are using potash cars for shipping grain which, in many instances elevators cannot use because the spouts are too low, thus creating disparity between competitive elevators, will the allocation of those cars be based on the number of cars or on bushel capacity so that a better balance can be created?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, the block system is certainly not operated blindly in terms of the total number of cars, but rather in terms of the total quantity of grain required to be moved. The objective of the block system at the moment is to try to move grain as equitably as possible from all delivery points.

Mr. Korchinski: A supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. As we have one or two minutes left I wonder whether we could not agree to give other members the opportunity to ask questions.

CRIMINAL CODE

ABORTION—REMOVAL OF PROVISIONS IN LIGHT OF CANADIAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION POSITION

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Justice. In light of the significant fact that the Canadian Medical Association has removed the ban on abortion from its code of ethics, will the minister now consider legislation for the removal of abortion from the Criminal Code?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): We are considering all factors as they arise from time to time, Mr. Speaker.

IMMIGRATION

REPRESENTATIONS BY ROYAL CANADIAN LEGION ON ADMISSION OF U.S. DRAFT DODGERS AND DESERTERS

Mr. P. V. Noble (Grey-Simcoe): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, Mr. Speaker, but in his absence I shall direct it to the Prime Minister. Has the Royal Canadian Legion made any representation to the government protesting the entry to Canada of 60,000 draft dodgers and deserters from the United States?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I remember the representation appearing in the newspaper, Mr. Speaker, but I have not had word from the minister that he intends to take action.

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON OPERATION OF REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT INCENTIVES ACT—NEWFOUNDLAND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion if, before the adjournment of Parliament, he will make a statement on the operation of the Regional Development Incentives Act which has now been in operation for one year, in view of the failure of the act in the two provinces that need it most, Saskatchewan and Newfoundland?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, every month, a report is tabled in this House on the subject and the hon. member may see what results are achieved.

Mr. Speaker, last Monday, the hon. member for St. John's East asked me whether I was aware of the existence of a $1 billion program established in Newfoundland. At that time, I answered that I did not know anything about

it but I can tell him now that I have been officially informed by the government of Newfoundland of the existence of such a program.

[*English*]

Mr. McGrath: May I ask the minister a supplementary question—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. May I suggest to the hon. member that we are trying to give the opportunity to a few more members to ask questions, although we have reached the end of the question period.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

TRAINING OF NURSES TO SERVE IN AREAS WITHOUT DOCTORS

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Since, in view of the great scarcity of general practitioners, nurses are being trained to take the place of doctors in areas that doctors have left, will the minister assure the House that no action will be taken before there has been full discussion with the National Nurses Association and the medical profession?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I think I can give the hon. member that assurance. I know that the matter has certainly been discussed with the Canadian Medical Association as part of the over-all discussions surrounding the health cost report. I am not sure about discussions with the National Nurses Association.

RESTRICTIONS ON USE OF DRUGS, TALWIN AND DARVON

Mr. W. C. Scott (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In view of the reports that the United States government is considering imposing restrictions on the use of the pain killers Talwin and Darvon, will the minister say whether his department is considering similar action for Canada?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I will not be able to answer that question today. I should like to take it as notice.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I raise the point now, in view of some of the things the minister said earlier, because I did not want to take up the time of the House during the question period. In view of the gratuitous apology of my colleague for Fundy-Royal with regard to certain alleged statements of the Minister of National Health and Welfare, and since I was also mistaken about something which I thought I had heard, may I also extend my humble apology to him. In order to clarify this remarkable chain of events and/or confusion that exists in my ears—

An hon. Member: In your head.

Mr. Nowlan: Not my head; my ears. I deliberately said my ears. That may have been one of the Prime Minister's canards; I do not know. In order to clarify this matter, and this is important, I hope the minister will speak to his colleague, the Secretary of State, who is to appear in the House tomorrow, and ask him to explain how so many hon. members who were listening to The World at Eight this morning heard a narration pertaining to a Hamilton meeting, with the insertion of a voice that was allegedly the minister's voice. I should like that clarified. Allegedly it was the minister's voice.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I apologize for raising this as a point of order but I directed a question to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion which required a simple yes or no answer. In keeping with the undertaking given at the time of the passage of the legislation one year ago, and in view of some apparent discrepancies in the operation of the act, will the minister make a statement on the operation of the Regional Development Incentives Act before Parliament adjourns for the summer recess?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That is not a point of order. The hon. member has asked a question. He is not alone in being frustrated. I notice a number of other hon. members who are also anxious to ask questions. If the hon. member is allowed to do so after the question period has been expired for quite a few minutes, then other hon. members will also raise other points of order and they will have to be allowed to put their questions. I appreciate the difficulty in which the hon. member is placed. If there is unanimous agreement to allow the hon. member to put his question and to allow the minister to answer, the Chair certainly has no objection.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Obviously, there is some difficulty. I suggest we should at this time allow the Leader of the Opposition to put his motion to the House.

Mr. Bell: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order with respect to today's debate. In view of the importance of today's debate and the invitation the Prime Minister gave to us today to bring up matters with respect to the economy, will the Prime Minister assure the House that the Minister of Finance, and other responsible ministers, will be in their places this afternoon to hear our speeches on this important day near the end of the present session?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance told me himself that if the opposition wishes to raise any particular matter which concerns him he will gladly engage in debate on the subject.

Mr. Bell: Mr. Speaker, may I say that the first two major speeches we shall be making concern the Minister of Finance. Could the Prime Minister take my remarks as notice?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I will pass on this information to the minister. I know his intention is to be in the House, if called for. He may not be able to hear every part of every speech which is made, but I am sure that the essence of the message that the opposition wants to convey to him will be conveyed to him—whatever essence there is.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

• (3:30 p.m.)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY S.O. 58—DISAPPROVAL OF CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES OF GOVERNMENT

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition) moved:

That this House express its disapproval of the administrative policies of the government by opposing items in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1971; and in particular Vote 1 of the Department of Agriculture, Vote 10, Communications and Post Office, Vote 5 of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Vote 1 of the Privy Council and Votes 1 and 5 of the Treasury Board.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I hope the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has sent a message directly to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson), because I know he would not wish to miss anything I say about the question of unemployment and related matters. The Prime Minister quipped a moment ago that the Minister of Finance would be happy to hear the essence of our message, if there is any essence. I hasten to assure him that, without doubt, there is a great deal of essence to the problem, which is important for this country and exceptionally serious for our people who have been caught in misfortunes created for them by the Government of Canada. The government does not appear to take these problems at all seriously.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: The most recent Dominion Bureau of Statistics figures on unemployment are most alarming.

Mr. Bell: The Prime Minister is leaving.

Mr. Stanfield: They show an unemployment rate of 6.2 per cent for May 23, as seasonally adjusted. Without seasonal adjustment, the rate for the month is 6.1 per cent, compared with 4.7 per cent for one year earlier. Seasonally adjusted, the rate for May is 6.2 per cent. The rate of unemployment is 6.2 per cent, representing 513,000 persons, as against 4.8 per cent in 1969. The seasonally adjusted rate of 6.2 per cent is the highest seasonally adjusted rate of unemployment this country has experienced since 1962.

Mr. Bell: Shame.

Mr. Stanfield: Employment between May 1969 and May 1970 increased by about 90,000 persons in the course of that year. Eighty-five thousand out of the 90,000 new jobs were created in the province of Ontario. In other words, in the rest of Canada the increased employment over-all was a mere 5,000 persons. The amount of employment on the Prairies was stationary as between 1969 and 1970. It was somewhat less in Quebec in May of this year than it was one year ago. It is up by some 5,000 in the Atlantic provinces, and in British Columbia it is up somewhat as well, although we must recognize in fairness that there have been some strikes in British Columbia which will affect the picture in that province.

It is important for us to look at the figures as a whole. It is significant, too, sir, that the amount of actual employment is down significantly in a number of important areas, in particular the area of manufacturing. There were 18,000 fewer persons employed in the

manufacturing industries in Canada in May, 1970 than in May, 1969. The main increase in employment took place in the area of community, business, and personal service, to a total of 158,000 persons. In other words, Mr. Speaker, in all areas other than the areas of services, the total employment in the country decreased during the year.

We have a seasonally adjusted unemployment rate of 6.2 per cent. Despite this figure which, without exaggeration, must be described as shocking we have here—unfortunately, they are not here for this debate—a very complacent government. I am not commenting on the absence of the Prime Minister because he may have some other commitment. However, during the course of the question period, the Prime Minister did not consider it necessary to give any assurance to those who are unemployed that the government intends to undertake proposals in order to relieve their present misery. Unemployment was put forward as a side effect of the fight against inflation. I ask the Acting Prime Minister and the members opposite whether they really believe it was necessary to create unemployment in order to fight inflation.

There are 109,000 persons between the ages of 14 and 19 who are unemployed. This was the figure a month before the high schools closed. There are 395,000 persons between the ages of 20 and 64 who are unemployed. There are 96,000 persons in this country who have been unemployed for seven months or more, well up from a year ago, and 98,000 persons who have been unemployed for a period of four to six months, also well up from a year ago. This gives some indication of the extent which the economy of Canada is running below its potential by deliberate design.

The Economic Council of Canada has estimated that the average economic growth rate in this country between 1967 and 1975 ought to be at the rate of 5½ per cent a year. Admittedly, this does not mean that it has to be exactly 5½ per cent each year. However, this is the average growth rate recommended by the Economic Council of Canada, not only as the potential which the country can reasonably achieve, but the target at which the country has to aim if it hopes to provide employment for the increasing number of people forecast to be coming into our work force each year during this period.

In March the Minister of Finance forecast that the growth rate this year would be between 3 and 3½ per cent. The OECD recently issued a statement predicting the growth rate in Canada in the current year will be a mere 2½ per cent. This is another example of the minister's competence or otherwise in the area of forecasting.

Mr. Benson: Who can be within one-half of one per cent?

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, does my hon. friend admit that he was wrong?

Mr. Benson: Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition will permit a question. Can he tell me any year in which any government of Canada has been accurate to within one-half of one per cent in forecasting?

Mr. Stanfield: The year is not over yet, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Benson: Answer the question.

Mr. Stanfield: I do not think I have seen a Minister of Finance make a prediction in March and, within a couple of months, have shown to be substantially off.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: I do not know what the result will be at the end of the year. We are simply comparing forecasts. The point is that the forecast made by the OECD shows how far below potential this government is deliberately operating the economy of this country. This unemployment was not created by accident. It is a result of policies deliberately adopted by the government. That is what I am talking about.

Yesterday, the officials of the Department of Finance gave some indication of the enormous cost to the country of the government operating far below its potential for even one year. That calculation was made on the minister's estimate of 3 or 3½ per cent. If we use the forecast of the OECD, the annual loss to this country, which can never be regained, as a result of operating far below the potential is almost incalculable. It is certainly much higher than the officials admit. In addition to this, there is all the suffering and damage being done to the individuals involved. If I am wrong, I hope the minister will deny that the seasonally adjusted rate of unemployment in Canada is now, and has been for some time, the highest of any developed country in the world.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Stanfield: There has been an increase in employment in the period April to May. No doubt much will be made of this. However,

the increase of employment in that period is far below the increase in the labour force in the period April to May. From the forecast made by the Economic Council of Canada, there is no doubt that the labour force in Canada will continue to grow at a rapid rate. We know that it will be much greater than at present. There is so much unemployment at present that many people are discouraged from trying to enter the labour force.

The rapid growth in the labour force in Canada is the reason for the forecast by the Economic Council of Canada of a growth rate of 5½ per cent per annum. When this is related to the 2½ per cent forecast in our rate of growth by the OECD, to put it as conservatively as possible, there is no reason to believe that the seasonally adjusted rate of unemployment will be reduced as the year proceeds unless the policies of the government are substantially changed. I ask Your Honour to bear in mind that the amount of unemployment we have today is the result of deliberate government policy. No doubt it will be said that the opposition should make some suggestions as to what might be done to increase the rate of employment in this country. I intend to make some suggestions and no doubt other hon. members will do the same.

The essential point to bear in mind is that the 6.2 per cent seasonally adjusted figure is a direct result of deliberate government policy, yet we have this extraordinary complacency exhibited by the government of Canada. To my knowledge, the ministry has announced only three changes of policy in recent weeks. First, there has been the floating of the dollar and the measures which the minister has adopted with a view to partially compensating for some of the effects of the floating dollar. I am referring to the reduction of the rediscount rate of the Bank of Canada and the increase that the minister announced in payments to be made to the provinces. These are all measures the minister took with a view to upsetting, partially at least, the effect the floating of the dollar might have in increasing unemployment in Canada. These are not measures taken with a view to offsetting the unemployment which had developed already as a result of other policies.

• (3:40 p.m.)

Second, the minister announced he was abandoning the restrictions on consumer credit he had proposed in his budget—of course, it was difficult to take this seriously at any time, anyway. Third, his colleague made some announcement with regard to student employment; it amounted to an assurance of employment for some thousands of students. But I do not think any member of the government would deny that these measures went very little distance toward offsetting the increased difficulties students find in obtaining employment in the face of an adjusted general unemployment rate of 6.2 per cent, a situation created by the government itself.

As I say, the minister and the government have not made any effective response to the striking rise in unemployment.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: The most the minister can possibly claim is that he has taken one or two measures which may partially offset the detrimental effects which the floating of the dollar might create. Anything the Minister of Finance has done or announced has been directed to that purpose. I make the charge, and I do not think the Minister of Finance can deny it, that it is the deliberate policy of the present government to run the economy very substantially below par. It is suggested that this is justified. Indeed, it is suggested sometimes that it is necessary in the fight against inflation, though I notice that the Prime Minister in reply to a question this afternoon was certainly not prepared to say that the amount of unemployment we have today is an essential part of the efforts to end inflation. He did say, however, that he was prepared to see unemployment go as high as 6 per cent per annum. We now have a rate of unemployment of more than 6 per cent, seasonally adjusted, and, of course, we all recall that it is the seasonally adjusted rate to which the Prime Minister has, in the past, attached particular significance.

So we are faced with what the Prime Minister says, and what the government does, as well as with the policy of the ministers who are carrying out the main design. I want to put this as plainly as possible. I think it is hard boiled. It is cruel. And what is it doing? I suggest it is not really working. The policy of deliberately running the economy well below its potential as an anti-inflationary measure has not worked recently in any other industrial country in the world. I will refer to a particular example—the construction industry in Toronto where I understand there is substantial unemployment despite the fact that there was recently a costly settlement of a wage dispute. In other words, there is no evidence that the policy of running the economy way below potential has had an anti-inflationary effect.

I say furthermore that the government has produced no evidence, nor have I seen any evidence, to suggest that a seasonally adjusted rate of unemployment of 6 per cent or more is necessary as part of an anti-inflationary fight. I say, too, that there has not been the slightest evidence produced by anyone, and by the government most of all, to indicate that an increase in employment to an acceptable figure would in fact create additional inflationary pressure.

There is no excessive demand in this country except in certain special areas such as housing. Nobody can claim that the economy is overheated. Indeed, it is practically turning cold. It is certainly running way below its potential and the forecasts as to the future are very depressing, based not only on the expectations published for businessmen but upon the forecasts made by the OECD.

Housing is an area in which the restraints imposed by the government have added to the inflationary pressures. The poor record of the government in housing in the first five months of the year, its failure to produce nearly enough houses, has imposed further upward pressures on rents and house prices. If more housing units had been built or were being built now, this would not only add to employment but it would become an important part of the anti-inflation fight because it would tend to prevent the escalation of rents and house prices which unfortunately are reflected in the demands put forward for increased wages and salaries. Here is an area in which government policy has not only added to unemployment but has added to the inflationary pressure. The construction of a larger number of housing units would not only provide more employment but decrease inflationary pressures arising from the housing shortage.

The government should remove the 11 per cent sales tax from housing. It should take positive measures to see that more funds are available for housing. I say, also, that with an unemployment rate of 6.2 per cent the government ought to loosen up the screws, because the policy of deliberately creating unemployment is not defeating inflation but only adding to the amount of misery in the country. I am not suggesting for a moment that we should give up the fight against inflation. I recognize that this has to be a long struggle. In some ways, this is an international phenomenon. We have to be both patient and determined. But the government will not necessarily help the country as a whole by doing serious damage to half a million Canadians. The fight against inflation has to be pursued not only with tenacity but with humanity. We have no excuse for the way in which we are treating old age pensioners. We have no excuse for the amount of unemployment which has been created. I think also, in passing, that the minister ought to meet with representatives of industry and labour, as labour has suggested. I believe it is the government's responsibility to act directly in this area and not to try to foist it off on the shoulders of some commission which has been set up.

I apologize to the minister. Because of a previous commitment I shall not be able to hear what he says in reply to me, if he does reply directly after I have spoken. I assure him I shall read what he has to say with great care. The Prime Minister has told us that the fight against inflation is Canada's first priority. I say that when the unemployment rate, seasonally adjusted, reaches 6.2 per cent, it becomes a matter of the first priority and something must be done about it.

• (3:50 p.m.)

I say to the minister again there is no evidence that a reduction in this figure would add to inflationary pressure. There is every evidence, certainly in certain areas such as housing, that further employment would reduce the inflationary pressure. I say to the minister and to the government that, without abandoning the high priority of the fight against inflation, the first priority of the minister and the government today is to reduce the rate of unemployment in this country. That, I suggest, has become the first priority. I say in all sincerity that that need not involve in any way an abandonment of the fight against inflation. If the government is to get the people of Canada behind it in the fight against inflation, it must not only convince them that its measures are fair as between labour and business as well as others, and that its package is fair, but it must also convince the people of Canada that its methods are humane. The government must convince the people of Canada that the fight is worth maintaining.

In order to maintain the will of the people of Canada to fight inflation, the government must modify its policies and must bring down the rate of unemployment in this country to a level that the people of the country are prepared to accept. I am not really suggesting that any level of unemployment is acceptable,

but I say to the minister that if this rate is maintained it will be very difficult to maintain the will of the people of Canada to fight inflation. If the minister is to conduct an effective battle against inflation, then he better move to do something about unemployment.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly apparent to any casual observer that the government's anti-inflation policy is a shambles. Not since the famous retreat from Moscow have we witnessed anything like the present government led by a little Napoleon beating a retreat, heading his decimated forces across the frozen wilderness littered with the shattered hopes and abandoned policies of a bankrupt government. Here is a government which started out to fight inflation by creating unemployment and by deliberately provoking an economic slack in the economy. Now, the government finds that all the economic restraints it proposed to impose have been ignored by everybody except itself in respect of its own employees. I shall come to that in a moment. The provincial governments have indicated they do not intend to impose any 6 per cent wage and salary ceiling. Both the premiers of Quebec and Ontario have made this abundantly clear.

It certainly is evident from looking at the prices of goods in the stores, and the profits of corporations and financial institutions in this country, that they have paid no attention to the government's restraints. The only person who is trying to impose the economic guidelines which the government has asked be accepted voluntarily is the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury). He stands like the little Dutch boy with his finger in the hole in the dike while the whole ocean comes billowing over the top of the dike. Can there be anything more ludicrous than a government which has completely failed to secure support for any of its economic guidelines seeking to impose those guidelines solely on its own employees? The provinces do not intend to impose the 6 per cent guideline. The government itself has not even attempted to impose it on the workers who come under federal labour jurisdiction. But the government is saying to its own employees in the Post Office, in the civil service and in various Crown corporations, that they will be limited to an increase of 6 per cent.

With great fanfare, a short time ago the government gave the civil servants the right to collective bargaining. How much free collective bargaining is there when the government sits down at the bargaining table and says, you can freely bargain all you like but we will not give more than 6 per cent. At the same time the government is not prepared to give its employees any assurance that their cost of living will not go up, that interest rates will not go up, that rents will not go up, that profits of corporations will not go up, that executive salaries will not go up and that other groups in the community will not get a much larger share of the national income. The government is seeking to make guinea pigs of its own employees and made a mockery of all its professions of giving to its own employees free collective bargaining.

• (4:00 p.m.)

I think the workers of this country are perfectly entitled to ask the question: why is one form of income selected for restraint when no effective means whatsoever are being applied to other forms of income? Prices continue to rise—rents most of all—and profits continue to go up. They have been quoted many times. Hon. members have already seen the financial statements of the seven chartered banks which for the first six months of this year show an increase in their profits of 27.7 per cent over the profits they made last year. And last year was not a poor year—their profits were up 26.5 per cent over the year before. It is rather interesting that the Minister of Finance on Monday, June 8 of this year, at page 7839 of *Hansard*, in answer to a question from my colleague, the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow), respecting these increased bank profits, is reported as follows:

> Mr. Speaker, at the meeting earlier this year of the Prices and Incomes Commission, the banks made an agreement with regard to restricting their profits. I trust that the Prices and Incomes Commission will make sure they are adhering to this and, if they are not, I trust that the commission will bring it to the public's attention.

Mr. Orlikow: Some restriction.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): First of all, of course, there is no provision for restricting the banks' profits. The minister's statement is completely misleading. The provision that was agreed to at the price stability conference of last February merely had the agreement of the banks that the ratio between the interest they paid to depositors and the interest rate which they charged on consumer loans would remain constant. But the best proof that the crite-

rion was completely ineffective is the figures that I just read indicating the tremendous increase in the banks' profits.

It is significant that the government's idea of restriction is for the Minister of Finance to say that if corporations are making more profits than they should, the Prices and Incomes Commission will bring this to the public's attention. What the public wants to know is whether the government knows about it and what will be done about it. The fact is, of course, that other forms of income have not been restricted. But the government and their front man, the Prices and Incomes Commission, have been seeking to get the wage earners and salary earners of this country to accept restraints which they are not imposing on anyone else.

When I asked the Minister of Finance yesterday about the proposal of the Canadian Labour Congress to have a conference called by the government to which business and labour would be invited to devise "a more realistic and co-operative approach to our present economic problems", what was the minister's reply? It was that labour is somewhat late in asking for a conference. He said that the Prices and Incomes Commission had already invited them to a conference and they would not come. Why would the trade unions attend a conference called by a commission that has no power and no teeth to agree to a voluntary restraint for other sectors of the economy but to accept a binding restraint for itself? What the Minister of Finance forgets is that when the industrialists, the manufacturers, the financial institutions and the banks give a verbal assurance that they will not increase their incomes, there is nothing binding about it. As the minister himself said, if they violate it, all the Prices and Incomes Commission can do is to draw that to the public's attention.

But when organized workers agree to a wage restraint, they sign a collective bargaining agreement. That is not a verbal agreement, that is not something that can be violated, it is something which is binding for two and three years. The organized workers of this country have very properly taken the position that if they are going to be asked to sign collective bargaining agreements restricting the amounts of increased income they can get, then the other segments of the Canadian economy must equally be bound by restrictive measures that will have some teeth rather than mere verbal assurances and pious expressions of hope that cannot be enforced.

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

What is the use of going to a conference with the Prices and Incomes Commission? They cannot guarantee anything. They cannot guarantee that the 6 per cent will be applicable across the board, will be applicable to executive salaries, to professional fees, to corporation profits, to dividends, to interest rates, and to taxes.

The government has used the Prices and Incomes Commission as a patsy, as a front man to do the dirty work which the government has not had the courage to do itself.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Orlikow: The minister is hiding behind the curtain.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Only the government has the power and the authority to sit down with business and labour and say: If you will do this to restrict your income, we will guarantee that other forms of income will be restricted in the same manner and for the same duration of time. The Prices and Incomes Commission cannot do that; only the government can do it. Because the government does not have the courage to do it, they use the Prices and Incomes Commission, which they call an independent body, to carry on a public relations effort for them in an attempt to convince the people that the government is doing something about inflation when, as a matter of fact, they are doing nothing except to make it worse.

I have given notice that I will put forward a motion, when we vote on the various items tonight, on the item which pays the cost of the Prices and Incomes Commission. We in this party propose to vote against that item because the Prices and Incomes Commission has proven to be absolutely useless. We do not think the government ever intended it to be useful. If the government wanted merely a statistic and data collecting agency, it has plenty of agencies in the government to gather this kind of information. But a commission that has no power other than to gather statistical material and no authority other than to make suggestions to which no one until now has paid much attention is a waste of time and a waste of money. We shall vote to abolish the Prices and Incomes Commission in the hope that the government will then step forward and accept its own responsibilities, because the government and nobody else has the responsibility to lay down the policies to deal with the problem of inflation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): It is time that façade was torn down and the government stood on its own feet. It is time we took off the gloves to see whose hands are dirty, and there is no doubt that in this case the government's hands are soiled. They have not only failed to grapple with the problem of inflation, but in the process of their ineffective and inept handling of the situation they have brought this country to a very serious state of economic affairs. Far from stopping the rising cost of living, the increased rents or rescuing people on fixed incomes from their plight, the government has made the situation worse because they have now slowed down the economy. The OECD report shows that our production and our economic growth are being steadily reduced. We are now getting what the Minister of Finance and his predecessor used to call "economic slack in the economy". We are getting a good deal of slack.

The federal officials themselves now admit, as outlined in an article of the *Globe and Mail* of June 17, that, because of the high unemployment figure in this country we are losing in terms of production over $5 billion a year, and that is not the full cost of the unemployment. It does not take into consideration the welfare payments that are made by the provinces and municipalities. It takes no cognizance of the heartaches, the homes that are broken, and the misery that is caused. Just in cold, calculating economic terms, the Canadian economy is losing over $5,000 million a year. If our economy were operating at an unemployment figure of 3 per cent to 3½ per cent, if our increasing production were back to the normal figure where it ought to be, between 5 per cent and 6 per cent, we would be producing over $5 billion worth of wealth, a third of which would find its way into the coffers of either the federal, provincial or municipal governments.

• (4:10 p.m.)

When you talk about not having the money to do the things that need to be done, the solution does not lie in curtailing public expenditures. The solution lies in stimulating the economy and increasing our production so that from our increasing wealth we could give our people the standard of living to which they are entitled in a great, wealthy, country like Canada. Not only has the government succeeded in slowing down the economy to a walk, but it has succeeded in doing what the Prime Minister said he was prepared to do if he had to, that is to get unemployment up over 6 per cent. That is one accomplishment upon which the government can pride itself. No other country in the western world has been able to get an unemployment figure like that. So, the Prime Minister should be able to go to the United Nations and point out, if he does not deserve any other accolades, that he can claim to have the highest unemployment rate of the industrialized nations of the world.

Mr. Aiken: It is the only promise he has kept.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The figure for the month of May is 6.1 per cent for actual unemployment as compared with 4.7 per cent last year, 4.6 per cent in 1968 and 3.9 per cent in 1967. We have this year a seasonally adjusted unemployment figure of 6.2 per cent compared with 4.8 per cent last year, 4.9 per cent in 1968 and 4.2 per cent in 1967. That is a ghastly record, Mr. Speaker, but unfortunately it is not all the story.

The fact that we have at the present time, or at least to the end of May, 513,000 unemployed does not give us the whole picture. We have over 600,000 students, a very large percentage of whom have not been able to get work this summer. In addition to that, there are 350,000 persons taking manpower training programs. Incidentally, I notice a report in the *Globe and Mail* that federal officials are predicting that 80 per cent of those trainees will not be able to secure employment when they finish their courses. So, we are not talking about just 513,000 unemployed. Taking people who are out of work and those who are not likely to get work, the figure is around 750,000.

In a country which has potential wealth, in a country which has all the materials within its own borders to build homes, and communities, and socially needed projects, the best that the government can do to resolve our economic problems is to keep tightening the screws, slowing down the economy and throwing more and more people out of work, creating artificial scarcity. Could anything be more callous? Could anything be less humanitarian, in this scientific and technological age of plenty, than for a government deliberately to create artificial scarcity?

We in this party have been pressing the government for a long time to adopt some more realistic measures to grapple with this problem.

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

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to allow the hon. member to continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I thank the House for its kindness, Mr. Speaker, and I assure you I will not trespass too long on its indulgence. I wish to mention three things that we have been urging the government to do, and which we again urge it to implement.

The first is to call a conference of the business interests and of organized labour, and sit down with them man-to-man—not through some third party—to work out a policy by which we can get maximum production in Canada without the ravages of inflation.

I am convinced that if the government approaches this with firmness, with some sound policies to place before business and labour, it can get their co-operation. I am not suggesting that you can make everybody happy, but I am sure that a consensus can be worked out. I am equally certain that the members of this House on all sides would support the government if we could see clearly where the government wants to go, if we knew it had a goal, and if we knew it had the policies that would enable it to attain that goal.

The second thing we urge upon the government is that it should adapt an expansionist policy to relieve unemployment. There can be no excuse for unemployment in this day and age. Keynesian economics have demonstrated that when you have the raw material and when you have the manpower, it is quite possible to keep people fully employed producing the things they need for themselves, and trading the things they don't need for themselves for commodities which they can import from abroad.

The government could start by a massive injection of funds into the housing programs. The drop in housing starts is a scandal. It is inexcusable at this time to have over half a million people unemployed and housing starts going down. The government could help the situation by dropping the 11 per cent sales tax on building materials. That sales tax was put on at a time when the government claimed there was a shortage of trained manpower and a shortage of building materials.

The government said at that time that the 11 per cent sales tax was not nearly so much for the purpose of securing more revenue as it was to slow down the accelerated rate of construction. There is no need to slow down the construction rate now, Mr. Speaker. We want to speed it up. We want to put people to work not only in the construction industry but in transportation, in the logging camps, in the factories that make light fixtures and plumbing fixtures, so as to give our whole economy a shot in the arm. The government can do this by a massive injection of funds into the housing programs, and by removing the 11 per cent sales tax.

The government could also help by putting more money into urban renewal projects. One has only to read the discussions that took place at Halifax, at the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities Conference, to see there is hardly a city in the country that is not anxious to rebuild and clear up its slums. The government would have no difficulty at all finding projects all across Canada that would put unemployed people to work.

Money could be used for socially essential programs such as building hospitals, nursing homes, and housing for the aged. The government could re-institute the winter works program so that next fall and winter municipalities could absorb many of the unemployed in municipal projects. This could be done. Such policies have been useful in the past and could be useful again. The government could lower interest rates on a selective basis, mainly for two categories; first, for money going into expanding industry which would create more jobs; and second, for socially useful projects such as housing, urban renewal, hospital and school construction, etc.

• (4:20 p.m.)

The third thing I suggest is that the government consider the advisability of selective control on prices, profits, rents and all forms of income. I know the government will argue that the expansionist program I have been talking about will speed up inflation. But surely, Mr. Speaker, no intelligent person is going to accept the Hobson's choice that we must either have painful unemployment and an economic slowdown or inflation. Surely, it is possible in the modern economy to have relatively full employment, a rising standard of living and at the same time to retain a measure of price stability. If it is not, then

the government has the responsibility to consider mandatory selective restraints but with two provisos: those restraints must be on all forms of income, not just wage and salary earners, and the government must examine some of the prices which have been artificially inflated against the possibility that controls would be imposed. Any attempt to impose restraints on income should be flexible with respect to those on very low incomes and cost of living increases should be built into public and private pension plans so that those on fixed incomes would continue to get the return to which they are entitled from their retirement plans.

I suggest these things to the government, Mr. Speaker: the calling of a conference of business and labour, an expansionist program to relieve unemployment and, if the government is frightened of inflation or finds that it is getting out of hand, the government should consider the feasibility of a comprehensive selective system of restraints on all forms of income.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the Canadian people have always responded to dynamic leadership that knows where it is going, whether in wartime or peacetime. The Canadian people are a patriotic people, and I use the term "patriotic" in the proper sense of the word. The Canadian people would respond to these things if the government said, "We are going to stimulate the economy; we are going to put every able-bodied person to work but we need your co-operation to see that inflation does not become rampant". They could get that kind of co-operation, but to get it the government itself must give courageous and effective leadership. To date, they have not given it and for that reason I think they no longer deserve the confidence of this House.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased, without being happy about it, however, to participate in the debate on this most important motion that deals with matters in which we encounter problems daily.

The federal Department of Agriculture was set up to meet a need and play several roles which interest not only the farmers themselves but also the consumers, for, on page 15 of the estimates for 1970-71, the objectives of the Department of Agriculture are given as follows:

To improve the performance of Canadian agriculture as a strong, competitive, primary industry.

I feel that, strictly in the field of production, the federal Department of Agriculture, in co-operation with the provincial departments of agriculture and the farmers themselves, really achieved that objective years ago, but this creates marketing problems not only for the farmers themselves, but also for the government which cannot sell that production.

And so, the federal Department of Agriculture, has really achieved one objective but if it wants to continue to be efficient and play an even greater role, it must, with the help of other departments, see to it that that production reaches the consumer in order to meet human needs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we see that, unfortunately, that last objective has not been achieved. In fact, warehouses are packed with goods and the federal government is requesting the farmers to slow down this production which is breeding trouble for the administration. However, we would be far from having surpluses were this production to reach the consumers, so as to meet their needs not only in Canada but in the United States and in the other countries of the world.

We may share an idea, which is not a discovery made by the hon. member for Bellechasse, but one we may trace down to the Fifth report of the Economic Council of Canada which was tabled in the House in September 1968, and which has a chapter on the problem of poverty. While saying the word "poverty" I know that some people think that there should not be too much talk about that, or better even, that the subject should be avoided.

If I now talk about it, it is not just for the sake of doing so. The word is not a pleasant one, specially for those who are the victims.

The Economic Council of Canada has made some suggestions inviting the governments to take the necessary steps in order to ensure economic relief in the country as a whole so that the greatest possible number of people may benefit from consuming Canadian products, thus enjoying a minimum of security.

On page 17 of the summary of this report, one reads the following:

Poverty in Canada is real. Its numbers are not in the thousands, but the millions. There is more of it than our society can tolerate more than our economy can afford, and far more than existing measures and effort can cope with. Its persistence, at a time when the bulk of Canadians enjoy one of the highest standards of living in the world, is a disgrace.

Thus, in the agricultural field—and everyone will admit it—there is an increase in production and in the total gross income. However, the fact remains that the net income which every farmer can receive decreases year after year, because of the rise in the cost of production. We are caught in a vice and we do not seem willing to take the necessary means to loosen it so that the farmers could share further in the fruit of their labour.

In the past year we have noticed a rise in interest rates which is one of the main causes of the decrease in the net income of farmers and of the rise in the cost of living. It is said generally that inflation is with us and that to fight against it drastic action is required. Everyone is affected by it even those who are not responsible for this situation. The farmers at the present time are actually the victims of that fight against inflation while they have not contributed to the price increase because with a yearly income of $2,000 or $2,500 reasonable people cannot afford to buy anything at any price by whim or simply for the pleasure of saying that they are spending their money.

The same phenomenon applies in the labour field where a great number of workers receive a yearly salary of less than $3,000. Last week, I think it was June 8, in a reply to a question that I had directed to him, the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Côté) gave, for the year 1968, the number of people who paid taxes with an income of less than $3,000. I was surprised to note that over 1,600,000 people pay income tax while their income is less than $3,000 a year.

• (4:30 p.m.)

These people are not responsible for inflation either and I think it is unfair to penalize workers by saddling them with more responsibilities and freezing their wages.

The flaw lies in the distribution system and the government categorically refuses to help farmers and industrial milk producers through advertising.

Now, everybody knows that advertising is the most effective way of promoting the sale of a product. We hear evidence of it every day. If industrial milk producers could get 50 or 60 cents more per hundredweight for their product, they could afford the luxury of having pretty singers make television commercials such as the one we hear 25 times a day: "It's the real thing". This is the advertising for Coke and God knows how much Coke is sold in Canada. Why? Because it is constantly advertized.

[Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse).]

If millions of dollars could be spent on songs such as "It's the real thing" for dairy products, we could perhaps get people to consume more dairy products.

The government is not solely responsible. The producers themselves can take the necessary steps to ensure that advertising. But to that end, it is necessary to have an income, and to have an income entails securing reasonable prices. But at the present time, prices are inadequate, as a result of higher production costs.

To top it all, unusual things are happening to us. The Canadian Dairy Commission, which has rather broad powers to direct Canadian production, to control imports and exports, is being cheated because the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce issues permits to import dairy products and dairy substitutes which enter this country at a disconcerting rate.

I have here copy of the reply to a question which was placed on the order paper on May 21, 1969. It contains astonishing statistics. The question read in part as follows:

1. Does the government know how many pounds of "coloured spread" were sold in Canada from April 1, 1967 to March 31, 1968 and from April 1, 1968 to March 31, 1969?

The answer was the following:

April 1, 1967 to March 31, 1968, 188,151,000 lbs; April 1, 1968 to March 31, 1969, 195,142,000 lbs.

The second part of the question read as follows:

2. Of that amount, what proportion was sold illegally?

The answer was the following:

2. No information available.

I do not blame the minister for such an answer. At least, it is recognized that some goods are sold illegally, even if the government has no information on the matter.

The third part of the question read as follows:

3. What were for the same periods the amounts of other imitation milk product sold in Canada?

The answer was the following:

3. There are no statistics available on imitation fluid milk sales in Canada.

The last part of the question read as follows:

4. What were the amounts of milk products of all kinds which were imported from other countries during the above-mentioned years?

And the answer was the following:

April 1, 1967 to March 31, 1968, 488,189 cwt.; April 1, 1968 to March 31, 1969, 478,504 cwt.

Butter has even been imported, while it is said that we do not even know what to do with domestic supplies, which prompts the government to levy taxes on producers of manufacturing milk.

As far as imports are concerned, according to a table at page 29 of a bulletin published by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics in 1969, 67,200 hundredweights of butter were imported while we had surpluses in Canada. As for cheese, I admit that certain special kinds must be imported, because we have not yet succeeded in manufacturing them in Canada and if the consumer wants them, I could not blame him. However, it is unthinkable that in a single year we import 222,233 hundredweights of that product from the United States, Argentina, New Zealand, Australia, Rumania and Hungary.

I feel that the necessary studies should be conducted—and this is the suggestion I take the liberty of addressing to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson)—in order to find new ways of processing industrial milk to increase consumption considerably and even sell it on international markets. It is not any more wrong for us to try and secure international outlets than it is for the countries I have just mentioned to sell their products in Canada.

It is only very recently that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) went to New Zealand where it is reported he stated that the control of dairy production in Canada was intentional and was designed to reduce production, which would allow New Zealanders to export butter to Canada. This is astounding when our people have to grapple with a very difficult situation and are putting up a strong fight to survive in order to make our parishes more prosperous and better able to fight poverty and, as pointed out in the fifth report of the Economic Council of Canada, develop small industries so as to give employment and increase purchasing power.

Apparently, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) has some responsibility in the field of imports and exports and I would ask him today to kindly look into the following situation. It seems that some products from the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, including a great many dairy products for the feeding of calves, are coming into Canada.

In the Standing Committee on Agriculture, we studied for months the question of the dairy industry and the use of dairy products. Some government members sitting on the committee suggested that a larger quantity of milk be used to feed calves in order to make this milk into meat instead of butter, cheese or powdered milk.

Even though the farmers take care to obey the authorities and, in particular, the minister as well as the Canadian Dairy Commission, when another department lets in a foreign product, this is likely to counteract the efforts of the manufacturing milk producers and of the Canadian Dairy Commission. Then, we are going around in a circle, efforts are not co-ordinated and the desired results are not achieved, because of a lack of co-operation among departments.

I shall now deal with Vote 1 of the Department of Agriculture.

When the Standing Committee on Agriculture was considering a special matter referred to it by Parliament, namely, the dairy policy of the government for the year 1970-71, we were handed the blue book, that is the 1970-71 estimates which showed some cutbacks. These were said to amount to some $10 million. However, on close examination, the amount of the cutback applying to agriculture, as shown on page 147 of the main estimates is $28 million. This can be harmful to agriculture, spread over a period of 12 months. Of course, according to some officials and even to replies to questions, it might have been possible to transfer this amount to some other section of agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, when I go into a shop to buy a pair of shoes and am offered a hat, that does not suit me. As for the millions of dollars that are being requested by the 25,000 farmers who signed a petition, yesterday I asked the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) when the emergency debate would take place, and his answer was as follows:

• (4:40 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, it will depend on the progress made. If all the legislation discussed with the House leaders is passed, it might be possible to hold, before June 26, the debate mentioned by the member.

The member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) asked whether it would be possible to meet this request a little earlier. He got the following answer:

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to discuss the matter with the representatives of the other parties, but I emphasize that we should conclude first the business of the House.

It is always the same thing. The farmers always come after the others. If time is available, the question will be considered, if not, it will be postponed until next year. It will be postponed until October. In the field of agriculture, things are getting worse from day to day, from week to week, from month to month. Then the farmers are told: You are never satisfied. You always want something else. The more you get, the less you are happy.

[*English*]

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

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to allow the hon. member to continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lambert (Bellechase): I thank you, Mr. Speaker, as well as my colleagues. I shall not take too much of the time of the House. Before concluding my remarks, I should like, once again, to urge the government, and in particular the Minister of Agriculture and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), to reconsider the daily policy so as to meet the legitimate requests of those who claim that this policy might be harmful, not only to the persons who are its immediate victims, but also to the economy of the whole province of Quebec.

The subsidies of the government of Canada are an important part of the net farming income in Quebec, that is approximately $50 million or 25 per cent. Because of the budgetary restraints required by its fight against inflation, the government is seeking to reduce its subsidies. They have been reduced this year and a further reduction is contemplated for next year.

Mr. Speaker, farmers do not want subsidies but a fair and reasonable return for their work. If the government thinks that consumers should pay for part of the product and the government for the other part, it is his business.

What is important is that the product has some value and that the producer is entitled to a fair share of the revenue. In 1949, base year on which the value of the Canadian dollar is estimated, butter cost 63 cents a pound. Considering the progressive increase in prices since then, we realize that in 1970, the price of butter in proportion to that of other products should be $1.07 a pound. What does that mean?

It means that the farmer who has worked and bought machinery was forced to pay more and more each year. In order to be fair to him, prices should be set so that he would be able to earn an income based on the quantity of products he sells. It seems to me that it is easy to understand. Nobody is asking for the moon. All we want is acknowledgement of this essential right of the farmer to the fruits of his labour.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that by reducing subsidies, credits for industrial milk production and the subsidies of the Canadian Dairy Commission for the coming year, the government of Canada will speed up the disappearance of marginal agricultural operations in Quebec.

If such is the aim of the government, it will attain it. But if it is trying to establish a fair and reasonable balance between consumption possibilities and total production, it should take the necessary steps to be fair by controlling imports, so that those products will not directly compete with those of farmers who have definitely chosen agriculture as an occupation. Surely they cannot be made into lawyers; they are farmers of 35, 40 or 50 years of age. Farming is their trade. They cannot become tradesmen or labourers overnight, since in all industrial fields, there is a surplus of labour.

I consider for my part that it would be advisable for the state to subsidize for a certain time those small producers, even if it cost $1,200 or $1,500 per year to do so. It would still be less costly than to give them $250 per month as welfare payments and tell them to remain idle. They come to a point where they lose all faith in themselves, where they feel they are useless and a burden to society. However, if they were given $1,000 or $1,500 per year, the cost would be less and they would be allowed to do their share. They are proud if they can consider themselves as self-sufficient and contributing to the well-being of society, and not as entirely dependent on it.

Mr. Speaker, would that be the proper means to implement an anti-inflationary policy, so that the Maritimes and Quebec might assume the major share of the costs, even if their unemployment rate is very high? Indeed, in Quebec, God knows that the unemployment rate is high, and the same is true of

the Maritimes. And steps have to be taken within the framework of the "just society".

• (4:50 p.m.)

I am satisfied that all hon. members are willing to work toward the establishment of a just society. But after all, what is a just society? Is it a society in which big companies and large institutions can make for themselves more and more profits, as some press reports pointed out recently? There are witnesses who can vouch that some banks have made 27 per cent more profits in 1969, and they are not asked to reduce them. But the little fellow is asked to restrain himself, to do his part to curb inflation. I do not think that is the just society.

A just society is a society within which all people who can produce something or sell services are able to support themselves and discharge their own obligations without being forever dependent on the state for health insurance, hospital insurance, subsidies here, subsidies there, ever soliciting and begging. To my mind, the way things are going now, we are not heading towards a just society but towards a more and more unjust society, because the gap between the haves and the have-nots is widening all the time, with the former being fewer and fewer and the latter more and more numerous.

In the present economic slump when the necessary agricultural adjustments are overlooked, does the cutback in subsidies to agriculture not threaten to bring about very unfavourable social consequences? Yes. And the effects are still being felt!

I will be told: A farmer might buy the neighouring farm in order to enlarge his property. But some rather large farms of this type do not turn out so well.

There are also cases where a relatively well off farmer cannot buy his neighbour's farm because he is unable to obtain credit at a suitable rate of interest. Unable to see his way clear to make enough profits to honour his commitments, he is compelled to give up his farm. That is why in certain parishes there are whole concessions where 25, 30 or 40 farmers used to live and now only three or four are to be found.

As regards public expenditures for road maintenance in summer and in winter as well as for all municipal services, they must be maintained. However, since the number of farmers in rural parishes is gradually decreasing, the fiscal burden of those citizens is getting increasingly heavier, which tends to reduce even more their net income and to delay the advent of a just society.

Before resuming my seat, I should like to give the government the assurance that we, of the Ralliement Créditiste,—and I am certain that all other opposition members have the same objective—want to offer our full co-operation, as well as to all intermediate bodies, in order to take the appropriate steps, to make the sacrifices required, to put order where necessary. If it is ever necessary to change tack, we will have to act firmly, in order to keep on developing agriculture, because the world's population is increasing. Tomorrow, we will need more food products.

If we do not take the necessary steps to ensure the survival of agriculture, there will be difficult days ahead and we shall then witness an increase in prices as well as the establishment of the black market. We shall have to use coupons, and then there will be a scramble for goods on the black market just like during the war. Such a state of things should not happen. It could happen in two, three or twenty years from now. To govern is to foresee. We should make sure that conditions will improve by taking right now the necessary steps to achieve a just society and meet the needs of all Canadians.

[*English*]

Mr. Steven Otto (York East): I hope hon. gentlemen on this side will applaud after I have finished.

Mr. Bell: Look where the applause came from.

An hon. Member: You won't get much after your speech.

Mr. Otto: I have listened with interest to the speeches made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) and by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas). Like them, I wish to review the economic situation, having returned from a visit to my constituency during which I found business almost at a standstill. Unemployment has increased to about 530,000, and there are another 500,000 or 600,000 people unemployed but getting paid, notwithstanding the fact that they have nothing to do in the plants in which they are engaged. Everyone is apprehensive. Everyone is afraid. I wondered what in the world could have happened. Is this our government? Is this the same government that introduced the white paper on taxation, a reform paper, and which had the audacity to change the Criminal Code, the

divorce law, and introduce the white paper on unemployment insurance, a forward-looking document? I ask, could this be the same government? What in the world has happened? The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has a habit of speaking on the issue of guidelines on the basis that if one is not for the Prices and Incomes Commission then one is for inflation. I fail to succumb to that point of view.

• (5:00 p.m.)

All of us, and I particularly, are concerned about inflation, but I believe the great tragedy in this connection has been Dr. Young and his commission. I cannot imagine how in the world Dr. Young was able to inveigle the position except that possibly the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) was busy with the white paper, the government was busy with other things and there was a vacuum into which the Prices and Incomes commission moved. This was a disastrous decision which will reflect on this government and on this nation for some time to come.

The terms of reference of the commission were quite wide. The commission could have assessed the situation—inflation is obvious—and tried to find out what was causing it. Having done that, it could have recommended either restrictive or expansive policies. I do not mean the same type of expansive policies mentioned by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas). The commission quite possibly could have decided to be conventional. I have a feeling that even Dr. Young was not in command. I have a feeling it was Rasminsky and Bryce. Thirty years ago these two young clerks had all sorts of ideas, but they have not caught up with the changes and theories which have been introduced. What did the commission and the banks do? First, they tightened the money supply. They blamed our inflation on the United States inflation. Everyone in Canada knows there is an inflationary demand pull in the United States because $20 billion worth of their total production goes into the space program. More than $20 billion or $30 billion goes into the war in Viet Nam. They are fighting two wars, both of which are very expensive.

The money spent for the production of these goods has to produce approximately 75 per cent of the remaining goods. That is the demand pull. We agree. Had we been in the same position and had the Price and Incomes commission recommended restrictions, I would have said that possibly they would work. But we were not in this position.

[Mr. Otto.]

Obviously according to the balance of trade figures, we would have been able to out-sell the United States in its own market had our production capacity been anything like comparable to that of the United States. In that case, we would have been out-selling them at 50 per cent of their price, but this was not so. The government decided to go on in this conventional way without thinking of the new ideas mentioned by able economists such as Weldon, Miss Cohen and others. They decided to keep the old way of doing things. The government could not possibly have reviewed this policy and asked itself what is happening today in this country.

So, as the Leader of the Opposition said, we do have an unemployment figure of 6.2 per cent. It will become worse. Of that figure, 118,000 are new people in the labour force. Another 27,000 or so are in Quebec and, of course, there were the British Columbia strikes which did not help the situation. The time will come very shortly when the companies which now are paying men for not doing very much will place these men on the unemployment lists, because the reserves in Canada are limited and we are eating into these reserves at a fantastic rate. what will happen if the government should decide to slow up a bit? There will be a tendency for inflation to shoot up. I venture to say that by spring next year we will not have a 6 per cent annual inflation cycle but rather a 10 per cent annual inflation cycle, and then we will be completely out of the market. The real fact in respect of Canadian inflation is that Canadians are poor producers. The DBS figures point this out. We stand ninth. We have the second highest standard of living but on a per man productivity basis we are ninth in the world. We are behind Greece, France and Italy. This is a fact. It is not all labour's fault. Indeed it is not labour's fault. I think it is ridiculous to keep blaming labour for something which really is the responsibility of management and governments.

It has been said, for example, that if the major items of equipment in our factories were modernized we could increase our production by almost 28 per cent. Is it conceivable that we could do this all at once? We could certainly increase it by 14 per cent, because we do have poor equipment in Canada which should be replaced. Does anyone dare tell me that the restriction on the money supply will help industries put in new equipment? Where would they get the money? Can Dr. Young explain how the restriction on wages to 6 per cent will ensure

productivity? In a report quite recently he said that Canadian per man-hour productivity is approximately 2 per cent gross and of course an 8 per cent increase in wages leaves a gap of 6 per cent which is our inflation. How can we guarantee that the productivity will increase 2 per cent all told? If we have a 4 per cent, 6 per cent or 10 per cent inflation cycle, what is the difference? Dr. Young, in a speech, looks at the figure and says that indeed there is a relationship between productivity and wages, but he does not delve into the real situation as he should and come up with ways and means to gear wage increases to production increases either industry by industry, plant by plant, or nation-wide.

This is the type of commission we still have. I am afraid to believe that this commission will still have an influence on the government. The reason I have taken part in this debate is to advise the government not to act when the commission recommends wage and price controls because that would be a disastrous stroke; it will not work and we will suffer from it for years to come. There is a presumption that somehow we can duplicate the war years when patriotism was involved, when production was not the issue, and when the depression years were still in our memories. All of these things have to be considered when wage and price controls are proposed. The machinery will be cumbersome and the controls will not work. Even though price and wage controls may be limited to 4 per cent or 6 per cent, the chances are that production will drop by 10 per cent because the Canadian public will not willingly accept such controls. There is a supposed willingness. You hear Canadians saying all the time: "I think we should have wage or price controls as long as they do not affect me. We should have wage controls for everyone else but I do not want to be included in them". This is the natural feeling of people when such a control program is started; they will not like it if they are involved. They will not tolerate it, and the program will be a disaster.

• (5:10 p.m.)

I hope that the government can see its way clear to telling Dr. Young to wind up his books and go home. Indeed, I say right now that when the motion of the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) comes up, I shall vote for it because I think there can be no greater contribution to Canada's economy than to have Dr. Young pack up his equipment, pay off his bills, and go home. He is not doing much good; in fact, he is doing a lot of harm. I suggest to the government that it does not have much time left to look into our real problem, that is our productive capacity, and do something about it.

Much has been said about banks, and we know that a lot of it is true. But on the other hand, banks and businesses are making money. The easiest way to make it, of course, is through consumer lending. I say to the minister the first thing that should be done is to encourage our industries to replace their worn out and antiquated equipment. For this, they will need money. I would even suggest we should induce them to do this by allowing quick write offs. Any industrialist who puts in new equipment to increase his production should be able to write off his debt in a year. Where is he going to get the money? He cannot pay 18 per cent interest to the banks, and the banks are not too keen to lend money to commerce or to industry. They are very busy with the consumer loan market from which they get about 32 per cent, and that is not peanuts.

But we do have a weapon we can use without applying the restrictions that are called for by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands. I refer to the reserve. At present, banks are required to set aside a certain reserve with the Bank of Canada. I see no reason why this reserve cannot be divided. Let us say to the banks that if they lend to industry we will lower the reserve required for industrial and commercial loans. Let us double or triple the reserve required for consumer credit. It is time the government told our banks that if they want to enjoy the privileges of branch banking they have to provide a service to our industry and to our economy rather than just line the shareholders pockets. If they continue on the same road—and I do not think they should be nationalized—then we should immediately amend the Bank Act to allow competitive banking.

Branch banking has a purpose. The banks always cry on our shoulders, asking us not to open up the whole field of banking to anyone who wants to start a bank. They tell us they are giving a wonderful service and that branch banking serves a purpose. But they are not living up to their responsibilities. The government should put it to the banks now that if they do not provide the service and live up to their responsibilities, we shall open up the banking field to a competitive group of people. These competitors will then be able

to obtain a licence through the corporations branch. I think competition will do the banks a lot of good.

There are one or two more points that I would like to make. I have spoken now about the management side. Something should be done about labour, and we have to face that immediately. The minister pointed out that some of the unemployment and a great deal of inflation results from work stoppages. We still have a 100-year old system of negotiating so-called labour-management disputes. Everybody quits. This compounds the problems because production stops, but people still have to be fed and housed so they dig into their savings. Companies have to keep their plants open, so money has to come from an increase in the price of the product. The government has to find a new and acceptable method of dealing with labour-management disputes as an alternative to work stoppage.

The hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis), in a speech he made in Montreal about two years ago, said he would welcome any workable plan, and that probably the unions would welcome such a plan. I placed a private bill on the Order Paper which provided that, where there is no contract, the plant should keep operating but the profits made during the duration of the so-called strike would go to the government as a 100 per cent tax. Possibly union dues could go to the government as well. In other words, we could at least keep on producing and the nation would get the benefit of production. Work stoppage is one of the great obstacles to good production. The work stoppage may only last 14 days, but its effects go on for a great deal longer. After the strike is settled—and I have seen this time and time again—no one is happy. The strike is often settled because of a sense of compulsion.

Following the settlement, productivity drops for the first three or four months to less than 50 per cent because of a lack of incentive to produce. The workers are still angry after the strike is over. They have to keep on producing but the animosity created during the strike continues, and there is a complete lack of communication between management and labour. This is not conducive to good production. However, we have to increase our production. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that if we in Canada increase our production by 10 per cent, then a 10 per cent increase in wages will not cause inflation. If we can increase our production by 20 per cent, then a 20 per cent wage increase will not be inflationary.

[Mr. Otto.]

There is a relationship between the two, and if our productivity increases we will be able to compete with the whole world. But the fault lies in the failure to gear these two together. So long as we continue to have a 2 per cent gross national product increase and an 8 per cent or 10 per cent price and wage increase, there is bound to be inflation and there is no way of stopping it. That is, in essence, what the Prices and Incomes Commission should have been dealing with, but it has not and it has no intention of doing so. During the committee's examination of Dr. Young, he flatly stated that the commission has that option but it will not take it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired. Does the House give unanimous consent to the hon. member to continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Otto: I will only take another minute, Mr. Speaker. I have tried to outline not only the cause of the trouble we now have, but what can be done about it. I would like to define what the government should do in what I would call expansive programs. Some of my suggestions may include some of the proposals made by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands. Housing has dropped 50 per cent. This will cause a reaction within a very short time because, even with rent controls, you cannot create more houses by lowering rents. The houses will just not be there. Industry is growing so apprehensive that even now it will need more than six months to get up courage to expand. But inflation will keep on growing, and industry will be using its reserves to meet its losses. Therefore, I urge the government to forget about restriction, bank restriction, money restriction, and go all out to increase production.

• (5:20 p.m.)

I want to remind the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) that he was not given the mandate of leadership by advocating a policy of restriction by saying he was going to tell farmers not to grow crops, that he was going to tell businessmen not to take profits, and industry not to produce more. His mandate was based on advocating opportunity, hope, and a forward-looking program. That is his mandate, and that is the mandate we have. We do not have a negative mandate. Had the people wanted a negative, restrictive mandate they would have given their confidence to someone else.

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in this debate because I believe the economy of the country is drifting into a very serious state of affairs and I do not think the government is taking that state of affairs nearly seriously enough. To realize how serious it is, we only have to look at the unemployment figures which, in my view, give the most accurate picture of where the economy is, and where it is going.

Let us look back just two months and see what the unemployment figures were then. In March, unemployment was 5.1 per cent seasonally adjusted; in April 5.6 per cent, seasonally adjusted; and in May, 6.2 per cent seasonally adjusted. That is a very sharp rise month after month. It is not just those three months that have been affected. This rise has been going on ever since January. The indication is that it is going to continue to rise in the same steep fashion if something is not done about it very soon. In the last year there have developed 127,000 more unemployed than there were a year ago. This has brought us to the highest unemployment figure in eight years.

I think that two things should happen. I think that we in the opposition must present serious, well-thought-out proposals for grappling with this situation, to the government, and on their part I believe that the government must accept these suggestions in the spirit in which they are given. The suggestions should receive consideration, and if the government believes there is some good in them they should not be too proud to accept them, use them and help the economy in that way.

The most alarming part of this whole situation so far as I am concerned is that the opposition has been putting forward ideas and suggestions to the government over many months and the government have laughed at them, sneered at them, paid no attention to them, made wisecracks about them. I just do not think that is good enough. I think the time has come when we in this Parliament must emphasize the situation that I have described, by producing the unemployment figures. I have used the seasonally adjusted figures because on many occasions the government have stressed that the seasonally adjusted figures are the only ones that give the true picture of unemployment.

Obviously, if we are going to overcome this unemployment problem we are facing, and the serious situation the economy finds itself in, we must create new jobs. In order to create new jobs we have to lower costs so that prices can come down, so that our products can be more competitive, so that they will sell more readily both in Canada against foreign competition here, and in the export market against foreign goods that compete against them. The question is, what can we do to bring down costs and prices?

I am going to present six points to the government that I think are worthy of consideration, six things that I think they should do, many of which I have presented in the past and which have been ignored. The government have never taken the trouble to state why they believe these ideas will not work. Mr. Speaker, I have found that these suggestions do work in practice, because I have used them and seen them work, both while working for 20 years in industry and while a member of government with economic responsibilities over a period of six years. So, in all seriousness, I say to the government that these are put forward seriously, as practical suggestions, and I am convinced that if the government will adopt them they will greatly help the economy.

The first deals with tax incentives. Mr. Speaker, in a democracy such as Canada you cannot put a gun at the head of producers, like dictatorships can do, and force them to do the kinds of things you want them to do. You have to make it so attractive for them to follow a certain line of action that they literally cannot afford to ignore that line of action. The most effective form of inducement is by way of tax incentives. Under this plan, you do not give a producer something and say, "Here is an inducement. Go ahead and see what you can do with it." Rather, you say to him, "If you do what I suggest you should, we will make it worth while for you at the end of the year by giving you a rebate on your taxes." That is a very simple, practical way to reward a producer for doing the kinds of things you believe he must do for the national economy. The first step is offer tax incentives to induce greater productivity.

We hear a great deal of talk about productivity. Everybody agrees productivity should be increased. The government agrees it should be increased but do absolutely nothing to make it attractive for producers to increase their productivity and thereby lower costs and prices, make their goods more competitive and more capable of producing jobs. In order to become more productive and increase your productivity you must make a

sizeable outlay of money in the form of new plant, new machinery, new production systems. This is what our competitors all over the world are doing, particularly the eastern countries such as Japan. There is also West Germany and certain other countries which have set great marks in productivity and are doing so well as competitors against our goods. My first suggestion is that we offer tax incentives based on increases in productivity during the year, whereby a plant would be rewarded in the form of tax rebates at the end of the year, based upon a specific increase in productivity during the preceding 12 months.

• (5:30 p.m.)

The second suggestion is a tax incentive to induce those who produce and sell goods to keep price rises during the year within the 2½ per cent guideline which the government has set as an acceptable level. They have based the 2½ per cent figure on the fact that over the past 70 years since the Dominion Bureau of Statistics started keeping track of inflation from year to year, the average increase in prices has been 2½ per cent each year. The government has taken that figure and said that in its view, if it is not exceeded the economy will not be in jeopardy.

I have proposed to the government that if a producer keeps the price increase on all his products during the year within 2½ per cent, he should receive a rebate of 2½ per cent of his corporation taxes at the end of the year, and an additional 1 per cent rebate for each percentage point of price increase which he holds down steadily, going down to zero. In this case a company which did not increase prices at all during the year would be eligible for a 5 per cent rebate on its corporation taxes. That is a practical incentive and one that businessmen understand. It is the kind of incentive they will react to and it will make it worth their while not to exceed the government's 2½ per cent guideline. Businessmen will go a long way to obtain that tax incentive. Their goods would be more competitive and easier to sell if they kept prices rises within 2½ per cent.

The third measure which I suggest the government should adopt is the introduction of penalties against companies which do not keep price rises within the 2½ per cent per year guideline. A few months ago the government called the leaders of industry together and asked them to keep price rises within reasonable limits. All the industries concerned said they would not increase prices more than their increase in costs. But, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing to induce them to limit those increases in costs. There is no penalty which can be applied against them if they do not keep their price rises within that range.

Businessmen across the country are literally laughing at this government for believing they will react as the government expects. They just will not do it unless they are rewarded for doing so or penalized for not doing so. Members who have been in business or have had experience of businessmen know that these are facts of economic life. I suggest that in order to induce our producers to keep within the 2½ per cent guideline, penalties must be set by the government and imposed against producers who do not comply.

My fourth suggestion is that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) immediately call together the presidents of the chartered banks and of the main lending institutions of this country and point out to them the need for keeping interest rates well below the level they are at today. I believe the present levels are far too high and are adding unnecessarily to the costs of production, making our products uncompetitive and thus making it more difficult to provide jobs. The disclosure a couple of days ago that the profit achieved by the chartered banks of Canada in the first six months of their fiscal year was an increase of 27.7 per cent over 1969, when the increase was 26.6 per cent, shows that the banks and other lending institutions could well afford to lower interest rates and still make a reasonable profit. It is up to the government to call together the heads of these lending institutions and point out, in the national interest, the absolute need for reducing interest rates. The government should indicate clearly that if they are not willing to do this, it will step in and impose some kind of control on interest rates in order that costs can be kept within reasonable bounds and prices at reasonable levels. This action is necessary if products are to be sold competitively and jobs made available for our people.

The fifth suggestion is one that I last made about a week ago and have made on various occasions to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). In order to persuade the leaders of organized labour that it is vitally important for labour to play its part in keeping costs within reasonable bounds, thus making it possible for our products to remain competitive and thereby creating jobs for members of their unions, the Prime Minister should call

together the leaders of our major labour unions. A private meeting could be held well away from the press, radio, television and all publicity. He could talk to them at his home in a quiet, restrained manner and outline the tremendous need for their co-operation in the drive to keep prices within reasonable bounds. He should point out that this is necessary if products are to be sold in Canada and abroad in the face of foreign competition, and that it is necessary if we are to create more jobs for Canadians.

My sixth suggestion is that the government, without further delay, make up its mind about what kind of help it will give our export industries to enable them to maintain the present level of sales. This level may be satisfactory today, but because Canada has had to go on a floating exchange rate our export industries face very serious competition in world markets. Their products have been made much more expensive because the Canadian dollar has been put on a floating exchange rate. If they are to maintain their markets they will have to reduce prices, and in order to do that they must have help from the government. If help is not forthcoming, many orders which would have been obtained for Canada will be lost, and it follows that jobs will be lost: foreigners will be given employment that should be given to Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, these are very simple, straightforward economic proposals which from experience I am convinced will work. I should like the economic ministers of the Crown, starting with the Minister of Finance, to take these suggestions and either use them, modify them or have the courtesy to explain to the opposition side of the House why they are unworkable, if they believe them to be so, in present circumstances.

• (5:40 p.m.)

I think the time has come for the government to stop laughing, sneering and joking about the economic plight this country is in today. They should stop making fun of suggestions which come from the opposition. Above all, we want the government either to accept our suggestions or put forward plans of its own that will work, reduce costs, enable prices to be kept down, make our products more competitive so that Canadians can sell more readily against foreign competition in Canada and abroad, and so produce more jobs for our people.

These are the kinds of plans we want to hear about. We take no pride in their authorship. I do not wish to hear the government say that a proposal like that was brought forward by the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings or anybody else. All I want is this government to come forward with a plan that will meet the tremendous problem of our very rapidly rising unemployment. I outlined the figures at the beginning of my remarks. Our unemployment is going up at a startling rate. This is not just a statistics, as the Prime Minister would like us to believe; it represents human misery, privation and desperation which affects a great many Canadians. The trouble is that it is growing worse every hour of every day.

I earnestly ask the government to accept these suggestions in the spirit in which they are put forward. If they are wrong, let the government have the decency and courtesy to tell us why. If they are any good at all and can be used, let the government use them. If they can be used in their entirety, let it use them. If the government can produce something better, let it produce it. But for heaven's sake let it stop pretending that the problem does not exist. Let it stop living in an Alice in Wonderland atmosphere in which people always expect something to turn up tomorrow in some miraculous fashion. Speaking from a practical businessman's point of view, I say these things do not happen miraculously. They happen only if plans are well thought out and put into operation in a serious, conscientious and practical manner.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, before we recess at six o'clock I wish to speak for a few minutes about some of the remarks which have been made. My colleague, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson), will be speaking later and may be dealing in a more substantive form with other points which have been raised this afternoon. I am curious to know why the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings (Mr. Hees) has given us the benefit of his experience on the basis of six years in government, because in those six years the economy of Canada was probably operated in a worse way than at any other time in our history. We are indebted to him for the advice he has given today.

Mr. Hees: That is exactly what we hear day after day. That is why the economy of this country is going straight to hell.

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, may I mention some of the contradictions inherent in the hon. member's remarks. We have heard the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) say that we ought to have guidelines. The minute we bring them in and try to impose a guidelines policy, the hon. member says that is not what we ought to be doing. The hon. member seems totally unaware of the fact that the Prices and Incomes Commission is currently—

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister a question?

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, I am allowed to speak for only 15 minutes.

Mr. Hees: I said that we ought to have guidelines. The minister knows that perfectly well.

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

Mr. Hees: I ask the minister to stop talking trash.

Mr. Basford: The hon. member seems unaware of the fact that the Prices and Incomes Commission is currently examining and investigating the recent fantastic figures relating to bank profits. It is inquiring into that situation. There are to be meetings with the bankers to see if the situation cannot be corrected. I noted with interest the remarks—this is really the matter I want to deal with—of the leader of the NDP, the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas). He, with his usual great rhetoric, as well as the hon. member for York East (Mr. Otto), suggested that the Prices and Incomes Commission should pack its bags and go. I would make it clear, as the minister who recommended to cabinet the establishment of this commission and the appointment of Dr. Young, that we have no intention of asking the commission to do that. Nothing has happened during the last year to make me regret either recommendating the establishment of the commission or the appointment of Dr. Young as its chairman.

I think the old people of this country, those living on fixed incomes, the weaker people who are hit by inflation and hurt by its effects, would be incensed if they knew that for the past 18 months the leader of the NDP has done nothing in this House or outside it except try to destroy, discredit and negate the efforts of the Prices and Incomes Commission to restrain inflation. I put on record, Mr. Speaker, that this has been the history of the NDP for the past 18 months.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: Shame.

Mr. Basford: We have endeavoured, as a government, to find new techniques for dealing with inflation and the NDP has done everything possible to put roadblocks in the government's way, to discredit its efforts and to prevent any sort of proper cost restraints being introduced into our economy. This is a matter of record and one can see it happening in the House every day during the question period. We recognize that for some years we have had in this country a very unsatisfactory prices situation. This is true of Canada, of the United States and of all other western industrialized nations. We have been endeavouring to bring the current inflation under control and have actively and vigorously been applying measures of monetary and fiscal restraint designed to curb the growth of inflation in our country.

It was recognized that the pervasiveness of inflationary pressures was so great that we had to find methods in addition to the traditional ones of monetary and taxation policies. We recognized that it would be very difficult to apply traditional methods for a protracted period because there would be adverse side-effects which no one, including members of this government, wanted to see, namely, an interruption of the growth of production in the economy and a temporary rise in unemployment. It seemed to the government that a smoother, and therefore less painful transition back to reasonable price stability could be achieved if a way could be found to cut directly into the spiralling process of prices and incomes increases, with the object of slowing them down more rapidly than seemed possible by using traditional methods.

If we could cut directly into prices and incomes increases it might be possible to moderate government policies of budgetary and credit restraints earlier, and soften some of their more painful side-effects. That is why the government has supported and is supporting the Prices and Incomes Commission's efforts to work out, in consultation with representatives of all major groups in the community, a specific undertaking to be asked of business, labour, other private groups and governments, designed to achieve a substantial across-the-board scaling down of price increases in 1970, and to devise methods

and procedures for ensuring that the spirit of these undertakings is observed in practice.

Although the economic environment has changed considerably since the commission was established, the approach which it has been following, with the full support of this government, is just as relevant today as it was one year ago. The business community and governments, provincial and federal, are co-operating with the commission in seeking to hold price increases below cost increases. But more effective steps to contain cost pressures in the economy are essential if substantial expansionary moves are not to set prices rising faster than ever before.

It has been alleged in this House that the approach of the Prices and Incomes Commission has no support. It may interest hon. members to know that I had occasion to lead the Canadian delegation at the meeting of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development in Paris on May 22, and the policies that we have developed in Canada through the Bank of Canada, the Department of Finance and the Prices and Incomes Commission received very substantial support at that ministerial meeting involving 18 industrialized nations of the world.

• (5:50 p.m.)

There has been mention in the House that the OECD is critical of our policies. I wish to read from a communiqué issued by that conference on May 22. I quote from the first page:

> Ministers agreed on the need to persevere in most countries with the restrictive demand management policies already adopted. To achieve stability it will also be desirable to combine these policies with other measures of a structural and more selective nature. According to circumstances, such measures may include manpower policies,—

We are in this fiscal year spending more money on manpower policies than ever before.

—regional and sectoral policies—

We are also spending more money in this area than ever before.

> —incomes policies and efforts to increase competition, nationally and internationally.

As I made clear to the House, we are in the process of revising our competitive policy through the Combines Investigation Act. At the OECD conference, speaker after speaker emphasized that a prices and incomes approach and a guidelines approach, in spite of all the difficulties, frustrations and sometimes the disillusions, are worth pursuing. They stated that if countries are to control the unacceptable rate of price increases which we have experienced in the western world over the last few years, we must, in spite of all the difficulties of a prices and incomes approach, follow that approach and persist in those policies. I wish the members of the New Democratic Party could have heard the representative of their more successful counterpart in Britain, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Jenkins. I wish he would come to Canada. He can certainly teach the New Democratic Party something. If the members of that party spoke with him, they might make more intelligent speeches than they made today and have made over the last 18 months.

The efforts of the government in its anti-inflationary program as a whole, including its support for the commission's price restraint program, have clearly achieved a measure of success in slowing the rate of price increases in Canada. The most recent consumer price index is for May, 1970. We have all listened to the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings asking questions every time DBS releases a report. When the price index declined by 0.1 per cent between April and May, we did not hear from the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings. This was the first decrease recorded since 1962. Between May, 1969, and May, 1970, the rise in the over-all index was 3.8 per cent, which is still unsatisfactory. However, this was the first year-over-year rise of less than 4 per cent recorded since March, 1969.

We are beginning to see hopeful signs that the fiscal and monetary policies of the government, and the Prices and Incomes Commission, are having an effect on the unsatisfactory rate of price increases that we have had. I thought the members of the NDP, who are always moaning about one thing and another, would have welcomed this sort of development and would have supported the program of the Prices and Incomes Commission. Instead, they have spent the last 18 months trying to destroy and discredit it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Basford: So far, the reduction in the rate of price increases has been made possible by the squeeze on profits that has occurred with fewer increases in direct taxes rather than a reduction in labour cost increases. Corporate profits in the first quarter of 1970, as pointed out in this House, were 3.9 per cent below the level of the first quarter of 1969,

while annual wage and salary increases granted under major collective agreements were in the order of 9 per cent. I know that members of the NDP will say that does not include increases in the profits of chartered banks. That, of course, is true. That is why the Prices and Incomes Commission is examining and investigating the recent profit figures of the chartered banks of Canada. It should be obvious that unless there is an early and marked reversal of the recent upward trend of labour costs, executive salary and income costs, there can be no possibility of consolidating recent progress in containing price increases, let alone continuing to move in the direction of reasonable price stability.

I now turn to the efforts of the Prices and Incomes Commission to work out, with Canadian labour leaders, a co-operative program to put reasonable limits on wage and salary increases away above productivity levels. The commission was appointed last spring. During the summer it met with Canadian labour and business leaders. It hoped to be able to put together a national consensus on restraint that would have contained inflation more than it has today. It is a matter of regret that on October 17 the leaders of organized labour rejected any approach to the problem which incorporated an explicit formula limiting wage and salary increases. After consultation with business and government the commission decided to explore a narrower approach in which firms alone would take the first step in a commitment even though a corresponding degree of restraint on the cost side could not be guaranteed. Had the commission been successful at that time in working out the kind of agreement it was endeavouring to work out, and had the leaders of organized labour in Canada gone along with that arrangement, there is no doubt in my mind that we would be suffering less from inflation and there would be less unemployment.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

TIME OF ADJOURNMENT THIS DAY

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, further to the suggestion of the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) there have been discussions. It appears there may be consent to the following order, that notwithstanding the special order made earlier this day, the ordinary time of daily adjournment for this day's sitting shall be 10 p.m. If I am right in that assumption, perhaps that could be made an order of the House.

Mr. Aiken: Speaking on behalf of the official opposition, Mr. Speaker, we agree to this order being made, without in any way withdrawing the fundamental objections expressed earlier this afternoon by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield). In fact, had we been able to have this debate on a more suitable occasion, it might not have been necessary to make this order. In any case, we do agree.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, we agree to this order. It puts us back where we were this afternoon before the kerfuffle which we thought was quite unnecessary. At any rate, we do agree.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

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

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 58—DISAPPROVAL OF CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES OF GOVERNMENT

The House resumed consideration of the motion (Mr. Stanfield):

That this House express its disapproval of the administrative policies of the government by opposing items in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1971; and in particular vote 1 of the Department of Agriculture, vote 10, Communications and Post Office, vote 5 of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, vote 1 of the Privy Council and votes 1 and 5 of the Treasury Board.

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock I was reciting the history of the Prices and Incomes Commission in endeavouring to enter into co-operative arrangements with the leaders of organized labour. I expressed the disappointment of the government and of the commission at the announcement that those representatives

would take no part in such arrangements. The commission followed up this effort by holding on February 9 and 10 a national conference on price stability.

• (8:10 p.m.)

The Canadian Labour Congress, which now has called for a conference, of course could have been at that conference had they acted differently in the fall. Following the conference of February, the Prices and Incomes Commission held further discussions with leaders of organized labour in which it was pointed out that wage and salary earners as a group could not disclaim responsibility for playing a part in the general restraint program. On March 23, in their annual submissions to the government both the CLC and the CNTU rejected again the principle of restraint on incomes. At the May conference of the CLC this position was restated.

As the House knows, on June 5 at the federal-provincial ministers of finance meeting the commission sought the support of governments in applying wage and salary criteria of 6 per cent including fringe benefits. The objective is to assure progress in reducing cost and price increases, permitting the federal government to relax further fiscal and monetary restraint. This proposal was fully supported by the federal government and is presently being considered by provincial governments.

As the House knows again, on June 16, this week, the commission met with the executive council of the CLC to discuss this proposal. No progress in modifying the CLC's attitude can be reported to date. The Canadian Labour Congress has now made a most intriguing suggestion following the meeting of June 16 although it was not discussed at the meeting, that the government convene a national meeting of government, industry and labour representatives with the assistance of the best technical personnel available to work toward effective and equitable solutions. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the government is a little puzzled by such a suggestion at this time. This is the reason I am placing on the record the record of the negotiations. We as a government have great confidence in the Prices and Incomes Commission which has demonstrated, surely, by word, deed and goodwill its desire to find effective and equitable solutions.

If there is to be a conference, the Prices and Incomes Commission is the instrument for organizing such a conference. Having put 18 months of effort into establishing the Prices and Incomes Commission and its machinery, we are not at this point going to junk it and start out with some other kind of machinery. This latest suggestion by the Canadian Labour Congress was not discussed with the commission on June 16, nor has it been discussed with any member of the government despite the very many opportunities that have been presented to do so. Therefore, it is a little difficult for me to know precisely the intention of the Canadian Labour Congress. What is it that the Canadian Labour Congress would hope to see emerge from such a conference? Within the same statement calling for the conference the president of the CLC said:

> We are involved not in a national inflation but in a universal inflation over which our internal policies have little if any control.

It would seem to me to be of little use for the government to call an organized conference simply to be told that all our problems are beyond our control and are because of the effect of the Viet Nam war or something else. It is the view of this government that there are things we can do with the Canadian economy. While we are subject to international forces, there are things we can do in Canada to improve our price performance and price stability. If such a conference were useful, the Prices and Incomes Commission is the body to organize it, but surely we should have some indication that there will be something meaningful forthcoming from such a conference. Surely, before calling or organizing such a conference we should have some indication that it will be successful and will make progress toward better price stability in Canada.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the minister, but I am afraid his time has expired. Is there unanimous consent to allow the minister to continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful to the House for allowing me this time, and I shall shorten my remarks as much as possible. As I say, surely we are entitled to some indication that such a conference to be organized by the commission will be successful. We will wait with interest to see whether any such indication is forthcoming.

Because of the remarks made in this House today and on previous occasions I should like to mention briefly some of the work the com-

mission is now doing in an effort to show that it is having an effect on inflation in Canada and is improving our price stability picture. As the House knows, the commission held a national conference on price stability in February from which certain criteria emerged in respect of price increases under which price increases had to be clearly less than cost increases. The commission set in motion the whole machinery of price review panels to ensure that business leaders in Canada were observing the pricing criteria agreed to. At the present time 40 reviews are being carried out by the Prices and Incomes Commission. These cover a whole range of items such as bread, milk, processed foods, edible oils, rubber tires, cement, tin containers, air fares, freight rates, copper, construction costs, coffee, razor blades, fine papers and others.

One result of this work is in respect of, for example, a very basic commodity such as copper. As a result of the work of the Prices and Incomes Commission, with the support the government has given, the price of Canadian copper—a very basic commodity in our economy—is now 59 cents a pound. As a result of that action alone, and that small part of the program, the Canadian fabricator has saved at least $30 million a year. This is a saving to the Canadian economy, and ultimately to the Canadian consumer, of $30 million. In the case of aluminum, while our export price has been increasing the commission has persuaded the company to keep its Canadian price down. This has meant a savings to the Canadian consumer of $1,500,000 per annum. Another matter of concern and interest to housewives is the work done in respect of glass containers. One company announced an increase for 1970, and as a result of the commission's work some of this increase was rolled back, at a saving to the Canadian consumer of $400,000 a year.

Those are just three rather small instances of the work of the prices review panels and of the Prices and Incomes Commission. I could discuss other aspects of its work which have been agreed to and supported by provincial governments. There was a document released only yesterday with regard to its retail price surveillance program. It states that the Prices and Incomes Commission now is operating a system of regular checks which effectively monitor the largest stores in the retail trade in Canada. The retail monitoring system used has already resulted in the rollback of some price increases. But, most important, it has resulted in manufacturers, processors, supermarkets, department and variety stores being much more aware that any price increase which is to be passed along to the consumer must clearly be within the guidelines. We had an encouraging price index for the month of May. While, obviously, the Prices and Incomes Commission cannot claim all the credit for that, I submit its activities are making an important contribution in restraining price and profit levels.

The commission is aware that many Canadian firms are absorbing at least part of the cost increases in order to meet the commission's criteria and restrain price increases. The commission is aware of such instances in the food processing industry and in a variety of other fields such as milk, luggage, dyestuffs, stoves, washing machines, glass containers, certain chemicals, steel products, copper and aluminum—which I have mentioned—and others. So the program is having an effect. The impact of the program, as with any sort of prices and incomes program, cannot be measured by statistics alone, reviews, studies or price increases. The real success of the program should be evaluated in terms of price increases which have not taken place or which have been smaller than they would have been without the criteria. Its success is that Canadian industry appears to be accepting and applying the price restraint criteria to their pricing policies for 1970, and this should in turn be reflected in a slowdown in the rate of price increases. There has been a slowdown on profits in the first quarter, resulting partly from the work of the commission.

• (8:20 p.m.)

I could detail the work of the commission with regard to professional fees, which are always debated in the House, and the commitment it has received from the Canadian Medical Association, the Canadian Dental Association, the legal profession, professional engineers, architects and chartered accountants. I have here a document relating to what the provinces have done as a result of the federal-provincial conference, following the conference on price stability, with regard to revising their rents under the landlord and tenant acts. Some provinces have indicated, as a result of the meeting in Winnipeg the other day, that they will review what they have already done.

However, in spite of what the commission does on the price side, no matter what commitments it gets from business to restrain

prices, no matter what the provinces do with regard to rents, or what professional bodies do in restricting increases, it is perfectly clear to me that there is no way in which we can completely solve this problem unless there is some restraint on the wages and salaries side. There is no way in which such an important component of total production costs as wages and salaries can continue to rise as rapidly as they have in recent months without resulting sooner or later in substantial price increases to consumers.

Difficult market conditions, in combination with the existing price restraint program, are requiring many firms to absorb part of these cost increases, thus lowering profits. But there are limits to how far large increases in labour costs can be absorbed through declining profits before firms begin to cut back on their hiring and expansion plans. Nor would it be realistic to count on the continued co-operation of the business community in limiting price increases, or professional groups in limiting fee increases, if there were no limit on wage and salary increases. For that reason the government is lending its full support to the extension of the existing restraint program to include limits on wage and salary increases including—and I make this clear—executive salaries, monthly salaries and non-unionized salaries, as well as on increases in prices and other forms of income.

It is a matter of regret that in this kind of program, which is beginning to have an effect and which has been put in place with a great deal of effort, we seem to be able to expect absolutely no co-operation and no help from the New Democratic Party. By broadening the fight against inflation we can not only save existing jobs in our economy but act responsibly to create new job opportunities. Surely that is what this country needs. By maintaining and, where possible, strengthening our price restraint program—I emphasize that all our options are open—and by having an effective 6 per cent ceiling on salary and wage costs we can turn the economy around much faster than we could by simply using the traditional instruments available to a government in these situations. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) will discuss this question in more detail later.

The job of the Prices and Incomes Commission is not a very easy one. In fact, it is a very difficult one, often a very frustrating one. But I submit that it is having an effect on our economy and is contributing to a better price performance in Canada. It is encouraging price stability in Canada. For all these reasons it is worth while persisting with these policies no matter how difficult it may be. As I said this afternoon, the whole program would have been more successful if we could have counted on a greater degree of co-operation from all those in the private sector who are making price and wage decisions. Inflation would not be running at the rate it is today, nor would the rate of unemployment be as high had the commission received more co-operation than it has.

I hope that all the people of this country who are suffering from inflation, and those who are unemployed as well as the workers themselves and the housewives of Canada, will realize that the work of the commission would have been more successful had the NDP and its leader not deliberately set out 18 months ago to sabotage its efforts; and surely this is what they have done in the House and across the country every day for the last 18 months. I hope that those who are suffering most from inflation will recognize, as we do, that the people from whom we have received the least help and co-operation are the members of the NDP.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I am participating in this debate because I have had to give notice of our opposition to certain items as a mechanism to the consideration by this House of some of the problems that were raised during debate of the estimates. I want to preface my remarks with regard to the particular items I have posted with some remarks on the work of committees in so far as the study of estimates is concerned. I have been very disappointed in the actual results. It is not that we cannot talk to ministers or to officials during the study of estimates. I know of no case where they have not made themselves available to the degree possible in their very busy lives, at least those with whom I have come into contact, and I think I speak generally for my colleagues, in saying that about officials from most if not all of the branches of government. I do not think they have been in any way reticent in discussing the estimates. The only difficulty is in getting the information out into the open.

There is a mad rush, when the study of estimates is being undertaken, to have all possible committees sitting at one time so that even the government side, which has large numbers of members available, has to put on platoons or squads running from one committee to another merely to sit there and peri-

odically provide quorums if there is to be a vote. Those members in most cases have not heard one iota of the evidence, nor have they been able to read one word of the evidence because no transcript has been available. Therefore, it has been merely an exercise of political muscle. The press is not in a position to cover all these meetings. The resources are not there and it would be unreasonable to believe they could be there.

Mr. Nesbitt: They were covering the Quebec election.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): I recognize the mammoth difficulty in trying to get the transcripts of evidence before members so that the meetings become meaningful. We know that in the past when estimates were discussed in the House and a real problem arose, we could refer to the daily *Hansard* and to comments of all kinds by the press regarding major points of issue that were raised in the committees' studies of the estimates. Now that is all gone. It is almost government by default, government by snuffing out.

I say that the responsibility is that of the government in that the system that was set up was established before there were adequate facilities to deal with the estimates. The net result is that practically nothing, or very little that has been discussed in the estimates has reached the public's ear. Therefore we have to use these few opposition days during the month of June because the estimates are rushed in for completion by the end of May and we do not receive the transcripts until nearly the end of June.

• (8:30 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, it is the most frustrating type of operation to be able to discuss the estimates. After all, the job of Parliament is the passing of estimates, the consideration of supply and the granting of supply. Its main job is not to line up and say yea or nay to scores of government bills, many of which are mere housekeeping, albeit important. And as to the legislation, we have the same problems there with the committee system. So I do not apologize for hosting the items I have, in order to draw to the attention of the House the particulars with respect to the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and the Department of Manpower and Immigration that I want to touch on briefly this evening.

I am particularly concerned with the parks branch of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. This has been a longstanding war, and I say "war" quite advisedly, although it has been rather quiescent of late. I suppose the government was waiting for the Supreme Court decision in the case of the permanent leases, and of course ever since the Supreme Court decided in favour of the leaseholders and not the government, the government has been very quiet about the national parks. We have not heard any more about Bill C-152 and I presume that bill will die where it is. It certainly should.

There has been a long history, going back over many years, of absolute frustration on the part of the people in the two principal national parks, those which have the largest number of residents. For some reason or another there is a conception in the parks branch that people should not be living in the parks and that those already there should be eliminated. This is trying to turn back the calendar, to eliminate thousands of people who reside there. Banff and Jasper are two very particular types of parks. They are the two main parks in this country, and they are mountain parks. But the people in them are regarded as second-class citizens. They cannot have any local organization that is meaningful. They cannot qualify for many of the benefits and the facilities allowed to townspeople in other communities in Alberta. They are not allowed an elective council. There is no local government at all. It is all handled on a long-range basis through Ottawa. There are various layers of officials stretching from here to the parks. There are town managers. But frankly, Mr. Speaker, if you ask the men at the park level what authority they have, you find it almost limited to acting as postmen, passing citizens' requests on to Ottawa. They cannot make meaningful decisions at the local level. It is as frustrating for them as it is for the park residents. This is a situation that has continued for many years.

First there is the question of the parks branch trying to eliminate the bona fide leases held by the park residents. If you are a resident and want to carry out an improvement on your property, because there is a renewal clause in your lease, a permit is required. That is all right; development must be controlled; it is not a Topsy-like operation in the parks. The people accept this. But it should not be used as a blackjack. To get a permit a person now has to turn in his lease and take out a terminable lease. This is what the officials now insist upon. The list of difficulties is long. A committee of this House

went out to the parks a few years ago and held public hearings, Whatever recommendations it may have made, they have been ignored. Whatever representations were made by the townspeople in the parks, they were ignored. As a matter of fact, life got tougher for them.

More and more tourists are travelling through the parks. Now that the Yellowhead Highway has been built through Jasper there is no way of rubbing it out. Scores of thousands more tourists travel that route. If members visited the area during the next two months they would see the difficulties tourists have to face because there has been a reluctance to keep up with progress in providing them with decent facilities. The government spends thousands of dollars on tourist promotion with regard to the two principal national parks; but when people arrive there, what do they get? Unless they have made reservations months in advance, they find it almost impossible to get accommodation. They have to bring their own trailers and tents, but there are not enough facilities for these. The facilities that are there are of good quality—I will not dispute that—but they are not sufficient to cope with the situation.

With regard to public health and welfare services that are provided in the province of Alberta, and considering the availability of senior citizens' homes and all that sort of thing, I believe there should be some form of local self-government so that an appropriate authority could be established to handle these matters, for instance in the townsite of Banff. It is no answer to say that such an organization could be established outside the limits of the park. What would this mean in Jasper, which is 25 miles from the park gate? They wanted laundry facilities in Jasper. What were they told? They were told to establish new laundry facilities at Hinton, 50 miles away. That is incomprehensible. There are many difficulties which require a far more intelligent, humane and human approach.

No one wants a Coney Island, unrestricted type of development in the parks. But it should be pointed out that these are huge parks. Only a very small portion of them is required for development to handle the millions of tourists who go through the parks. I do not have faith in the administration of the parks, at least so far as those two particular parks are concerned. I do not speak about those in the Atlantic provinces or about what may be developed in Quebec—and I hope we will see some more national parks in Ontario. My concern at the moment is with regard to the national parks in Alberta, which comprise the great majority of the area of national parks in Canada. They are of tremendous size. The government simply cannot tell the people of that province that they must develop other parks, because practically all the eastern slope of the Rockies from Edmonton south to below the international boundary is taken up with national parks. All the best areas have been pre-empted. We want to develop them for winter skiing; we do not want them to remain just as game conservation areas.

• (8:40 p.m.)

Over 90 per cent of these parks will never be touched and can be kept as wildlife reserves. On the other hand, let us have a little bit of reason. I have heard people say we should erect a ten-foot fence around the national parks, put a great chain and a padlock on the gates, lock it and throw away the key. This is an extreme view, of course, but one held by some people who have something to say about the administration of our parks.

Now I want to say something about immigration, Mr. Speaker, and I put forward two items. First of all, I think our present immigration program is based on the wrong conception, the conception that Canada will go scouring the world for the better educated, better trained individuals of other countries. In other words, Canada says to the world, "Give us your best people; we will take them". In this day and age, Mr. Speaker, that just is not possible. In this country we have absorbed scores of thousands of people who came here without any discernible skills, though some of them picked up skills here. But they all possess the desire to work. We should check today to see how many of their children are going to university. They are property holders and in the main they live a good life and are happy. Of course, there are exceptions but most of them have proved to be good citizens.

We say now, Mr. Speaker, that this category of potential immigrant must be kept away; that we do not want them. There is a complete disregard of regional requirement in the policy. We have very narrow selection criteria and a selection system that is difficult for the officials to interpret. I am sure they go through all sorts of agonizing periods before making judgments, but I think they are getting the wrong people and placing them in the wrong areas. I am objecting to govern-

ment policy. The transcript of the hearing of April 28 shows that I discussed this matter with the Deputy Minister and his officials. I have no quarrel personally with individuals in the department, but I think their policies are wrong and in some cases I think the interpretation of them is far too restrictive. One example is national standards for certain categories. Mr. Speaker, we have no national standards. We cannot fit people from Vancouver to St. John's, Newfoundland, in the same slot, though that seems to be the practical result.

Then we have the heartbreaking situation, which I think should be reviewed, of people allowed to come into the country on a visa and then having them apply for landed immigrant status. They may have already landed a job, or in some cases may be working surreptitiously and doing quite well, but they do not qualify for the 50 points. Surely they should be entitled to an appeal. A sponsor of an immigrant who is still abroad cannot appeal an assessment. It seems to me that if a man is here and has a bona fide disagreement with the assessing officer, he should have a right to appeal without having to go through the procedure of a special inquiry making a deportation order and then going before the appeal board, with the deportation order being reissued. I know the Deputy Minister has indicated that there may be a study made with a view to altering this procedure, and I hope the department comes up with a fast answer. The officials indicated that there were almost 2,000 appeals pending before the immigration appeal board and that despite its Trojan efforts it is falling behind in this respect.

The mere fact that there are almost 2,000 appeals against the points assessment indicates that something is wrong. We get the situation of an individual who is already here, appealing to the immigration appeal board and having to wait 18 months or two years for a decision. On the information that has been disclosed, there does not seem to be any hope of improvement at the present time unless there is a wholesale reassessment of the system. I do not think the answer lies in doubling or trebling the size of the board. I suggest that the answer lies in having a simpler appeal procedure without the indignity of going through deportation proceedings. It is for that reason that I withhold my consent to these items.

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words about questions which were raised by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) and the leader of the New Democratic Party this afternoon concerning unemployment and the economic situation in Canada. We as Liberals are very unhappy that the rate of unemployment is high in Canada at the present time. In fact, it is almost up to the lowest level that was attained during the period of the former Tory government, and it is at the highest level since we formed a Liberal government in 1963. I should like to say a few words about the unemployment situation—

[Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West).]

An hon. Member: You didn't inherit it, as we did.

Mr. Benson: The number of workers with jobs increased sharply during May. The seasonally adjusted increase of 63,000 jobs represented a rise of 10 per cent at annual rates over the previous month. This compares with an average increase in employment during the 1960's of just under 4 per cent. It was, therefore, more than twice the average rate of employment growth during the last decade. This growth might have been even larger if it had not been for the effect of strikes in British Columbia and Quebec which I will mention later.

Seasonally adjusted, the labour force increased at a still faster pace. It rose by 1.4 per cent—118,000 persons—in May over April. This is a considerably larger increase than has taken place in any month since 1953. This increase of 1.4 per cent in the size of the labour force, seasonally adjusted, compares with an average increase in May between 1953 and 1969 of .2 per cent and the previous increase in the labour force last month is seven times larger than the average 1953-1969 increase of May.

Despite the substantial increase in employment in May, the even more extraordinary increase in the labour force resulted in an increase in unemployment of 55,000 persons on a seasonally adjusted basis. This, of course, includes students coming into the labour force. Almost half of the increase in the labour force, 58,000, involved those in the 29 to 24-year age group. In this age group, 27,000 of the increase remained unemployed, accounting for half the total increase in unemployment of 55,000 on a seasonally adjusted basis. It may well be that a number of these persons were students unable to find work. The increase of 58,000 in this age group is exceptionally large; it is nearly three times

as great as the 21,000 increase recorded in the same month last year, which was far above any May since 1965.

• (8:50 p.m.)

A significant increase in labour force participation rates under way since last November for women and for men in the 14-24 age group has also contributed to the sharp growth of the labour force in May. The reasons for this increase are not yet clear. During May, 67,320 workers were involved in work stoppages due to industrial disputes. While this was considerably below the total in the same period last year, these stoppages appear to have had a major affect in causing lay-offs of workers in other industries. This was particularly true of British Columbia, where the strike of a relatively small number of towboat operators, 1,630, virtually crippled pulp, newsprint and lumber operations in the province and reflected a sharp increase in unemployment in British Columbia.

In Quebec, work stoppages involving 26,545 workers, particularly in the Montreal construction trades, contributed to a lesser extent to the deterioration of the unemployment picture in that province. More than half the 55,000 increase in total unemployment on a seasonal basis took place in Quebec—29,000, with the bulk of the remainder, 23,000, occurring in British Columbia. This may reflect the relatively slow growth of capital investment in the province compared with other areas of Canada, which in turn may be related to political circumstances.

The government is concerned about the level of unemployment, and in fact a number of steps have been taken both in the budget and since to relax the restraints of fiscal and monetary policies. While some impetus has been given to the economy, the problem of inflation remains a serious one, as was pointed out by the Leader of the Opposition. Although some initial and tentative progress has been made in slowing down the rate of price increases, the continued upward spiral of costs, particularly of wages and prices, threatens to undermine this progress.

The government has taken the position that it is anxious to promote a greater rate of economic growth and increased employment. Before doing so, however, it is necessary to obtain assurances that cost pressures are beginning to ease. In the absence of such assurance, policies aimed at promoting a faster rate of economic growth run the danger of renewing inflationary pressures in the economy. This emphasizes the importance of obtaining co-operation from labour in the national restraint program launched by the Prices and Incomes Commission.

As indicated in my March 12 budget, the essential problem is that of maintaining a sound economic balance in the conditions confronting the country. As repeatedly pointed out, the fundamental objective of the government is to halt the inflationary spiral of costs and prices in order to pave the way for a return to the path of strong but stable economic growth. The budget emphasized that we would face a hard task in bringing about a significant reduction in the rate of price and cost increases. The budget speech warned that the economy would probably grow at a slower rate than in 1969, as would also the increase in employment. The result would be some increase in unemployment.

In my budget speech I fully anticipated that difficult wage negotiations lay ahead. I said, "Some of these negotiations may issue in strikes—perhaps prolonged ones—before settlements are reached." The budget provided for some easing of the restraints imposed by the fiscal position of the federal government, which was matched at the time by some easing of monetary restraint. As anticipated, the economy has continued to grow at a moderate rate. There has, nevertheless, been some increase in unemployment during the course of the year. This is a direct consequence of the fight we must continue to wage against the inflationary pressures that pose such a serious threat to our future prosperity.

Since the budget was introduced last March there has been a further easing of both fiscal and monetary restraints. The government has decided against proceeding with the budget proposal to establish consumer credit controls. During the recent federal-provincial conference of finance ministers and provincial treasurers, further measures were announced that would have the effect of further easing the fiscal restraint of the federal government through increased payments of $300 million in the current year to provincial governments. On the monetary side, the lending rate of the Bank of Canada has been reduced from 8½ to 7½ per cent since the budget and there has been a decline in the level of interest rates generally, particularly for short-term securities.

In addition to providing a further moderate degree of stimulus to the economy as a whole, the government has formulated specific plans aimed at increasing student employment

during the summer months. I should like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that most of the problem of increased unemployment in May arose from strikes in British Columbia and Quebec and from students entering the labour force.

On Thursday, June 11, the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen) reported to the House of Commons on the total government effort to provide summer jobs for students, a program which aims at providing 36,000 openings for students this summer at an estimated cost of $27.9 million. He announced a program aimed at employing 17,200 students this summer at a possible salary cost of $18.5 million. He also said that within two weeks his department would open 33 additional special offices to serve students. These, and the 40 already operating, will be manned by students.

The defence department is launching four job-creating projects: ground maintenance at bases across Canada, range clearance at Gagetown and Valcartier bases, opportunity to serve in the militia, and increased cadet training. This should employ about 10,500 students. Another 300 students could enrol in leadership courses, for which Canadian Red Cross Youth has been approached about assuming responsibility. These five projects will cost about $7.9 million.

The Secretary of State's department expects that about 1,800 additional applications wil be received for the student travel program. This department is also launching a project to teach French or English to some 1,000 students. With the help of the defence department, an effort will be made to establish drop-in centres in major cities to provide beds for students travelling throughout the country. The manpower department has also approached the Canadian Red Cross Youth to allow the department to provide funds to extend its educational projects to all provinces. The Minister of Manpower and Immigration also noted that the Canadian Chamber of Commerce is providing leadership in encouraging its membership to provide additional openings for students.

Since the beginning of the year some tentative progress has been made in slowing down the rate of price increases. In May, the consumer price index declined by .1 per cent from the previous month, which is the first such decrease recorded for this month-to-month period since 1962. The two-year increase in the index of 3.8 per cent was the lowest in the past 15 months. Contrary to the contention of many critics both inside and outside the House, Canada has made some significant strides in dealing with the problem of inflation. It may be noted that the decline in the rate of price increases in this country comes at a time when the rate of price increases appears to be accelerating or at least maintaining a high rate in a number of other countries, including the United States. This appears to challenge the often-heard argument that there is little Canada can do on its own to combat an inflationary problem that is world-wide.

This initial progress in reducing the inflationary rise in prices has to date not been matched by a comparable decline in cost pressures. The continuing sharp rise of wages and salaries, in particular, seriously threatens to undermine the progress we have made on the price side unless it is brought under control. Because of the existence of more moderate economic conditions, many employers are less able to absorb high wage and salary settlements through the process of increasing prices. They are being forced to become more resistant to continuing high union demands, which in turn have led to increasing industrial strife.

In its brief to the cabinet last March, the Canadian Labour Congress suggested that existing economic conditions would soon have "an appreciable dampening effect on the rate of wage increases" this year. Up to now, however, there has been no significant evidence of any slowdown in the rate of wage increases. As the House is aware, representatives of organized labour in Canada have repeatedly refused to play any part in the national effort to bring about cost and price restraint on a voluntary basis. This position was reiterated by Donald MacDonald, president of the Canadian Labour Congress, at its convention in Edmonton last month. "We shall not accept guidelines, not only because they are unfair and unworkable, but because they pose a threat to the very system of collective bargaining itself," Mr. MacDonald said. "So far as the Canadian Labour Congress is concerned, the trade unions will continue to bargain for wage increases which, in their opinion, represent the legitimate demands of their members."

• (9:00 p.m.)

Earlier this week the Congress again put itself on record as being flatly opposed to supporting the kind of wage and salary guidelines proposed by the Prices and Incomes Commission to the federal-provincial

conference of finance ministers and treasurers, in Winnipeg. While Mr. MacDonald suggested that the government convene a national conference to discuss the general problem of inflation, the Canadian Labour Congress president once again did not suggest any alternative form of approach that might be considered in an effort to end the spiral of costs and prices. At a press conference he declined even to acknowledge that the recent rate of wage and salary increases contributed in any way to the inflationary pressures that continue to exist in the economy. Given that stance on the part of the CLC, it is difficult to conceive what constructive purpose would be served by a national conference which is now proposed, after having refused to join in a similar gathering proposed by the Prices and Incomes Commission last fall.

Mr. Orlikow: Tell us about the banks.

Mr. Benson: As my colleague—

Mr. Orlikow: Tell us about the 27 per cent increase in the profits of the banks.

Mr. Benson: The banks made an agreement with the Prices and Incomes Commission. The Prices and Incomes Commission is now examining the activities of the banks in this regard, to see whether they have lived up to this agreement. At least it will be made public. We have some power in this Parliament to look at what the banks are doing.

Mr. Orlikow: May I ask the minister a question? Assuming that the Prices and Incomes Commission finds that the bank statements are correct, and that they had an increase in profits of 27.5 per cent over last year, can that be rolled back in order to stay within the guidelines?

Mr. Benson: The banks have made an agreement with the Prices and Incomes Commission, which the hon. member could read if he so wanted. If the banks have not lived up to this agreement, I believe they deserve the censure of us all. The hon. member talks about a 27.5 per cent profit increase, without considering the assets involved, the shareholders' investment and the return to the shareholders. It is always easy to say that because business is making more money, labour should have more money. I agree that labour should have a fair return for its efforts and should share fairly in the profits or the net returns of a business. Hon. members of the NDP from time to time argue and pick out a figure without ever considering the return of investment to the ordinary person in Canada investing in that institution.

As my colleague, the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Côté), indicated to the House earlier this week, the government is more than anxious to see the development of conditions that will permit an expansion of the Canadian economy. I do not agree with the leader of the NDP that the government can spend its way out of inflation. It does not work that way, and the hon. member knows it. He is afraid to admit it. He advocated this afternoon that the government of Canada can get out of inflation by spending hundreds of millions of dollars. That will do nothing more than increase inflation. The leader of the NDP knows as well as I that the only source of those funds is an expansion of the banking system, which will create inflation in this country.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Will the minister permit a question? Does the minister say the only way it is possible for the government to control inflation is to create artificial scarcity and unemployment?

Mr. Benson: Not at all, Mr. Speaker. That is not what I said. I do not agree with that. I believe that when a country is fighting inflation, two steps must first be taken. These are the restrictions of fiscal and monetary controls. No country in the world, democratic, socialist or communist, has ever fought its way out of inflation through the use of price and wage controls alone. It is necessary to use fiscal and monetary measures first; then it is necessary to move to some sort of policy of trying to control cost increases.

We have continuously appealed to Canadian governments, business and the labour movement to be modest in their demands and not demand more from the economy than is coming to them from increased productivity. We got a reaction from the business side. The reaction from the labour side is in effect telling the government to go to blazes. They want all they can get out of the economy. They are not worried about the problems of the people who are unemployed or hurt by inflation, such as the poor and those on fixed incomes.

As my colleague the Minister of National Revenue indicated to the House earlier this week, the government is more than anxious to see the development of conditions that will permit an expansion of economic growth in

Canada. As he noted, it is at present giving a further significant stimulus to the economy. Before such measures can be implemented, however, it is essential to obtain concrete evidence of a slowdown in the rate of wage and salary increases, which is a prerequisite for a return to relative price stability. Were the government to take major steps to spur economic growth in the absence of such evidence, it would run the very real risk of adding more fuel to the inflationary fires, eventually making it necessary to resume the battle against inflation all over again.

The leader of the NDP suggested this afternoon that we could solve this problem by building indices into pensions and a great many other things in Canada, in order to offset inflation. I refer him to the experience in Brazil when they tried to do such things. The minister of finance of that country has become a hero because he has cut down inflation from 100 per cent a year to 20 per cent a year. We cannot stand that in Canada.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): May I ask the minister a question?

Mr. Benson: Just a minute.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) rising on a point of order? The minister has the floor and should not be interrupted except on a point of order.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The minister is either deliberately or unconsciously trying to distort what I said this afternoon. I did not suggest the government should keep on issuing money to carry on a program against inflation. The minister is aware that I said that if a program of expansion to relieve unemployment was likely to cause inflation, the government should implement a comprehensive program of selective control in respect of all forms of income. The minister knows—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That is not a point of order. The Standing Order makes it possible for the hon. member to speak a second time to correct a statement made by the minister, if he thinks he has been misquoted. The minister has the floor.

Mr. Benson: If I did misinterpret the statement of the hon. member this afternoon, I sincerely apologize. I simply repeat that the government cannot spend its way out of inflation; nor can price and wage controls, which the hon. member was really talking about this afternoon, control inflation per se. Price and wage restraint can be of help, whether it be done through controls or voluntary methods. It can be a help in the control of inflation. I challenge the hon. member to point out any country in the world where price and wage controls, without using fiscal and monetary policies as well, have ever controlled inflation.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): They have to be selective and directive.

Mr. Benson: Even if they are selective and directive they do not do the job if the other measures are not used as well. I challenge the hon. member to indicate any democratic country in the world where this has worked.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The minister misunderstood me. I stated that the monetary and fiscal measures must be selective. We are not denying—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, I maintain that our monetary and fiscal measures have been selective.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): No, they have not.

Mr. Benson: I think if the hon. member looks at the unemployment figures that have been produced he will see that the programs we have evolved aid areas which have not developed as fast as the rest of Canada, such as the Maritimes. The rate of increase in unemployment has not been as high in that area as in other areas. The exception is Quebec, where there were particular circumstances last month with regard to a great many strikes. Over 29,000 people were on strike which, as the hon. member knows, caused other people to be unemployed at the same time.

• (9:10 p.m.)

I should like to stress that until organized labour is prepared to join with other sectors of the economy in the national effort now under way to bring inflation under control, it must accept a major share of responsibility for the economic conditions which now prevail and for the resulting increase in unemployment this year. As I emphasized in the

House on June 8, the federal government remains determined to break the back of inflation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Benson: We are hopeful that the guidelines policy proposed by the Prices and Incomes Commission, together with other policies, will enable us to achieve that goal. How quickly we achieve it and at what cost to the economy in terms of slow growth, of loss of income and of unemployment, in no small measure lies in the hands of organized labour to determine. In conclusion, I should like to add that we have used fiscal and monetary measures as much as I should like to see us use them. We should like to ease up fiscal and monetary measures, but we can only do so if we have co-operation and if people not only in labour but in government and business do not try to take more out of the economy than they are putting into it by way of increased productivity.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Orlikow: May I ask the minister a question?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member may ask a question if the minister is prepared to reply.

Mr. Orlikow: The minister has been talking about guidelines and restraint on the part of the workers. I ask whether he has devised policies which would impose some restraint on salary increases of senior professional people, including government officials. I would point out that the salary of the minister's own deputy has increased by about 30 per cent in the last three years.

Mr. Benson: As the hon. member knows very well, executive salaries follow the salaries granted to employees after collective bargaining. He knows this as well as I do. As those salaries increase, executive salaries increase proportionately. Until organized labour accepts reasonable settlements, we shall not find reasonable increases in executive and similar salaries. I would add that in the public service the salaries of executives, except at the highest level, are determined by collective bargaining and in very few cases has this question gone to arbitration. The fixing of salaries through collective bargaining agreements has determined the raises necessary for the top public servants who would otherwise be getting less than the people who are supposedly working under them. I would be glad to give the hon. member evidence of this.

Mr. Orlikow: Is it not true that the salaries of Deputy Ministers and Assistant Deputy Ministers have gone up by an average of 10 per cent or more in each of the last two or three years, which is more than the ordinary—

Mr. Benson: I should be glad to talk to the hon. member and show him the evidence. The increases were the result of collective bargaining on behalf of senior officials directly below the Deputy Minister level. Their salaries have been squeezed much closer to the salaries of Deputy Ministers. I would be glad to illustrate this for the hon. member.

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, if Canadians have any obsession, it appears to be over a national identity. The latest episode of this self-indulgence is in the CRTC ruling that more Canadian content is required in both the CBC and private networks. All the clichés since confederation have been dusted off and our new jingoistic nationalism about Canadian culture is once again to the fore. No one would deny that intelligent appraisal of Canadian culture and policies is wrong and much good may come out of a scrutiny of our entertainment. But any thinking person would question the wisdom of engineering Canadian culture by decree as a matter of national policy. The present CRTC ruling is an infringement of our right to see, read and hear what we choose, and thereby does more to damage than promote the development of the arts in Canada.

The CRTC has proposed that the CBC and private broadcasters serve the purpose of moulding national character. But surely the assertion that a distinct and excellent culture can be manufactured by reducing foreign competition on private national networks is wrong. If Canadian culture is to transcend mediocrity, it can only do so by meeting the challenge of free and open competition. There must be a free market of creativity; artists cannot flourish in servitude to a national policy. One of the most dangerous indications, as far as the survival of democracy is concerned, is the extent to which the CRTC is now dominating the industry and the extent to which the broadcasters are grovelling before its power. No one dares to speak up against this commission which has taken on all the trappings of a cultural bloody assizes.

Currently, the CRTC is standing behind two sets of rulings which if implemented will shut Canadian viewers up in a tower of isolation. The CRTC has taken upon itself to regulate not only Canadian broadcasting as to Canadian content but to tell Canadians what they may and may not see and hear in broadcasting from abroad. The ruling shutting off cablevision from the United States is one which Dr. Goebbels in his most totalitarian frenzy could not have bettered. In Russia you are not allowed to watch or listen to foreign programs. In other countries behind the iron curtain you are not allowed to watch or listen to foreign programs. In Red China you are not allowed to watch or listen to foreign programs. In Canada, if this ruling goes through, you will not be allowed to watch or listen to foreign programs except those chosen for you and declared harmless by the CRTC and Dr. Juneau.

No one in Canada has the right to regulate what Canadians shall see or hear. I maintain any such ruling by the CRTC is unconstitutional and invalid, and is certainly an infringement on the Bill of Rights. If they can shut out foreign television programs via cablevision, they can shut out foreign newspapers and magazines and we will have taken a long step toward totalitarian thought-control in this country. I maintain the CRTC does not have this power. Parliament never intended it to have this power. Nowhere in the act are they given the power to prevent access by Canadians to broadcasting originating in other countries. If this is permitted, they can prohibit shortwave radio and even records produced in the United States. I am not a lawyer, but this kind of intellectual and cultural separatism is so much against our traditions and the spirit of our laws and constitution that I say with confidence it goes far beyond any power ever confided by Parliament to this board.

Telling people what they can view and what they can hear is in the same category as telling them what they can read and what they can say. We are dealing with the field of communications. If this board has the power to do this, then Parliament must immediately clip its wings. I am prepared to move a motion to the effect that the production of cablevision programs from the United States, while subject to the ordinary rules governing broadcasting, shall not be prohibited by order of the board. The board, in other words, shall not have the power to prevent cablevision transmission. If that is not enough, we can go further. I feel that cablevision should be subject to our rules, but surely the board cannot cut it off completely without reducing this country to a totalitarian state.

I come now to the closely allied question of Canadian content. I charge that the board's position is purely one of strategy. The board has no intention of enforcing a 40 per cent Canadian content ruling because they know, first of all, they cannot define Canadian content. Secondly, they could not enforce it if they could define it. Some 70 per cent of CBC television now is from the United States. If you take out the news and a few afternoon shows, most of which feature United States personalities stopping over in Toronto, and the deadly CBC panel shows, what is left is produced in the United States. If it were not, the CBC would be one vast expanse of dead air—and that might be an improvement. On the CBC during prime time on Sunday nights we have that great Canadian show "Ed Sullivan"; we have "I Love Lucy" in old re-runs; we have "Mission Impossible", "Disneyland" and dozens of others, each and every one an American production. Thank God for them!

• (9:20 p.m.)

The board knows it cannot define Canadian content and that, I submit, is just a stick with which to beat the broadcasters. They are going to be pretty tame if they know at any time the board can step in and say, "Your Canadian content is down; we are going to close you up." How can they prove differently? Is "Bonanza" Canadian content? It has an hour of Lorne Greene, who is a Canadian. Is the "Rich Little" show Canadian content? If not, why not? When Bob Goulet does a guest shot on the "Carol Burnett" show, is it Canadian content? Is "Tom Jones" Canadian content? He is a Welshman. If not, what about the "Pig 'n Whistle"? Do British entertainers count as Canadian in Toronto, and foreign in New York? What about René Levesque; is he Canadian content? These are some of the problems which make it impossible to define Canadian content.

When you have a show written by Peppiatt and Aylesworth, with Percy Faith's music, starring Rich Little and Bob Goulet with Lorne Greene as guest star, produced in New York, how do you count that? Mr. Juneau used to have a prominent position in the National Film Board. That organization recently obtained large sums of money from Parliament on the pretext of making Canadian feature films. They went down to the United States and got Abbie Hoffman, one of

those charged with conspiracy to cause a riot in Chicago, and starred him in a film. Is that the idea of Canadian culture that the people of Canada are paying for? Is that what the CRTC has in mind? The utterly disgraceful situation is that money voted by this chamber to the National Film Board and the CBC has been squandered. Rather than producing Canadian culture, they have produced hydra-headed monstrosities, neither Canadian nor American and certainly not recognizable as culture of any description.

The best show on Canadian television today is on the French network, called "Moi et l'Autre". It is a very amusing comedy and a very Canadian production of which any Canadian can be proud. I say, then, that the Canadian content provision is simply a device whereby the CRTC hopes to tighten the screws on already grovelling Canadian broadcasters. If they do not toe the line, they will simply be told their culture content does not measure up. This is a purely totalitarian approach. It is the same approach used by Dr. Goebbels when he threatened people with the awful charge of non-Aryanism. Here we have non-Canadianism. Broadcasters will be threatened with an undefined, undefinable crime as a result of which their licence to broadcast can be arbitrarily removed. If necessary, this Parliament should take action completely to remove the power of the CRTC to ban cablevision in Canada and, secondly, to reduce the Canadian content requirement to the point where it becomes a useful and practical expression of nationalism and not a club to keep the broadcasters in line.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to quote from an editorial which appeared in the Montreal *Gazette* of May 28, 1970. It reads in part:

> There is a danger of contrived Canadianism in the new climate of nationalism in which the CRTC, in common with some other government agencies and with half of the federal cabinet itself, is working. In broadcasting, this takes the form of images and impressions designed to suggest that the homely social and cultural realities of Canada are more different from those of the United States than they actually are.

It goes on:

> The fact is that the CRTC is engaged in the business of trying to create something that broadcasting cannot create, namely a genuine sense of Canadian identity. Broadcasting can only reflect this sense to the degree that it freely exists in society.

And further:

> The CRTC's obsession is summed up by the chairman, Pierre Juneau, who says the commission wants to "allow Canadians to see the world through the eyes of Canadians, not through someone else's eyes." What really matters, whether you are looking at social situations, international problems or Expo 70, is that you be given a clear and honest view, unmodified by nationality.

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, I do not think there has been such an anti-labour bias in a government since the Winnipeg general strike of 50 years ago. It is a sad night to hear in this House of Commons the Minister of Consumer and Affairs (Mr. Basford) and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson), who have always prided themselves on and paraded themselves as being friends of labour, make such a biased attack on labour in Canada. When the Minister of Finance says he is determined to break the back of inflation in this country, this should really be translated, in terms of its practical effect, into saying that he is determined to break the back of the working man in this country.

I listened with interest to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs in his flight of fancy and his attack on the New Democratic Party in which he said it has frustrated the will of the government. For years the Liberal Party has been in large part living off the ideas generated in this party. At no time did they ever have the courtesy to give some credit to the work done and the advice offered by this party. Now they try to justify the failure of their policy by saying that our small group has frustrated that mighty Liberal party, with its majority, in trying to do something for the country. It was not this party that called for increased unemployment in this country; on the contrary, this party has consistently pointed out that the policies of the government would not work and that unemployment was not an answer. Now, belatedly, there is some faint hope that they also see it this way. Perhaps we should be flattered by the attention paid us tonight, but I am not flattered when it comes from the ignorance that exists on that side of the House.

An hon. Member: Oh, come now.

Mr. Saltsman: Well, I would hardly call your views enlightened. The great Liberal Party, the defender of the marketplace, over and over again has turned to us on this side of the House and said we are interfering with that sacred unit called the marketplace and that we must not play around with it or interfere with it. This government says that prices have to settle themselves and that the struggle in the marketplace for the allocation

awards in our society is sacrosanct. They tell us they are not going to interfere in the marketplace or with the allocation of capital. That is not where they are going to interfere. They are going to interfere with labour. Labour is to be kept down. They decided not to interfere with the sacred marketplace. What is to be interfered with? None other than labour.

These are the people who parade themselves in this country as friends of the layman and labour. When the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs vents his ire against us for not being co-operative and for not accepting his policy of restraint, he displays a fairly short memory. After all, we sat as members of the joint committee of the House of Commons and the other place which was set up to study consumer prices. That committee was set up because of our insistence. We insisted on having such a committee, and reluctantly the suggestion was finally accepted by the government. Who has been calling for a prices review board so long as I have been here? Not the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, but the New Democratic Party. Who has been calling for disclosure? Not the Liberal party, but this party. Who has been calling for an office of consumer affairs? It was this party which called for it some time ago.

• (9:30 p.m.)

Mr. Basford: You are trying to steal it from the CLC.

Mr. Saltsman: It certainly was not the Liberals. As a matter of fact, some day perhaps we will tell the story about how it was foisted on the Liberal party. Perhaps it was foisted on the minister as well, who was not very enchanted with the idea at the time.

Mr. Cafik: Your halo is slipping. Pick it up.

Mr. Saltsman: I do not have a halo. I am far more interested in having the House examine the truth of these ideas.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): He is just stripping off the masks of hypocrisy.

Mr. Saltsman: Both the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and the Minister of Finance criticized the NDP for being friends of labour. We are proud of that label. We are proud to be the friends of labour in this country, and at this time labour needs friends. Its only friends are to be found in this corner. As I have said, this government has deliberately embarked on an anti-labour policy. The entire charade of the Prices and Incomes Commission has been to back labour into a corner until they could eventually point the finger at the organized workers in the country.

When we say we are the friends of labour, it is not to say that we do not recognize that there are things within the labour movement with which we do not always agree. It would be impossible to say that there is any group of people in this country with whom one can agree completely. But on the whole we think people will recall that the trade labour movement in this country has done a magnificent job of raising the sights and increasing the opportunities of our working men.

Where would we be without the labour movement in this country? I am glad to note that the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) has applauded this course. He is a man who has long been familiar with labour. I know all about cabinet solidarity and that you have to put a bold face forward with regard to any decisions taken by the government, but I wonder how he can sit there and see the kind of things that this government is doing to the country. It must be very painful for a man with his background and with his knowledge of the labour movement in this country.

I want to make it very clear that this party has consistently supported the idea of restraint in times of national need. We are not recent converts to this idea. But what we have said is that it must be based on at least three principles. First of all, it must be enforceable and it must be applicable to all. It is no good saying that business has made pledges, as if it had stood up at a rally and said, "I will give so much." That does not mean a thing. When the labour movement signs something, they put their name to a document and they are held to it for three years. What will business be kept to? Business may say, three months or six months from now," we are sorry, but we have decided we are not going along with this policy." Why should labour listen to this kind of policy? In what way has business given any kind of support to the idea of restraint that is legally enforceable? How can we have any confidence that this government, which has always been business oriented, will do anything to hurt its traditional friends? I do not think you can ask labour to accept that kind of pledge when they have to sign their name to a contract to which they are held.

Second, any policy of restraint must apply to every form of income. Despite the speeches we have heard tonight, there is no evidence that anything more than vague statements and vague hopes in the fields of rent, interest, dividends or the return of capital in general. The only real restraint that is being suggested is a restraint on labour. The other important principle is that the policy must leave room for correcting the imbalance in incomes. Six per cent for everyone is not the same for everyone. Six per cent to a man who is earning $4,000 a year is not very much, but 6 per cent to a man who is earning $40,000 or $75,000 a year is a great deal. Unlike the Liberal party, we are not prepared to freeze this country to the status quo. We say the present system is unfair to the working man. We are not prepared to apply the 6 per cent limit across the board for everyone, because to do that would be to perpetuate the inequity and rottenness against which we have fought all these years. It may be fine for those who have already made it, who have their privileges; it may be all right for them to say, "Freeze everything; nobody gets more than 6 per cent." But there will be no reform and no change, and the unfairness that has always existed will exist forever. We cannot accept that, and you cannot ask those who are now depressed and who are not now receiving their fair share to accept this kind of policy.

The other principle is that the policy has to be on a long-term basis. Inflation will not go away. It is something with which western society will have to live forever. Therefore, the kind of policies that are introduced must commend themselves to development and to fairness in the future, because if you bring in restraint that is not fair, that is not workable and that is not acceptable, the minute you take that restraint off you might as well not have put it on to begin with because we will be right back to where we started.

The trade union movement has clearly indicated to the government that it wants to sit down and talk with them, not to the Prices and Incomes Commission. We did not elect the Prices and Incomes Commission. The people of this country elected the government and they have the right to speak to that government. The government should not use a stalking horse like the Prices and Incomes Commission to do the unpleasant things for which they do not want to be held responsible, and then accept the credit when there is credit to be given. So far there has been no credit of that kind.

The government has waffled and has backed off whenever they have been asked whether the Prices and Incomes Commission is speaking for the government. "Oh, no, "they say," the commission is independent." It is like the old song and dance they went through with the Bank of Canada. The trade union movement has a right to say they want to speak to the government that was elected by the people of Canada. If the government and the trade union movement sat down, a formula could be worked out, and co-operative methods, which would make a tremendous contribution to solving the problem of inflation. Furthermore, we have called for a committee of the House of Commons to look into this matter. Our request has not been granted.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): The hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané).

Mr. Saltsman: Does the hon. member wish to ask a question?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre De Bané (Matane): Mr. Speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Has the hon. member for Matane a question for the member for Waterloo?

Mr. De Bané: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Since time is flying, I wanted to ask the hon. member if he would be kind enough to make a shorter speech in order to allow other members to speak.

[*English*]

Mr. Saltsman: The hon. member has asked if I would leave some time for him. I will conclude my remarks, to give him an opportunity to make his comments before the vote is called. The government has to stop bleating like goats, or sheep, as the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) described them. They have to get down to being realistic and honest instead of this phoney show which they are putting on, this anti-labour approach that they have taken. Perhaps they think that labour is unpopular today and this is why they can take that position. It will turn out that labour is far stronger and that the public's sympathy for labour is far greater than they anticipate. This may be their Achilles heel: this sad policy may be the very thing that will bring them down.

Government Administrative Policies

• (9:40 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. De Bané: First, Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member who spoke before me for cutting short his remarks so as to enable me to say a few words.

In my opinion, the policy of the government is good because it is impossible to let inflation continue its pressure on the Canadian economy. But, however good it may be, I feel that it is still not enough.

Indeed, if inflation is defined as the increase of prices in time and if inflationary pressure must be stopped long before all resources are developed and full employment achieved, it is none the less true that when governments cut back their expenditures as early as 1968 and 1969, private investments were then running at near-record levels.

In my opinion, the fact that the Prices and Incomes Commission is suggesting nothing but restrictions on wages and prices is a self-accommodating solution and consequently inadequate. The Prices and Incomes Commission must recommend price and wage control.

Indeed, as the great economist Kenneth Galbraith said, modern economy is characterized by multinational companies which control prices themselves, because competition is almost non-existent and financial independence almost complete. Moreover, the interest of those companies for investors depends more on their performance and their financial reserves than on the dividends they pay to their shareholders.

In an economy where the investments of a company come more from its reserves than from the savings of the people, the price asked includes not only production costs and dividends paid to shareholders, but also reserves for development and research, a decision reached by the companies alone. I think that in such circumstances, corporate autonomy in Canada is much too great.

I would therefore propose that the Prices and Incomes Commission put more emphasis in the future on efficient price control. I feel it is the only realistic solution to the problem of the erosion of the dollar.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but pursuant to the order adopted by the House earlier today, I have to put the question.

[*English*]

Pursuant to section 10 of Standing Order 58, it is my duty to interrupt proceedings on the motion now before the House and forthwith put every question necessary to dispose of the motions to concur in the main estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1971, and the supply bill to be based thereon.

[Mr. Saltsman.]

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

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

That vote 1, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1971 (less the amount voted in interim supply) be concurred in.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: I declare—

Mr. Woolliams: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could now have from the Government House Leader the total amount of money that we are approving.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member cannot ask this question now. The Standing Orders provide that the question has to be put and there can be no further debate. All those in favour—

Mr. Woolliams: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, whether the question is put or not, surely when we are dealing with $13 billion or $14 billion we are entitled to know, when you put the question, the total amount of money involved.

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

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it. I declare the said motion carried on division.

Motion agreed to.

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 10, COMMUNICATIONS AND POST OFFICE

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

That vote 10, Communications and Post Office, for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1971 (less the amount voted in interim supply) be concurred in.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Mr. Woolliams: Again on a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour—

Mr. Woolliams: —I would like to know the amount of money that this institution is approving, because the government has lost control of the purse strings of the country.

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

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it. I declare the motion carried on division.

Motion agreed to.

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 25, CONSUMER AND CORPORATE AFFAIRS

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

That vote 25, Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1971 (less the amount voted in interim supply) be concurred in.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion? All those in favour will please say yea.

Mr. Woolliams: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I still think we should know the amount of money we are now approving.

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to enter into debate with the hon. member. The rules are there. I did not make them. The rules provide that the motions have to be put. There is nothing I can do but put the motion. All those in favour of the said motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Call in the members.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Drury) which was agreed to on the following division:

• (9:50 p.m.)

Division

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alkenbrack
Allmand
Anderson
Badanai
Barrett
Basford
Béchard
Bell
Benson
Bigg
Blouin
Borrie
Boulanger
Breau
Buchanan
Caccia
Cadieu (Meadow Lake)
Cadieux (Labelle)
Cafik
Cantin
Chrétien
Clermont
Coates
Cobbe
Comtois
Corbin
Côté (Richelieu)
Côté (Longueuil)
Crossman
Danforth
Davis
Deachman
Deakon
De Bané
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Drury
Éthier
Fairweather
Forest
Forget
Forrestall
Francis
Gendron
Gibson
Goode
Goyer
Grills
Groos
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guilbault
Hees
Honey
Hopkins
Horner
Howe
Isabelle
Jamieson
Kaplan
Kierans
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Korchinski
Lachance
Laing (Vancouver South)
Lambert (Edmonton West)
Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt)
Langlois
Laniel
Leblanc (Laurier)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Loiselle
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacEwan
MacGuigan
MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond)
Mackasey
MacLean
MacRae
McCutcheon
McIntosh
McKinley
McQuaid
Mahoney
Major
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Marshall
Mongrain
Monteith
Moore
Muir (Lisgar)
Nesbitt
Noble
Noël
Nowlan
Olson
Ouellet
Peddle
Penner
Perrault
Pilon
Portelance
Pringle
Prud'homme
Reid
Richard
Richardson
Ritchie
Roberts
Robinson
Rochon
Roy (Laval)
Schumacher
Scott
Sharp
Simpson
Smerchanski
Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Southam
Stanbury
Stewart (Cochrane)
Stewart (Marquette)
St. Pierre

Division

Sulatycky
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Thomas (Moncton)
Thompson (Red Deer)
Tolmie
Trudel
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Wahn
Walker
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Whiting
Woolliams
Yewchuk—142.

NAYS

Messrs:

Beaudoin
Brewin
Broadbent
Dionne
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Fortin
Gauthier
Gilbert
Gleave
Godin
Howard (Skeena)
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Lambert (Bellechasse)
Laprise
Latulippe
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
MacInnis (Mrs.)
Nystrom
Orlikow
Otto
Peters
Rodrigue
Rose
Rowland
Saltsman
Skoberg
Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley)—27.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 5, INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

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

That vote 5, Indian Affairs and Northern Development, for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1961 (less the amount voted in interim supply) be concurred in.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: On division.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those against will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried on division.

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 65, INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

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

That vote 65, Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1971 (less the amount voted in interim supply) be concurred in.

[Mr. Speaker.]

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Drury) which was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Allmand
Anderson
Badanai
Barrett
Basford
Beaudoin
Béchard
Benson
Blouin
Borrie
Boulanger
Breau
Brewin
Broadbent
Buchanan
Caccia
Cadieux (Labelle)
Cafik
Cantin
Chrétien
Clermont
Cobbe
Comtois
Corbin
Côté (Richelieu)
Côté (Longueuil)
Crossman
Davis
Deachman
Deakon
De Bané
Dionne
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Drury
Éthier
Forest
Forget
Fortin
Francis
Gauthier
Gendron
Gibson
Gilbert
Gleave
Godin
Goode
Goyer
Groos
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guilbault
Honey
Hopkins
Howard (Skeena)
Isabelle
Jamieson
Kaplan
Kierans
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Lachance
Laing (Vancouver South)
Lambert (Bellechasse)
Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt)
Langlois
Laniel
Laprise
Latulippe
Leblanc (Laurier)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Lewis
Loiselle
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacGuigan
MacInnis (Mrs.)
Mackasey
Mahoney
Major
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Mongrain
Noël
Nystrom
Olson
Orlikow
Otto
Ouellet
Penner
Perrault
Peters
Pilon
Portelance
Pringle
Prud'homme
Reid
Richard
Richardson
Roberts
Robinson
Rochon
Rodrigue
Rose
Rowland
Roy (Laval)
Saltsman
Sharp
Skoberg
Smerchanski
Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stanbury
Stewart (Cochrane)
St. Pierre
Sulatycky
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley)

Tolmie
Trudel
Turner
(Ottawa-Carleton)
Wahn
Walker
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Whiting—128.

NAYS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alkenbrack
Bell
Bigg
Coates
Danforth
Fairweather
Forrestall
Grills
Hees
Horner
Howe
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Korchinski
Lambert (Edmonton West)
MacEwan
MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond)
MacLean
MacRae
McCutcheon
McIntosh
McKinley
McQuaid
Marshall
Monteith
Moore
Muir
Nesbitt
Noble
Nowlan
Peddle
Ritchie
Schumacher
Scott
Simpson
Southam
Stewart (Marquette)
Thomas (Moncton)
Thompson (Red Deer)
Woolliams
Yewchuk—41.

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 15, MANPOWER AND IMMIGRATION

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

That vote 15, Department of Manpower and Immigration, for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1971 (less the amount voted in interim supply) be concurred in.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion? All those in favour of the said motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it. I declare the motion carried on division.

Motion agreed to.

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 20, MANPOWER AND IMMIGRATION

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

That vote 20, Department of Manpower and Immigration, for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1971 (less the amount voted in interim supply) be concurred in.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion? All those in favour of the said motion will please say yea.

Division

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it. I declare the motion carried on division.

Motion agreed to.

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1, PARLIAMENT

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

That vote 1, Parliament, for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1971 (less the amount voted in interim supply) be concurred in.

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

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Drury) which was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alkenbrack
Allmand
Anderson
Badanai
Barrett
Basford
Béchard
Bell
Benson
Bigg
Blouin
Borrie
Boulanger
Breau
Buchanan
Caccia
Cadieux (Labelle)
Cafik
Cantin
Chrétien
Clermont
Coates
Cobbe
Comtois
Corbin
Côté (Richelieu)
Côté (Longueuil)
Crossman
Danforth
Davis
Deachman
De Bané
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Drury
Éthier
Fairweather
Forest
Forget
Forrestall
Francis
Gendron
Gibson
Goode
Goyer
Grills
Groos
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guilbault
Hees
Honey
Hopkins
Horner

Division

Howe
Isabelle
Jamieson
Kaplan
Kierans
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Korchinski
Lachance
Laing (Vancouver South)
Lambert (Edmonton West)
Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt)
Langlois
Laniel
Laprise
Latulippe
Leblanc (Laurier)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Loiselle
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacEwan
MacGuigan
MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond)
Mackasey
MacLean
MacRae
McCutcheon
McIntosh
McKinley
McQuaid
Mahoney
Major
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Marshall
Mongrain
Monteith
Moore
Muir (Lisgar)
Nesbitt
Noble
Noël
Nowlan
Olson
Otto
Ouellet
Peddle
Penner
Perrault
Pilon
Portelance
Pringle
Prud'homme
Reid
Richard
Richardson
Ritchie
Roberts
Robinson
Rochon
Roy (Laval)
Schumacher
Scott
Sharp
Simpson
Smerchanski
Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Southam
Stanbury
Stewart (Cochrane)
Stewart (Marquette)
St. Pierre
Sulatycky
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Thomas (Moncton)
Thompson (Red Deer)
Tolmie
Trudel
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Wahn
Walker
Watson
Weatherhead
Whiting
Woolliams
Yewchuk—143.

NAYS

Messrs:

Beaudoin
Brewin
Broadbent
Deakon
Dionne
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Fortin
Gauthier
Gilbert
Gleave
Godin
Howard (Skeena)
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Lambert (Bellechasse)
Lewis
MacInnis (Mrs.)
Nystrom
Orlikow
Peters
Rodrigue
Rose
Rowland
Saltsman
Skoberg
Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley)
Whelan—26.

[Mr. Speaker.]

• (10:20 p.m.)

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1, PRIVY COUNCIL

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

That vote 1, Privy Council, for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1971 (less the amount voted in interim supply) be concurred in.

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

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Call in the members.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Drury) which was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Allmand
Anderson
Badanai
Barrett
Basford
Beaudoin
Béchard
Benson
Blouin
Borrie
Boulanger
Breau
Buchanan
Caccia
Cadieux (Labelle)
Cafik
Cantin
Chrétien
Clermont
Cobbe
Comtois
Corbin
Côté (Richelieu)
Côté (Longueuil)
Crossman
Davis
Deachman
Deakon
De Bané
Dionne
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Drury
Éthier
Forest
Forget
Francis
Gendron
Gibson
Godin
Goode
Goyer
Groos
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guilbault
Honey
Hopkins
Isabelle
Jamieson
Kaplan
Kierans
Lachance
Laing (Vancouver South)
Lambert (Bellechasse)
Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt)
Langlois
Laniel
Laprise
Latulippe
Leblanc (Laurier)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Loiselle
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacGuigan
Mackasey
Mahoney
Major
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)

Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Mongrain
Noël
Olson
Otto
Ouellet
Penner
Perrault
Pilon
Portelance
Pringle
Prud'homme
Reid
Richard
Richardson
Roberts
Robinson
Rochon
Rodrigue
Roy (Laval)
Sharp
Smerchanski
Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stanbury
Stewart (Cochrane)
St. Pierre
Sulatycky
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Tolmie
Trudel
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Wahn
Walker
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Whiting—109.

NAYS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alkenbrack
Bell
Bigg
Brewin
Broadbent
Danforth
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Fairweather
Forrestall
Fortin
Gauthier
Gilbert
Gleave
Grills
Hees
Horner
Howard (Skeena)
Howe
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Korchinski
Lambert (Edmonton West)
Lewis
MacEwan
MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond)
MacInnis (Mrs.)
MacLean
MacRae
McCutcheon
McIntosh
McKinley
McQuaid
Marshall
Monteith
Moore
Muir (Lisgar)
Nesbitt
Noble
Nowlan
Nystrom
Orlikow
Peddle
Peters
Ritchie
Rose
Rowland
Saltsman
Schumacher
Scott
Simpson
Skoberg
Southam
Stewart (Marquette)
Thomas (Moncton)
Thompson (Red Deer)
Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley)
Woolliams
Yewchuk—59.

• (10:30 p.m.)

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1, TREASURY BOARD

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

That vote 1, Treasury Board, for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1971 (less the amount voted in interim supply) be concurred in.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Division

Some hon. Members: Carried.

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

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Motion agreed to.

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 5, TREASURY BOARD

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

That vote 5, Treasury Board, for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1971 (less the amount voted in interim supply) be concurred in.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Carried.

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

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Motion agreed to.

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN MAIN ESTIMATES

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

That the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1971, except those votes concurred in this day, and less amounts voted in interim supply, be concurred in.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Carried.

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

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Drury thereupon moved that Bill C-224, for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending March 31, 1971, be read the first time and printed.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: When shall the said bill be read the second time?

Some hon. Members: Now.

Mr. Drury thereupon moved that Bill C-224, for granting Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending March 31, 1971, be read the second time and referred to the committee of the whole.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Faulkner in the chair.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. Could we have a copy of the bill? I know a few have been distributed, but we are all Members of Parliament representing various constituencies. I cannot believe that I am the only one who is now being given a copy of the bill as a gift from the Minister of Finance, perhaps thereby putting this country into bankruptcy.

The Chairman: Shall clause 2 carry?

Clause 2 agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall clause 3 carry?

Mr. Bell: On division.

Clause 3 agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall clause 4 carry?

Mr. Bell: On division.

Clause 4 agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall clause 5 carry?

Mr. Bell: On division.

Clause 5 agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall clause 6 carry?

Mr. Bell: On division.

Clause 6 agreed to.

Schedule agreed to.

Mr. MacLean: Mr. Chairman, before the bill carries, would the spokesman for the government give the usual undertaking that the bill is in the standard form and that the schedule is exactly what has already been considered in committee?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Chairman, I can give the usual assurance.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I realize that I cannot debate a bill I have never read and that nobody else has read until now. I want to mention how superfluous these rules are because the purse strings have been taken out of Parliament. I hope the press will say how ridiculous this is.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Clause 1 agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, I rise on one more point of order.

The Chairman: Order, please. Perhaps the hon. member would wait until the bill is reported. I understood there was agreement to report the bill.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say what I have to say before $13 million is frittered away.

An hon. Member: It is more like $13 billion that is ultimately involved.

Bill reported.

Mr. Speaker: When shall the said bill be read the third time?

Some hon. Members: By leave, now.

Mr. Drury moved the third reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

An hon. Member: On division.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

At 10.40 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to special order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, June 19, 1970

The House met at 11 a.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND NATIONAL DEFENCE

CONCURRENCE IN NINTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Ian Wahn (St. Paul's) presented the ninth report of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence, and moved that the report be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

[*Editor's Note: For text of above report, see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

DRUGS

TABLING OF LEDAIN COMMISSION INTERIM REPORT ON NON-MEDICAL USE—STATEMENT BY MINISTER

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table on behalf of the government the interim report of the Commission of Inquiry into the non-medical use of drugs. The report is tabled in the form in which it was presented to the government on May 28 and represents the first year's work of the commission.

I am sure that hon. members join me in thanking the members of the commission for their efforts to date. In reading the report, everyone will realize the scope and complexity of the problems faced by the commission in this document and will wish them well in the job ahead.

In tabling the report I would like to emphasize to hon. members, many of whom have been unhappy that the report has not been made public sooner, that the government has had only a very brief opportunity to study the many recommendations and suggestions contained in the report. However, the government would like to express its views at this time with respect to one of the commission's recommendations. This recommendation, on page 521 of the report, deals with psychotropic drugs, which the commission defines as having "capacity to alter sensation, mood, consciousness, or other psychological or behavioural functions".

The recommendation reads:

> At the same time the commission is of the opinion that no one should be liable to imprisonment for simple possession of a psychotropic drug for non-medical purposes.

• (11:10 a.m.)

> Accordingly, the commission recommends as an interim measure, pending its final report, that the Narcotic Control Act and the Food and Drugs Act be amended to make the offence of simple possession under these acts punishable upon summary conviction by a fine not exceeding a reasonable amount. The commission suggests a maximum fine of $100.

The commission includes such drugs as heroin, methamphetamines, LSD and so on in its definition of psychotropic drugs. This government believes that current medical and sociological information does not justify all-encompassing changes and will await the completion of the commission's final report with interest.

On one point, however, Mr. Speaker, the government feels it should make its position known. In the case of marijuana it is the intention of the government to give consideration to the question of recommending to Parliament that this drug be transferred from the Narcotic Control Act to the Food and Drugs Act in a way that simple possession of marijuana could be prosecuted by summary conviction as an offence not subject to jail terms—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Munro: —with a system of graduated fines for first and subsequent offences.

Government reaction to the other recommendations in the report will be announced to hon. members in due course, although I would like to point out that prior to the receipt of the report the government had already proceeded with many matters which are recommendations of the commission, particularly in the areas of research and information. A listing of those now under way is tabled with the report.

In conclusion, it is recognized that the non-medical use of drugs is a serious problem which affects many Canadian families now and could affect the health and welfare of future generations. I hope that the tabling of the report will stimulate a constructive discussion in which all hon. members will participate.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, unquestionably the non-medical use of drugs is one of the most serious problems our society faces. Now that we have received the report we can get down to a discussion of its merits. But before doing so I must say, Sir, that having had a chance at least to scan the report, and having heard the minister's statement this morning I am at a complete loss to understand why the government felt it was necessary to keep this report secret from the House and from the public for as long as it did.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: I have to say, Sir, that I see absolutely no excuse for the government's conduct in this regard. May I say one more thing before I come to the merits of the report. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) threw out a challenge to the opposition. He said that he hoped we would be able to reach a decision with regard to the recommendations of the report as soon as the government. I am glad to be able to say that even though we have had the report for only two hours we have had no difficulty at all in going at least as far as the government has been able to go after having the report for a month.

The report is wide-ranging, Mr. Speaker, as one would expect. It is an interim report and I will not attempt to make any definitive comment on it. But what comes through everywhere from all pages of the report is the tremendous gap in existing knowledge as to the effects of most of the drugs that the commission has studied, although it clearly recognizes that amphetamines, LSD and certain other drugs are definitely harmful.

I have suggested for some time that I did not think any responsible politician in this country should take the position of recommending changes in the law with regard to the non-medical use of drugs until we had seen this interim report and had the opportunity to consider it. Actually, in this interim report the commissioners have recommended very few changes in the law. This stems largely I think, from the lack of knowledge as to what the effects are and what are the best methods by which to proceed.

The commission does not recommend, and I wish to emphasize this to avoid any misunderstanding, the legalization of the possession of marijuana. It recommends making lighter the penalties for the possession of psychotropic drugs, as the minister said. It recommends non-imprisonment and a maximum fine of $100. The minister announced that the government is accepting this recommendation only with respect to marijuana. I agree that the government ought to accept this recommendation for the easing of penalties for the possession of marijuana. I agree that the possession of marijuana ought not to be legalized at this time and that the minister is correct in accepting the recommendation for making the penalities for possession lighter. I also suggest, since the government is taking this position, that it should immediately move to have the sentences reviewed of those who may be serving penalties now for previous convictions.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: The government, in light of present knowledge, does not accept the recommendation of the commissioners that the penalties for the possession of other psychotropic drugs should be made lighter. I agree with the government. I agree with the minister that the recommendation of the commissioners ought not to be accepted at the present time at least, except in the case of marijuana.

I must say that I thought the comments of the minister on the report were certainly minimal. I had expected the minister to make some comment on the recommendations of the commissioners with regard to trafficking in drugs. Some of us have been concerned because the present law with regard to soft drugs does not make any distinction between those who traffic for private or personal gain and those who do not. I note that the commissioners recommend that the giving of a drug to another person without gain ought not to be regarded as trafficking. I certainly think that this recommendation should be given serious consideration, particularly with regard to marijuana.

In dealing with those convicted of drug abuses, Mr. Speaker, surely the emphasis should be aimed at rehabilitation rather than simply punishment. Therefore I would hope that the government would give consideration

to making available special institutions with proper treatment and counselling facilities instead of simply incarcerating those convicted of drug offences.

I am disappointed that the minister has not commented at all on the recommendations of the commissioners with regard to steps that should be taken to provide appropriate facilities for rehabilitation and for the co-ordination of research and education throughout our society, particularly in our educational institutions. The federal government in co-operation with the provinces must surely provide the necessary leadership to work out a national program to impart the knowledge that is now available regarding the use and misuse of drugs, including the legal consequences and the penalties involved, but, above all, to give the people of this country honest information about the consequences and other aspects of the use of drugs. Despite the absence of comment by the minister, I would hope the federal government would proceed to develop and co-ordinate such a program with the provinces, and I would hope also that the federal government would pay a substantial part of the cost.

• (11:20 a.m.)

Surely we must also have a system of centres established across the country to provide information, consultation and assistance to drug users on a more humane and rational basis, but the minister has not indicated that the government intends to do this. Surely further funds have to be made available for research into the nature and effects of drugs. I suggest that such a program has to be co-ordinated along the lines drawn up by the commission. I would recommend that a national drug foundation be established for the administration of these two recommendations, particularly with regard to research, the co-ordination of research, and the exchange of information. The commission suggested that an independent foundation might play a useful role and I believe this to be a sensible suggestion.

I would emphasize, as have the commissioners, the importance of providing for adequate representation of youth in the carrying out of any of these recommendations with regard to drugs.

I will be through in a minute, Mr. Speaker. I do not want to try Your Honour's patience too far, but this is an important matter and we have waited a long time for this document.

My colleagues and I recognize the growing use of such dangerous drugs as heroin, amphetamines and LSD. These drugs are clearly destructive of individuals and institutions. We believe we must proceed by every effective means to stop their use. The commission has questioned the usefulness of outlawing the possession of these drugs as a measure of law enforcement. As far as I know these views or recommendations have not been accepted by the government. Apart from anything else, of course, they outline that possession may be essential to stopping the trafficking which surely we must do everything to stop. Certainly I recommend that our present law enforcement methods and manpower and facilities be reviewed and assessed with the objective of more effectively and thoroughly enforcing those sections of the Criminal Code which deal with the importation, trafficking and manufacturing of such drugs.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: This is an interim report, sir, and these are our interim comments. The commission will be making a further report in due course. I hope that such reports will lead to a vigorous discussion of these very difficult questions and will lead to a more widespread examination of the information available. I hope that the matter will be discussed in as sensible and constructive a way as possible when considering a subject with such an emotional impact and with such serious consequences. As I have said already, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the minister and the government will proceed promptly to implement some of the suggestions made by the commission with regard to the importance of co-ordinated research, a co-ordinated method of providing education and information, and a co-ordinated and effective method of providing rehabilitation and treatment centres all across the country.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, the problem of the non-medical use of drugs is one that divides the people of Canada, cuts across party lines and separates the young from the old. It is no wonder that the government and Parliament have been reticent about dealing with this question. Although we have only had two hours to look at the report very quickly, I think I can speak for a large majority of the members of the New Democratic Party when I make these comments today.

Tabling of LeDain Interim Report

The Leader of the Opposition commented on the reluctance of the government to table the report and wondered about it. I do not wonder, Mr. Speaker, because implicit in almost every section of the report is a criticism of the way in which law enforcement agencies, the police, the Crown prosecutors and the courts, have tried to deal with the problem of drug use up till now..

The statement of the minister was only lukewarm. In fact, the minister only endorsed one recommendation of the commission. I will deal with some of the others later. If the minister had not accepted that recommendation, he would have rejected in total the interim report.

I believe that the commission was wise in separating the use of marijuana from other drugs. As pointed out by the commission, there is a great deal that we do not know and should know about drugs before we make any firm decision. The commission proposes that marijuana be dealt with under the provisions of the Food and Drugs Act rather than under the Narcotic Control Act. We think this is a good idea. The commission proposes that detailed studies be made with regard to the other drugs such as amphetamines, LSD and heroin. This is an excellent proposal.

We agree that the present method of coping with the drug problem has failed almost completely. There has been a tremendous increase in the use of so-called soft drugs in all sectors of the population. We disagree most strongly with the silly way the police and other law enforcement agencies have been dealing with the problem. It is no secret that a large percentage of the middle-class and professional communities in Canada use marijuana but there have been no prosecutions or investigations. The police have concentrated on the young and the alienated. That kind of discrimination ought not to have started and must stop immediately.

The commission recommends the abolition of imprisonment for the use of marijuana. I point out that when the present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) was Minister of Justice the Department of Justice issued a directive to Crown prosecutors that they should recommend to judges in cases of this kind that prison sentences be imposed. We are now being asked to change what the department recommended at that time. The Minister of Justice looks at me with surprise. The record will show that is correct.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Nothing surprises me.

[Mr. Orlikow.]

Mr. Orlikow: The commission recommends that possession, including the giving to another person, without payment, of enough marijuana for one dose, should be punishable only by summary conviction with a maximum fine of $100. That is an excellent suggestion. We also agree that those who cannot afford to pay their fines should be given time to pay. If this is not done there will be an obvious division between the rich and the poor, which is wrong.

The commission makes it very clear that they are completely opposed to the type of procedures the police have been using. I refer to entrapment and physical violence to obtain evidence. The commission recommended that this should be discontinued. I hope that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) and the Solicitor General (Mr. McIlraith) will not wait any longer to put that kind of policy into effect. I go a step further and suggest that they give immediate consideration to discontinuing the use of writs of assistance. I suggest they have been grossly abused by the police in recent years in respect of narcotics.

The commission emphasizes the need for education regarding the use and effects of drugs. It points out that exhortation, propaganda, distortion and exaggeration are not what are needed. To a large extent that is what we have been getting. I am sorry the government is so lukewarm in its position. It does not appear to give much support to that proposal. The commission suggests that young people should be encouraged to participate in the program of education rather than just the professionals whom the young people frequently reject and mistrust. We support this proposal. We deplore the fact that the government seems to need more time to decide on this matter.

• (11:30 a.m.)

The commission suggested that research and evaluation should not be a function of the law enforcement agencies. Too often it has been the law enforcement agencies which have in the past made policy with respect to drugs in this country. We think this is wrong, and we agree with the commission completely on this point. Again we deplore the fact that the government does not seem ready to support an approach of this kind.

The commission calls for flexible methods of treatment such as street clinics and regional centres. The commission suggests we ought to remove the fear which so many young people who have been using drugs have of

existing hospitals and other facilities. We think this is a down-to-earth and practical proposal and we hope the government will move quickly to implement it together with other suggestions made by the commission.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, the minister seems to be right in saying that, before taking a decision, the government will wait until the conclusion of the study on the effects of drugs. As stated by the minister at the end of his comments:

[*English*]

It is recognized that the non-medical use of drugs is a serious problem which affects many Canadian families now and could affect the health and welfare of future generations.

[*Translation*]

Nothing could be truer, Mr. Speaker, for it is proven that those who use drugs are mostly young people, because of that education they received not from schools, high schools or universities, but from drug peddlers or members of the underworld in Montreal, Toronto and other large cities. And I think that the government would be well-advised to earmark for the information of young people on the use of drugs at least as much money as for research, in order to establish the relationship between the use of drugs and the behaviour of the addicts. Thus the decisions would not be negative, but positive.

It is imperative to persuade young people that it is up to them to make their future, and to act today in a way that they will not regret in ten of fifteen years. The government should earmark certain funds for educating young people who use drugs. This way, we would avoid situations such as those described in the report tabled this morning. According to that document, young people are put into jail for having used marijuana or LSD.

It has been recommended that imprisonment for such offences be abolished. Should the government agree to this, no time should be lost in freeing those who are already in jail for having used narcotics. However, I feel that the government should contribute to furthering the education of youths and older people who use drugs, so as to prove to them that, in the long run, they are the ones who suffer the consequences which the use of drugs may have in a civilized society.

[*English*]

Mr. Munro: With the permission of the House, I should like to recognize the presence in the gallery of the chairman of the commission, Dean LeDain, and thank him on behalf of all hon. members for the very sincere work which he and the other members of the commission have done in the performance of a most difficult task.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

PUBLIC SERVICE

TABLING OF REPORT ON MODERNIZATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF PAY SYSTEM

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I should like to table in English and in French a report by the firm of Samson, Belari, Riddell and Stead on the modernization and improvement of the public service pay system.

An hon. Member: What about improving the pay?

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

DRUGS

NON-MEDICAL USE—CO-OPERATION WITH PROVINCES IN RESEARCH AND EDUCATION

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to give the Minister of National Health and Welfare an opportunity to fill in some of the glaring gaps in his comments today. Does the government of which he is a member propose to convene a conference with the provinces in the near future with a view to establishing co-ordinated methods in the fields of research and education to deal with the non-medical use of drugs?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am glad to reply to the Leader of the Opposition. He may recall that at the conference of health ministers I undertook that once the report had been made public its contents would be discussed with the health ministers of the provinces. I believe that other federal ministers will be discussing it with their counterparts, also in the hope of accomplishing some of the things the hon. gentleman mentioned.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Stanfield: I should like to direct a further question to the Minister of National

Health and Welfare. I am glad to be reassured that he intends to discuss these matters with the provinces. Can he also assure the House that the federal government is prepared to participate with the provinces in a program leading to co-ordinated action in the fields of research and education in connection with the non-medical use of drugs. In other words, is the government prepared to provide leadership and to take the initiative in setting up co-ordinated programs in these areas?

Mr. Munro: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

NON-MEDICAL USE—CONFERENCE WITH PROVINCIAL ATTORNEYS GENERAL AND POLICE OFFICIALS ON LAW ENFORCEMENT METHODS

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Justice following upon the announcement by the Minister of National Health and Welfare that he will be convening a conference with his provincial counterparts. Is the Minister of Justice and/or the Solicitor General considering the convening of a meeting with the provincial Attorneys General and provincial or municipal police officials to discuss the methods by which the police deal with the use of marijuana and other drugs?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): As I have said in the House before, I have convened a meeting of provincial Attorneys General for the second week of July in Halifax to discuss a wide range of matters relating to the administration of justice, and it might well be advisable to discuss certain aspects of this report at that time.

Mr. Orlikow: Will the Minister of Justice at that time, if not before, give consideration to the problem which has been created by this report in connection with a number of people who are serving relatively heavy sentences as a result of convictions which come within the scope of the commission's recommendations?

[*Later:*]

NON-MEDICAL USE—SENTENCES FOR FIRST OFFENCES

Mr. Marcel Prud'homme (Saint-Denis): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Justice. Is it the intention of the minister to instruct Crown prosecutors not to press for jail sentences for first offences by users of marijuana?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, since the amendment to the law last August permitting the Crown to proceed by way of summary proceeding in matters involving possession only of canabis, including hashish, and the restricted drugs, particularly LSD, well over 90 per cent of the cases have been prosecuted by summary conviction where the offence was a first or second offence. The general rule even with respect to the hard drugs has been that on a first offence we proceed also by way of summary conviction. Those instructions were contained in a memorandum sent to all federal prosecutors in Canada last August.

Since that amendment passed by Parliament came into force, the majority of cases involving the simple possession of canabis including hashish and the restricted drugs have resulted in the imposition of a fine. The usual fine has not exceeded $200. It is only in exceptional cases that the offender has been sentenced under the present policy to imprisonment instead of being given a fine.

Mr. Fairweather: Policy, or is that the law?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): That has been the policy of the government following the amendment authorized by this Parliament, and that policy will continue to be enforced.

NON-MEDICAL USE—ENFORCEMENT OF POLICY IN YUKON AND NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps hon. members may have misunderstood or I misheard the minister when he said that the policy of the government based on the amendment last fall was that there was a choice by the Crown in charges involving the use of hashish. I do not think that is correct; it applies only to the use of marijuana.

My question to the minister is: As Attorney General for the Yukon and as Attorney General for the Northwest Territories, is he in that capacity now going to instruct Crown counsel in both territories to follow government policy as just announced by the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, government policy as announced by the Minister of National Health and Welfare was with regard to the government's intention to consider a possible change in the law. My duty as Attorney General of the Yukon and Northwest Territories, of course, is to enforce the law as Parliament sets the law down.

NON-MEDICAL USE—TRANSFER OF OFFENCES TO FOOD AND DRUGS ACT, AMENDMENT OF PENAL PROVISIONS

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Justice. I should like to ask the minister whether he intends to implement two of the recommendations contained in the report, namely, firstly, that we transfer these psychotropic offences from the Narcotic Control Act to the Food and Drugs Act immediately, and second, that we amend the penal provisions of the Criminal Code?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I think the preliminary position of the government has already been stated this morning.

NON-MEDICAL USE—COMMITTEE STUDY OF LEDAIN COMMISSION INTERIM REPORT

Mr. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Would the minister consider referring the interim report of the LeDain Commission to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social affairs, where Members of Parliament may study the recommendations and receive representations from the public?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to take that suggestion under consideration.

NON-MEDICAL USE—CHANGES IN LAW REGARDING TRAFFICKERS—PENALTIES FOR POSSESSION OF HASHISH

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Justice. Is the government planning to make any changes in regard, first, to traffickers in marijuana and, second, traffickers in hard drugs, including amphetamines? Are there to be any changes to deal with the particular problem of trafficking?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I cannot at the moment add any more precision to the preliminary position of the government already stated.

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Would the minister indicate whether the government has taken a position with respect to lightening the penalties for possession of hashish to make them similar to the penalties for possession of marijuana? If so, when can such announcement be expected in the House?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the position of the government with respect to that matter has been well stated by my colleague, the Minister of Justice.

FINANCE

DISCUSSION WITH BANKS TO BRING ABOUT LOWERING OF PRIME INTEREST RATE

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, if I may change the subject, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. As he knows, the Bank of Montreal announced two or three weeks ago a reduction in their prime rate of interest, and no other bank has yet made such an announcement. Would the minister inform the House whether he has held any discussions with the other banks or their officers with regard to reducing their prime interest rate in order to ease the inflationary effect of high interest rates?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): No, I have not had direct contact with the banks, in this regard Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary question. The minister recently attended a meeting of the Canadian Bankers Association and I had hoped that this might have been one of the subjects he discussed with them. May I ask the minister whether he knows if the Governor of the Bank of Canada has held such conversations? If he does not know, would the minister assure the House that he will undertake to request that the Governor of the Bank of Canada seek the taking of action to reduce interest rates on the part of the chartered banks?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, I met with the operating officers of the banks in Vancouver but there was no direct discussion of this particular question. That is what I meant when I said I had had no contact with them concerning this matter. I know that the Governor of the Bank of Canada has met with the presidents of the banks recently and I shall be speaking to him or the Deputy Governor this afternoon.

Mr. Lewis: A further supplementary question. Will the minister assure the House that he will request the Governor of the Bank of Canada to seek from all chartered banks a reduction in interest rates?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, there is nothing I would like to do more.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Finance. Was his difficulty in communicating with the members of the Canadian Bankers Association that, while they were happy as a matter of politeness to have him speak to them, they were not really interested in speaking to him?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Villeneuve—

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): For Témiscamingue, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I apologize to the hon. member for Villeneuve.

[*English*]

I believe the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar has a supplementary, and I will allow him one supplementary

[*Translation*]

—Then, I shall recognize the hon. member for Villeneuve—I mean for Témiscamingue.

[*English*]

REDUCTION OF FARM IMPROVEMENT LOAN AND FARM CREDIT INTEREST RATES

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, may I address my supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture. In light of the reduction in the Bank of Canada interest rate recently, has the Farm Credit Corporation accordingly reduced its interest rates, and have the banks also reduced their rates under the farm improvement loans legislation?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance would have to answer for the Farm Improvement Loans Act. So far as the Farm Credit Corporation is concerned, I believe we adjust the rates every six months depending on the rate that the government is paying for money during that period.

[*Translation*]

INDUSTRY

GOLD MINING—POLICY RESPECTING GRANTS

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources.

[Mr. Lewis.]

Since the unpegging of the Canadian dollar, owners of gold mines are in a distressing situation because they are losing $1.50 per ounce and I would like to know if the minister intends to announce soon an increase of subsidies, a measure which would enable the mines to maintain their normal operations?

[*English*]

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I recently met with representatives of the gold mining communities and the Canadian Mining Association, who discussed with me the continuation of the Emergency Gold Mining Assistance Act and also the current problem and the accentuation of the problem as indicated by the hon. member. We have in my department a comprehensive study of the effect of the removal of the subsidy. I have instructed the officials to hasten the completion of this study in light of the current situation and the difficulty caused by the freeing of the dollar. I hope we will be able to have a government decision as a result of that study very soon.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

PROPOSED RECOGNITION OF COMMUNIST CHINA

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. We have not had a report for some time regarding the deliberations that were taking place between representatives of Communist China and Canada. In the Far East the general idea is that the reason these consultations have not been continuing is that virtual agreement between Communist China and Canada has been arrived at but the government of Canada does not intend to make an announcement in that connection until Parliament is on vacation. Is this correct? I bring this up on this happy day when all of us are in good spirits having regard to what happened in the land of "Heath". I ask the minister whether he will now give us a reasonably full report, not of that length which would require it to be made on motions, but will he tell us—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I take it that the question has been asked. I might add that it was also asked yesterday, but in view of the very special circumstances I think hon. members would want the Secretary of State for External Affairs to reply to the question.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, before the minister replies, I ask him very simply whether he has come to a reasonable basis of agreement, in the opinion of the government, and is it similar to that which was brought about between Italy and Communist China?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am sure I speak on behalf of all members of the House in welcoming the right hon. gentleman back to the House of Commons.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sharp: We have missed his very distinctive contribution to our discussions which is portrayed by the kind of question he has put to me today. It may be, of course, that the right hon. gentleman as a result of his recent very interesting travels knows more about the negotiations between Canada and the Peking regime than we do here, but I should like to assure him that no agreement has yet been reached between Canada and the Peking regime, nor do I believe that any agreement has been reached between the Peking regime and the Italian government. We are not holding up the announcement. Nothing would make me happier than to be able to say that they had been successfully completed.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Now that we know the negotiations have not been successfully concluded, what are the hopes and expectations that Mao will finally know where Canada is?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

DOMINION BUREAU OF STATISTICS

POSSIBLE ELIMINATION OF WORD "DOMINION" FROM NAME

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the honourable and learned Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. It concerns the possible introduction of legislation in respect of the nomenclature of part of his administrative domain. Is he contemplating removing the word "Dominion" from the designation of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics? If so, can he advise how this is to be accomplished and what will be the new name and initials for the institution?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I have already referred to that possibility in the committee during the discussion of my estimates. I have already indicated that a new bill respecting the Dominion Bureau of Statistics would probably be introduced in the fall, at which time we might discuss this particular aspect of it, if cabinet decides to include such a change in the bill.

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Speaker, would the minister and his colleagues give consideration to the proposition that solving the current problems of this country might deserve higher priority than obliterating its symbolic traditions?

SOCIAL SECURITY

INQUIRY AS TO TABLING OF WHITE PAPER

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. It does not have to do with the LeDain report. Now that the new unemployment insurance program has been introduced, which is related to the over-all social policy of increases in assistance to the disadvantaged, can the minister advise the House and the country when he will be introducing his white paper on social measures to alleviate the serious needs of the disadvantaged people of Canada?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated I expect to have the white paper on social policy before Parliament prior to the end of the session.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Marshall: Would the minister advise the House whether, in the social measures he is going to introduce, increases in war veterans allowance will be included?

Mr. Munro: Mr. Speaker, the matter of social assistance as it pertains to war veterans allowances is the responsibility of my colleague the Minister of Veterans Affairs. I think the question should be directed to him.

FISHERIES

EXCLUSION OF FISHERMEN FROM NEW UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROGRAM—PROVISION OF CATCH FAILURE INSURANCE

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries. Does the minister propose to bring in a measure setting up catch failure insurance for fishermen in view of the reference in the government's white paper to the

phasing out of unemployment insurance for fishermen, and will he refer this matter to the fisheries committee?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, this matter was referred to in the white paper tabled by the Minister of Labour. We will certainly be discussing it with fishermen, representatives of the fishermen and the industry during the coming months.

AIR CANADA

REPORTED TRANSFER OF PILOTS AND STEWARDESSES BASED IN WINNIPEG

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Transport. On May 22 I asked him if he would seek from Air Canada the assurance that a large number of pilots and an even larger number of stewardesses would not be transferred from Winnipeg to other bases in this country. The minister said he would endeavour to obtain that assurance. Has he yet obtained it?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Yes, Mr. Speaker. Air Canada advises there will be no significant change in the personnel stationed at Winnipeg. The problem, if there is one, arises because of the phasing out of the Viscount aircraft and the use primarily of DC-9 aircraft. In the changeover it is anticipated that virtually the same number of DC-9 pilots will be required as in the mix between Viscounts and DC-9's. So there will not be any great change there, perhaps only one or two at the most, I am advised.

In so far as the good looking stewardesses are concerned, we are going to leave them there to brighten the scene in Winnipeg indefinitely.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I am afraid I cannot think of a supplementary to that.

[*Translation*]

INDUSTRY

AMENDMENT OF CUSTOMS TARIFF TO PROTECT SHOE MANUFACTURERS—INTEREST OF CONSUMERS

Mr. Roland Godin (Portneuf): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

In view of the fact that shoe imports which have been tolerated to date place our Canadian manufacturers on the brink of bankruptcy, can the minister tell us if he intends to recommend that the customs tariff be amended with a view to correcting the situation?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I am at the present time reading the brief submitted by the Shoe Manufacturers Association of Canada. This document contains certain questionable statistics, but in any event we will meet with the representatives of this Association on June 24. Hon. members are invited to attend the first part of the meeting. Following the meeting we will give the matter further consideration and will make our conclusions known as soon as possible.

[*English*]

Mr. David Anderson (Esquimalt-Saanich): I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister give the assurance, inasmuch as Canadian consumers, particularly low-income consumers, will be most affected by any ban on imported footwear, that the Canadian Consumers Association will be consulted before any decision is taken?

Mr. Pepin: The government always tries to protect all aspects of the Canadian interest. There is of course no mention of a ban on imports.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—PROPOSED CONFERENCE OF GOVERNMENT, INDUSTRY AND LABOUR ON CONTROL PROGRAM

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Acting Prime Minister or the Minister of Finance, whoever has the knowledge, whether the government has yet reached a decision concerning whether it will convene a conference of labour and business along with government as requested by the CLC in order to try to work out some program upon which government, labour and business can agree with regard to combating inflation?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the government has not yet made a decision along these lines, but I can say on behalf of the government that we welcome the willingness of the trade union organizations to meet with the government and to talk seriously about the inflationary problem. It is one that affects all of us, and no one more seriously than the members of trade unions.

Mr. Stanfield: I ask the Acting Prime Minister whether, instead of expressing gratitude and pious wishes, the government will get busy and take advantage of an opportunity that might lead to some fruitful results?

SHIPBUILDING

PUBLICATION OF ROBERTSON INQUIRY REPORT —ASSISTANCE TO INDUSTRY

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): I have a question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Has the government received the report of the Robertson inquiry into a long-term maritime policy for Canada and, if so, what will be done with the report? Will it be published or will the minister be making at least a quick review of it in Parliament before the session is over?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): I received the report, which is 600 pages long, last Tuesday. The committee presented it to the Canadian Shipbuilding and Ship Repairing Association the next day. This is a report of the committee and the committee is free to do what it wants with it. I understand that copies are now available or will be made available soon to the Parliamentary Library.

Mr. Bell: In view of the statement made yesterday by the chairman of the Canadian Shipbuilding and Ship Repairing Association of Canada that this industry has had its worst year since 1940, will the minister do everything he can to hurry some relief to the industry?

Mr. Pepin: Yes, indeed, Mr. Speaker, but I think if my hon. friend reads the 600-page report he will realize very soon that one of the major facts that comes out of the report is that the committee while making important suggestions, does not disagree with the fundamental position taken by the government in respect of shipbuilding, specially with respect to subsidies.

POLLUTION

PROPOSED U.S. TAX ON LEADED GASOLINE— CANADIAN POSITION

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): I have a question for the Minister of Finance. In view of the proposal made in the United States by President Nixon to impose a tax on leaded gasoline to help in the fight against pollution, is the government of Canada presently giving any consideration to a similar proposal?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): It is an interesting way of raising additional revenue, but it is not presently being considered by the federal government.

HOUSING

ALLEGED FEDERAL DELAY IN APPROVING PUBLIC HOUSING PROJECTS

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): My question is for the Minister without Portfolio in charge of housing. I should like to ask him whether, in light of the claim of the chairman of the Ontario Housing Corporation that a substantial failure in achieving the targets for public housing in the metropolitan area can be attributed to a slowdown by the federal government in approving projects, the minister will assure the House that the situation will be remedied immediately in view of the urgent need for public housing in that area?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): I dispute the premise on which the remarks of the chairman of the Ontario Housing Corporation were based because, to the best of my knowledge—and I have looked into it—there has not been any inordinate delay in approving any projects brought forward. There have been discussions on occasions about density and amenities within projects recommended by the OHC, but amicable settlements have been made in each case. I think this is a red herring which has been brought into the picture based on some public housing fund freezing about a year and a half ago. I do not know how long they can continue to hide behind that one.

POLLUTION

LAKE ST. CLAIR—COMPENSATION TO SEINE FISHERMEN AND CAMP OPERATORS BECAUSE OF BAN ON FISHING

Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent-Essex): I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. In view of the question I asked him regarding federal compensation to those affected by the ban on fishing in Lake St. Clair and his answer that the fishermen were already paid, may I now ask the minister when the government's financial commitment to the seine fishermen and camp operators in that area will be fulfilled?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): We are making loans or advances to commercial fishermen whose livelihood has been cut off as a result of mercury pollution. Those loans are limited to people whose livelihood is related to commercial fishing. We have not made advances in areas where there is no ban on fishing, nor have we been making advances for sports fishery or related activities to people such as marina operators. The province of Ontario has been looking after the latter cases.

HUDSON BAY—LEVEL OF MERCURY IN BELUGA WHALES

Mr. Paul St. Pierre (Coast Chilcotin): I have a supplementary question for the minister regarding mercury pollution. Can the minister advise the House whether the mercury pollution level in beluga whales in Hudson Bay has reached dangerous proportions and, if so, is the Eskimo fishery in Rankin Inlet in danger?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): We have received the results of further tests on polluted whales canned in a whale factory in Rankin Inlet, and nearly all these tests show the level to be above our acceptable limit of .5 parts per million. However, other fish species have been relatively free of mercury, so there is no problem in respect of other species. Our information is that these whales have picked up the mercury at the mouths of rivers in James Bay and at the mouth of the Nelson River system.

TASK FORCE ON SOURCES OF MERCURY CONTAMINATION

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): In view of the continuing indications of mercury pollution throughout the environment, particularly in Canada, is the minister considering setting up a special task force to inquire into the sources of mercury poisoning in so many places in Canada?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): We do have a special task force dealing with this problem. I might say that there is a modest level or a background of mercury in all waters. It is only where there are exceptional levels of mercury that we have a problem. We think we have identified nearly all of these areas now. We are improving our background information and dealing with local problems as they arise.

[Mr. Danforth.]

ACTION RESPECTING PRODUCTION AND CONTROL OF DDT

Mr. P. V. Noble (Grey-Simcoe): My question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. Has the government taken any action with respect to production and control of DDT and, if so what is it?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): I cannot give a complete answer to that due to the limitation of time in this period, but many changes have been made related to the purposes for which licences will be issued and labels authorized in so far as the distribution of DDT is concerned. As a matter of fact, we have reduced the purposes by about 90 per cent from the period prior to making the announcement several months ago.

FINANCE

ACTION FOLLOWING MOORE REPORT ON FOREIGN CONTROL OF SECURITIES FIRMS

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Finance. In view of the Moore study recommending that an increase in the foreign control of Canadian securities firms be prohibited, can he indicate what, if any, action the government intends to take on the study's recommendations?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): We have only had the Moore Committee report for a very short period of time and we are studying its recommendations carefully. I would like, however, to welcome the report and to express appreciation to the securities industry and to the chairman and members of the committee for the comprehensive study they have produced. While I do not wish to comment at this time on the specific recommendations in the report, I will observe that the underlying principles of the report as regards foreign ownership in the industry are very much in line with government policy concerning other segments of the financial community.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It seems to me that the answer which the minister is giving now is more in the form of a statement which should be made on motions. I will have to seek the co-operation of hon. members in connection with supplementary questions. Many hon. members have been rising diligently and patiently for the last 30 minutes and are anxious for an opportunity to put their questions. Perhaps the hon. member for Waterloo may be allowed a supplementary question.

Mr. Saltsman: Has the Minister of Finance given consideration to the present access of the Merrill Lynch Company to the Bank of Canada through the Royal Securities Corporation and the effect this might have on the confidential relationships with the bank? Is it the minister's intention to restrict this access solely to Canadian-owned firms?

Mr. Benson: At the time the Moore Committee was carrying out a study of this matter the Department of Finance, in conjunction with the Bank of Canada, was also looking at the federal implications thereof. I hope to present to the House in due course a report indicating our views in this regard.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): I wonder if the minister would be able to make some progress in the establishment of a national securities commission by obtaining greater co-operation from the provinces than has been obtained by his colleague, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, who has made no progress in 18 months?

[*Translation*]

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Villeneuve.

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): For Témiscamingue, Mr. Speaker.

I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs, as Acting Prime Minister.

According to the news this morning, there will probably be a change of government in Great Britain. Does the government intend to send a telegram of congratulations to the sole Liberal member elected yesterday in Great Britain?

[*English*]

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

DETENTION IN JAIL FOR LONG PERIODS OF PERSONS AWAITING TRIAL

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Justice. Is he aware that yesterday in Montreal, because of lack of evidence, a charge was dismissed against a young man who had been in jail for 16 months without trial or even bail? Will he please assure the House that this case will be investigated? Would he also check into the allegation that people are sitting in jail because judges are away on vacation or because there are not enough judges to deal with cases?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): I will certainly take this up with the Attorney General of Quebec.

AIRPORTS

AVAILABILITY OF TAXIS TO SERVE PUBLIC

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Transport. I would like to ask whether he intends to allow the present practice of taxi firms keeping the travelling public waiting following the arrival of planes to continue, or will he instruct these firms to check the times of arrival of planes and have taxis available for the convenience of the public rather than at the convenience of the taxi firms?

Mr. Speaker: I interpret the hon. member's question as a representation to the minister. The House has to assume it has been noted.

INDUSTRY

ASSISTANCE TO ENAMEL AND HEATING AIRCRAFT DIVISION

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland-Colchester North): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Supply and Services. Will the minister look into alternate ways and means of assisting the aircraft division of Enamel and Heating at Amherst, which has found its work load severely curtailed because of the phase-out of the Yukon and Argus aircraft?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I have already indicated to the House that the department is receiving tenders on that work at the present time, and these will be opened shortly.

PROVISION OF WORK AT FAIREY AVIATION PLANT

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Supply and Services. For many, many months the 400 or 500 workmen at the Fairey Aviation of Canada plant at Eastern Passage have been in employment one day and out the next, and they are now in quite a desperate plight. Will the question of the overhaul of the Argus and Tracker aircraft be cleared up by the end of June?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I cannot set that date but the tenders will be opened shortly, during the month of June; then they will be studied and the contract awarded.

GRAIN

WHEAT—ACREAGE REDUCTION PROGRAM—INCLUSION OF PITIC 62 IN QUOTA REQUIREMENTS

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Would he consider reviewing what appears to be an unjust situation regarding Pitic 62, a feed grain which is being listed in the wheat quota requirements under Operation Lift, but which is only licensed as a feed grain and grown as a feed grain?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I would have to have more information than the hon. member has given me and I appreciate the limitations in the question period. If it was stipulated as a feed grain those acres would be allocated for quota of that particular grain. I do not believe there is a market for it at the moment.

Mr. Horner: No, there is not.

INDUSTRY

PROPOSED CLOSING OF CANADIAN SUBSIDIARY BY SKIL CORPORATION OF CHICAGO

Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, a week ago I asked a question of the Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce regarding the possible phasing out of its Vancouver operation by Skil Corporation of Chicago, with the loss of 125 jobs. Has the minister anything to report because at that time the acting minister replied that consultation between the department and company officials was proceeding?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, this is still the case. My officials are trying very hard to convince the company to keep on operating this plant in Vancouver or, possibly as second-best, to find a buyer here in Canada. The discussions are continuing.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

REQUESTED RECALL OF BILL C-196 FROM COMMITTEE

Mr. A. B. Douglas (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting House Leader in the absence of the President of the Privy Council. Would he consider introducing a motion recalling Bill C-196, authorizing protein grading which is so urgently required for western Canadian wheat, from the Standing Committee on Agriculture so it can be passed before the House adjourns for the summer, since the bill is obviously being obstructed in the committee—

[Mr. Forrestall.]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest to the hon. member that this is argument.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

FILLING OF VACANCY ON NEW BRUNSWICK COURT OF APPEAL

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, I have an urgent national question, having to do with the province of New Brunswick, for the Minister of Justice. As the first anniversary of a vacancy in the Court of Appeal of New Brunswick will occur when Parliament is in recess, can we have an announcement about an appointment before that year is up?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Yes, sir.

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): As a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, does the minister really think he can attend the annual New Brunswick barristers meeting in a few days time, without having made this appointment, and not suffer any bodily harm from his pals there?

VETERANS AFFAIRS

INQUIRY AS TO PRESENTATION OF COMMITTEE REPORT—WHITE PAPER ON SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs a question. Would he advise the House when the report of the standing committee will be presented to the House and if it will be before June 26?

Mr. Lloyd Francis (Ottawa West): Mr. Speaker, the report is now in process of being translated. I would hope that, with the permission of the House, we would be able to revert to motions on Monday afternoon and have the report presented at that time.

Mr. Marshall: As a supplementary question, I should like to clarify an answer by the Minister of National Health and Welfare which had to do with war veterans. He prom-

ised to introduce the white paper on social policy before the end of the session. Did he mean before the recess on June 26 or before the end of the actual session?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member may have been unintentionally misled when he asked when the white paper on social policy would be tabled and I said before the end of the session. I meant the end of the session, and not before the recess.

INDUSTRY

U.S.-CANADA AUTOMOBILE PACT—CHANGES IN LIGHT OF STATEMENT BY MINISTER

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Does the minister favour significant, immediate changes in the Canada-U.S. auto pact in view of his statement in Toronto that he strongly favoured multilateral trade and that specific commodity agreements were not always desirable?

Mr. Speaker: The question as asked is not in order.

DRUGS

NON-MEDICAL USE—USE BY RCMP OF UNDERCOVER AGENTS

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Justice related to the statement by the Minister of National Health and Welfare on the LeDain Commission report. Will the government be taking into consideration, along with the whole of the LeDain Commission report or that part of it already received, the existing investigative practices of the RCMP in infiltrating groups of young persons and encouraging the commission of narcotic offences?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I suppose I can say on behalf of the Solicitor General that he will be interested in making a comment about that at the appropriate time.

POLLUTION

THE ARCTIC—SALVAGING OF SUNKEN BARGE CARRYING DIESEL OIL AND AVIATION FUEL

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. In view of the fact that 2,000 tons of light diesel oil and aviation fuel were lost in August, 1969, in the Arctic with the sinking of the barge *Johnny Norberg*, I would ask the minister if any further attempts will be made to locate and salvage this cargo of dangerous pollutants?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to look into the matter. I have not had a report or heard any comment about it in recent weeks. I will take note of the hon. member's question and see what I can do.

AIRPORTS

TORONTO—RENEWAL OF GROUND TRANSPORTATION CONTRACT

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I have been standing for 163 minutes during the last four days I have been in the House, and I wonder if there will be any opportunity to be recognized by the Chair before the end of the session.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member might get in touch with some of his colleagues so that it might be easier for the Chair to recognize him. But if there is unanimous consent for the hon. member to ask a question he may do so.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Skoberg: I did not really mean to use that approach in order to be recognized, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Transport. Would the minister tell the House whether he sanctioned the statement by the hon. member for York West that the contract for air terminal transport had been renewed?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That question could wait another 160 minutes. Orders of the day.

• (12:20 p.m.)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

NORTHERN INLAND WATERS BILL

CONSERVATION, DEVELOPMENT AND UTILIZATION OF RESOURCES—CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENT

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development) moved the second reading of and concurrence in the

amendment made by the Senate to Bill C-187, respecting inland water resources in the Yukon Territory and Northwest Territories.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Speaker, I have some comments to make but before I do so, on a point of order I wonder if the minister would explain why we are considering this amendment at this time.

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, it is just a technical amendment to make sure that in this inland water bill the wording is in accord with the wording of the fisheries bill. It is just a new definition, changing the word "waste" to the other word that is mentioned in the motion. It is a technical amendment put forward in the Senate and we have no objection to it.

Mr. Aiken: May I ask the minister a question? In view of the fact that the amendment to the Fisheries Act has not yet passed the House, either on report stage or on third reading, what on earth is going to happen to this amendment if the Fisheries Act does not go through exactly as the government expects?

Mr. Chrétien: If there is a change in the Fisheries Act we may have a little problem. However, the purpose is quite clear and that is to try to get the same wording in both pieces of legislation. I think that members can try to stall good collaboration between different departments, but I do not think it is wise to do so.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I must caution hon. members against this interesting exchange. I am prepared to recognize the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka if he would like to make some comments on the motion before the House.

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): I have some comments, Mr. Speaker, because the minister has given me the background that I wanted. There is one point I want to make which is basic. This is a very minute amendment to the Northern Inland Waters Act but it illustrates what a haphazard, careless, unco-ordinated approach the government has taken to the whole question of water pollution, water management, northern affairs and all the bills that have been before the House during this session of Parliament.

This amendment illustrates the type of thing that many other members of the opposition, and indeed even some members on the government side, have been trying to impress

on the government, namely, the need for some co-ordination of activities in connection with water pollution and water management in this country. Let's get some person, some body, some minister or organization to co-ordinate everything the federal government is doing in connection with water pollution.

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Aiken: Certainly.

Mr. Chrétien: As the hon. member is aware, in the north there will be a board and the administration of the three pieces of legislation will be controlled by the same board. This will achieve the objective the hon. member has in mind.

Mr. Aiken: My argument is more basic than that, Mr. Speaker. I approve of this amendment which we are now being asked to consider. I cannot object to it because of the way it has been handled. But I am pointing out that these three bills were jockeyed back and forth between three committees. One committee did not know what the other was doing, nor did one department know what another department was doing. There was jockeying between the management of water resources under the Canada Water Act, under the Northern Inland Waters Act, which we are now considering, under the Fisheries Act and the Arctic Waters Pollution Act.

We started off in a fairly good fashion because waste was defined identically in all bills. When the Fisheries bill was studied by the Committee on Fisheries and Forestry, however, that committee decided that the word "waste" did not suit the Fisheries Act and so they decided to use the words "deleterious substances". The Canada Water Act, Bill C-144, was referred to the Committee on National Resources and Public Works. We worked on that bill from early February until May, and it was finally passed in the House. At the same time, the Fisheries Act was before the House and then went to the Committee on Fisheries and Forestry. The fisheries bill was intended to achieve the same purpose, although it was a little more definite.

I see the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) here and I have to say that he took us one step further from where the Canada Water Act had left us. Nevertheless, the Fisheries Act was amended and the word "waste" was redefined to read "deleterious

substances". Then, the northern inland waters bill also contained a definition of waste, but it was not changed to comply with the recommendations of the Fisheries Committee. So now, in fact, the Senate is catching up with the mistake that we all made. The Fisheries Act was in the Committee on Fisheries and Forestry. At the same time, the government had the northern inland waters bill and the arctic waters pollution prevention bill before the Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development. These bills were supposed to achieve roughly the same purpose as the Canada Water Act and the Fisheries Act amendment, that is, moving toward anti-pollution measures and better water management under the federal jurisdiction.

The Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development did not know exactly what was going on in the other two committees, except that some members of our party were doing their best to run between each of the three committees studying the water bill, the fisheries bill and the northern waters bill. However, they could not manage that because often the committees were all sitting at the same time. Whether this was intentional on the part of the government, I do not know Mr. Speaker. If so it was deplorable, because it did not give one committee an opportunity to consider what the others were doing. If it was unintentional it has backfired. That is why I am turning the prod a little now. If it was accidental that is even worse, because it shows a lack of management in this whole problem.

• (12:30 p.m.)

I rise to speak this afternoon because in spite of the efforts of many of us to tell the government to have one person control what was going on in all these departments and in connection with all these bills, there has been no action. We are going to have an amendment to the Canada Shipping Act later this year which will also deal with oil pollution. This undertaking has been given by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson). We are to have a clean air act, and that will be under the administration of the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro). Both these measures have been promised to the House.

Where will this jockeying back and forth lead and who will give some thought to the need for federal co-ordination in these matters? That is what I ask in speaking on what seems to be a very minor amendment made by the Senate. I shall be surprised if this is the only mistake that was made in the four bills that were put through simultaneously. Actually I see that Bill C-219, the Fisheries Act amendment, is to be further amended. The proposed amendment is not that of the minister but of a private member. I will be surprised if there are not a good many overlappings or gaps in the bills which have been simultaneously considered.

There is one more important matter I ought to raise with the minister. We are considering an amendment to the Northern Inland Waters bill which was passed by the House and sent to the Senate. The Senate looked at the bill and sent it back to us saying, "You fellows in the House of Commons overlooked something." The Senate was quite right. The problem confronting us at the moment is that this bill is being amended to comply with the Fisheries Act amendments which are still before the House. There is a great, long list of proposed amendments to be considered at the report stage with respect to that bill.

Mr. Chrétien: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. May I clarify the statement I made before? Probably I did not use the right words. This amendment is made because something was overlooked and not because the wording of this bill does not comply with the amendments to the fisheries bill. This terminology is the same as that used in the old bill. It is not in the new fisheries bill. It was in the old bill, but was overlooked. The amendment is brought, not because of the wording of the new fisheries bill but because this new bill is to include some of the old bill's terminology.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Speaker, I accept the minister's statement. It is my understanding that there was something wrong with the Northern Inland Waters Bill and that it had to be sent back from the Senate. The fact of the matter is that there was some discrepancy between the definitions, and that must now be corrected. Actually, I do not think we ought to be proceeding with our consideration of this bill until we have passed the amendments to the fisheries bill, because the fisheries bill amendments must still be considered at third reading. I have read this bill. On line 11, page 8 of the bill we are considering there is a specific reference to the Fisheries Act. This reference is contained in clause 10(3)(b). I submit that we are amending the Northern Inland Waters Act to comply with the Fisheries Act, despite what the minister has said,

and that the Fisheries Act must be considered by the House when it comes here at the report stage, and at the subsequent third reading stage.

I merely ask this: What sort of mess are we in? What would happen if someone, and it could be the government, were to move an amendment to the fisheries bill at the report stage or at the third reading stage, as could still be done, and thereby change some definitions? I understand that the definitions are not entirely satisfactory to all concerned. I think the whole thing is out of kilter. I think this bill has been brought too far too soon. This shows how little co-ordination there is in our whole anti-pollution and water management programs, something that many Canadians have been saying during the last few months.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Mr. Aiken: On division.

Motion agreed to, amendment read the second time and concurred in.

YUKON ACT, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES ACT AND TERRITORIAL LANDS ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING MEMBERS OF COUNCILS, VOTERS, APPOINTMENT OF JUDGES, LAND MANAGEMENT ZONES, ETC.

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-212, to amend the Yukon Act, the Northwest Territories Act and the Territorial Lands Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, before we proceed I wonder if it could be agreed that any votes on the amendments at the report stage will be deferred until all amendments have been considered.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): That is the rule.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: That seems a reasonable proposition. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Prior to proceeding I must say, on a pessimistic note, that I shall have difficulty in accepting several of these motions. I am prepared to hear procedural arguments on them. Specifically, I am speaking of Motions Nos. 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10 standing in the name of the hon. member for Yukon. I think he will probably agree with me that the procedural difficulties are the same in each of the cases. If he prefers to argue all the motions as a group, that will be fine; if he prefers to argue on each motion as it comes before the House, that also will be fine.

[Mr. Aiken.]

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I am prepared, and I think for the sake of order it will be more convenient, to argue the procedural difficulties chronologically as we consider the amendments. This will prove somewhat difficult because we have the bill as originally printed before us which includes the explanatory notes, whereas the reprinted bill as amended by the committee does not include the explanatory notes.

May I deal with Motion No. 1, which reads:

That Bill C-212, An Act to amend the Yukon Act, the Northwest Territories Act and the Territorial Lands Act, be amended by adding thereto, immediately following clause 1 thereof, the following: "2. Subsection (1) of section 9 of the said Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

Before reading the substitution, I should like to place on the record the existing subsection 1 of section 9 of the Yukon Act, which reads:

There shall be a Council of the Yukon Territory, which shall be composed of seven members elected to represent such electoral districts in the Territory as are named and described by the Commissioner in Council.

The amendment reads:

"(1) There shall be a Council of the Yukon Territory, which shall be composed of fifteen members elected to represent such electoral districts in the Territory as are named and described by the Commissioner in Council and by renumbering the subsequent clauses accordingly."—

The only change that this amendment makes, of course, is to increase the number of such members on the Council from seven to 15. I anticipate that Your Honour might believe, and members on the government benches might submit to Your Honour, that this amendment affects the expenditure of revenues from the Consolidated Revenue Fund and therefore cannot be brought by a private member. However, may I draw Your Honour's attention to the recommendation contained in the bill as originally printed, which was read the first time on May 11, 1970. Opposite page 1 of the bill, in the left hand column in the English version, I read the recommendation.

• (12:40 p.m.)

His Excellency the Governor General has recommended to the House of Commons the present measure—

That is Bill C-212.

—to amend the Yukon Act and the Northwest Territories Act respecting the payment of indemnities and expenses to the members of the Council of the Yukon Territory and of the Northwest Territories; to broaden the powers of the Commissioners in Council respecting the administration of justice and respecting the establishment, maintenance and management of prisons;—

Here are the important words, Mr. Speaker:

—and to increase the size of the respective Councils and the number of members elected thereto;—

Had it been the intention of the recommendation to confine the increase of the council members to the Council of the Northwest Territories, those words would not have been used in the recommendation.

The amendment proposes to increase the size and elected membership of the Yukon council. Under section 15 of the Yukon Act, members of the council are paid an indemnity and travelling expenses. The amendment, therefore, will result in an appropriation of the public revenue. Accordingly, it is a money amendment. As such the expenditures proposed must come within the purpose specified in the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor General as required by section 54 of the British North America Act and Standing Order 52(1).

His Excellency's recommendation in respect of Bill C-212, as I have read it from the bill, appears in *Votes and Proceedings* of May 11, 1970 at page 765. I have already read the text of that recommendation into the record. I repeat the last purpose set out in the first paragraph of the recommendation which reads:

—and to increase the size of the respective Councils and the number of members elected thereto;

The word "councils" in my submission refers back in the paragraph to the words, Council of the Yukon Territory and Council of the Northwest Territories. The earlier purpose also provides for the payment of indemnities and expenses to the members of councils with the result, therefore, that the purpose specified by His Excellency covered increasing the size of membership of the Yukon Council and payment of indemnities and expenses to such members, as well as increasing the size and the membership of the Northwest Territories Council and payment of indemnities and expenses to such members. Indeed, in the bill itself, it will be found that the size and membership of the Northwest Territories Council has been increased.

For whatever reason, the bill does not fulfil the specific purpose of increasing the size and membership of the Yukon Council as specified by His Excellency. The amendment for that purpose, in my submission, is quite in order. It is in order whether it is made by a Minister of the Crown or a member of the House who is not a member of the government. If that were not the case, the recommendation would have been confined and perhaps worded in a fashion similar to the words in the last sentence, and to increase the size of the Council of the Northwest Territories and the number of members elected thereto.

That is not what the recommendation of His Excellency sets forth. It sets forth that the number of members of the respective councils are to be increased in size and membership. It is on the basis of those authorities that I submit the amendment is in order and should be put.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I would like to reply as follows to the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen). The recommendation submitted to His Excellency the Governor General mentioned the possibility of increasing the number of the members of the Councils of both the Northwest Territories and the Yukon, but the government when it tabled the bill in the House did not see fit to increase the number of councillors for several reasons.

Moreover, the committee that studied the bill made no recommendation to this effect. Only the hon. member wants to do so today and since the government did not propose this, clearly a member of the House cannot propose something involving considerable expenditures of public funds without government approval.

At this time, an increase of the number of councillors would involve such increased expenditures.

For this reason, I submit that the hon. member is not entitled to present such a proposal to the House, but only a minister of the Crown and no member of the cabinet has seen fit to do so.

[*English*]

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I was not aware that these amendments would be before us today. Therefore, I was not aware that there would be another opportunity to get into a debate

on procedure. It is Friday and it is a good day to have this kind of debate. At any rate, having been caught unaware and not having had the opportunity to go into my files for something that I know is there, I will have to rely on my memory. But I think it is fairly accurate in this case.

About 1948, the government of that day proposed an increase in the old age pension. The resolution preceding the bill, to which was attached the recommendation of the Governor General, did not specify an amount. It merely said that the Governor General recommended this proposal for an increase. During the course of that session we, in our party, had been circulating rather extensively a petition asking for an increase in the old age pension, I think to what was then the magnanimous sum of $50 a month. When we collected the signatures for that petition, and we received considerable help to bring them down and table them in the House, there was some question as to whether the petition would be in order because it asked for an expenditure of $50 a month for every old age pensioner in Canada. To our pleasant surprise, when the Clerk of Petitions gave his report a day or so later he indicated that the petition was in order despite the fact that it asked for something that involved the expenditure of money because there was on the Order Paper a recommendation in the name of the Governor General asking for an increase in the pension without specifying the amount. Up to this point, I am absolutely sure of my memory. In fact I think I even have the right year, 1948.

I am not absolutely sure of my memory on what I am going to say next. It seems to me that we also moved an amendment to the bill when it came before us, relying on a citation in Beauchesne that says that if the precise amount was not named in the recommendation of the Governor General, it is in order for any member to move any amendment provided it comes within the terms of that recommendation.

• (12:50 p.m.)

Whether that amendment was moved, or voted upon, I am not sure; I would have to check the record. But as to the previous statement I made, I am sure of my memory. The clerk of petitions—and he is a very authoritative person—ruled that because there was this blank cheque recommendation from the Governor General our petition was in order. I trust this bit of history is not only interesting to younger members but that it is relevant to the present situation, because what the Governor General has recommended in this case is an increase in the size of the respective councils and in the number of members elected thereto. The recommendation does not say to what number the councils ought to be increased. It is a blank cheque, an unstated increase, just as was the case in the recommendation of 1948 to which I referred.

I realize that a lot of water has gone under the bridge since 1948 and that there has been a lot of jurisprudence, but I do not recall any case that would upset that one. So, on the basis of that decision and because the recommendation is so broad, it seems to me it is open to any hon. member, whether he is a member of the government or not, to move an amendment provided it stays within what is recommended, namely, the authority to increase the size of the respective councils and the number of members elected thereto. I believe that what the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) seeks to do is within the provisions of the blank cheque given and that as far as this aspect of the matter is concerned it should be allowed as being in order.

Mr. Nielsen: With the indulgence of the Chair and members of the House I would draw the attention of Your Honour to an exchange which took place on the introduction of this bill—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Since the hon. member has already spoken on this question he can only do so again, as he said, with the indulgence of hon. members. Is the House agreeable to allowing the hon. member to continue on this point of order?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Nielsen: I thank hon. members. I would draw Your Honour's attention to *Hansard* for May 13. I raised this point of order then, as reported on page 6927 and subsequently. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) took part in the exchange, as did Mr. Speaker, who was in the Chair. As reported on page 6928, Mr. Speaker had this to say—the reference in the first line is to myself:

> In this instance the hon. member objects to it (the recommendation) because there are not in the bill some matters which perhaps should have been there in order to be covered by the royal recommendation. I would not think that this makes the recommendation invalid. I hope I am not making a mistake in this regard, but I will look into the matter further and try to study the point a little more closely. I assume that this bill is not going

to be passed immediately but will eventually come back to the House, so there will still be time either to make a correction—

Meaning, in the recommendation itself—

—or by clarifying the point after I have looked into the situation more closely.

Perhaps His Honour might be given that opportunity, since we are so close to the luncheon adjournment now.

I would also draw to Your Honour's attention a point raised by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien) at that time. The revenues from which the members of the council are paid do not come from the consolidated revenue fund of the Government of Canada but rather from the Yukon consolidated revenue fund, which is a separate fund entirely, by virtue of Section 15 of the existing act.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Possibly I might accept the invitation of the hon. member for Yukon to reflect on this over the luncheon adjournment. I feel obliged, however, to point out that my procedural objection does not lie in the interesting area of argument developed so far. I do not want to prejudge any decision, but my objection really lies in the area of relevancy—does the amendment in fact go beyond the terms of the bill. It seems to me there are citations in Beauchesne and May which are unequivocal with regard to this matter. Nevertheless, I will reflect on the arguments put forward and make a ruling after the luncheon adjournment.

It being one o'clock I do now leave the chair until 2 p.m.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Prior to the luncheon adjournment the House was considering the procedural admissibility or otherwise of a motion at the report stage in the name of the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) to Bill C-212. At the time the Chair had some doubt as to its admissibility and heard procedural arguments. During the luncheon hour we have had some chance to give the matter further thought.

I must say that the difficulty is partly procedural and arises partly from the fact that we are very conscious of the importance of the amendment to the hon. member for Yukon. This is obviously something of prime importance to him, a matter to which he has given a great deal of thought. I have also heard him many times in debate on the subject. This always makes it more difficult, because the Chair realizes the degree of commitment.

If it is of some consolation, I must say that I confess the procedural arguments with respect to possible objection on the ground that it might violate financial provisions were somewhat convincing. However, I must return to what I alluded to prior to the luncheon adjournment as the ground upon which I take procedural objection to the amendment, namely, that it seems to me that it goes behind bill C-212 and tries to amend the provisions in the main Act which are not covered in Bill C-212.

It has been suggested that the proposal covered by this motion is irrelevant and goes beyond the scope of Bill C-212. I would draw the attention of the House to May's seventeenth edition, page 549, which provides:

An amendment is out of order if it is irrelevant to the subject matter or beyond the scope of the bill, or if it is irrelevant to the subject matter or beyond the scope of the clause under consideration.

In like manner, I might also remind the House of citation 406 of Beauchesne's fourth edition, which provides, in part:

Amendments are out of order if they are (a) irrelevant to the bill, or beyond its scope—

For these reasons, and with some regret, as I have expressed, I must rule the motion inadmissible.

The House will now deal with Motion No. 2, which I might put to the House. The hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) moves:

That Bill C-212, an act to amend the Yukon Act, the Northwest Territories Act and the Territorial Lands Act be amended by deleting the words "but the Governor in Council may, after consultation with the Council, at any time dissolve the Council and cause a new Council to be elected" in clause 2, lines 12, 13, 14 and 15, page 1 thereof, and replacing the comma after the word "longer" in line 12 with a period.

• (2:10 p.m.)

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, this amendment will be a little difficult for members to follow if they are consulting both the bill as originally printed and as reprinted. The amendment attempts to amend the bill as originally printed because this section was amended in committee. That amendment is reflected in the bill as reprinted. The reason for advancing Motion No. 2 is to have it in

preference to the section as it reads in the reprinted bill. The original print of the bill would have the council continue for four years instead of three years as is now set forth in the Act. Then, a certain phrase appears. Really, I would ask the minister to give us any logical reason he can that this archaic and colonialistic phrase should be continued. Although it may have been necessary at the turn of the century when it was originated, it is not necessary in this modern day and age. In section 7 the act sets forth clearly that the minister always has control of the administration of the government of the territories on the instructions of the Governor in Council from time to time through his commissioner.

In essence, the minister can do anything he pleases. He can in fact disregard every other section of the Act and proceed under a completely autocratic sort of system. I am not suggesting that he does this, but he has this power. He knows he has this power and, indeed, he said so to members during the committee hearing. Here we have a phrase which purports to extend the life of the council from three years to four years, but then it is clouded by a great club to be held over the head of the elected council of the Yukon because the Governor in Council has power to dissolve the council at pleasure if the activities of the elected members of the council do not meet with the approval of the cabinet or the minister. In that situation, the council can be dissolved. This seems to me to smack of King George III. I know the minister has no ambition to be King George III. There are some people in the Yukon or in the Northwest Territories who may wish him to be Louis XIV.

Why should the Governor in Council hold such a club over the heads of an elected body? Surely this is unnecessary. The whole purpose of Motion No. 2, as set forth on the notice paper, is to do away with this power. Why could we not simply say that there shall be a wholly elected council in the Yukon Territory consisting of seven members. We would have liked to have 15, but that has been ruled out of order. The minister knows that the Liberal Association in the Yukon, the Yukon council, and all of us would like 15, but we are not to be given 15. However, even with a council of seven members, why should we be subjected to this overriding power of the Governor in Council because the minister in any event has the power to direct the affairs of the government of the Yukon. He does not need a residual power. If he does not like what the elected representatives of the people are doing there, he can simply dismiss the council out of hand. This smacks of pure colonialism. It is archaic, out of date and has no useful purpose in the legislation. The purpose of the amendment is to do away with this phrase.

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to be difficult, but I should like to explain to the House why we feel this amendment should not be accepted. The main reason is we are trying to have a system of democratic institutions in Canada which is similar everywhere in the country. This practice, by which the Governor in Council, the Lieutenant Governor in Council or the minister may play a role to an extent in the Yukon, is to permit the people who elected the representative to have an opportunity to have another look at the situation. Members here in Ottawa are elected to the Parliament of Canada for five years. If there should be a problem in the House of Commons, the Governor General, on the advice of the Prime Minister, (Mr. Trudeau), has the power to call a new election. A similar problem could arise in the north. There might be a conflict between the administration represented in the north by the commissioner and the elected members.

There could be a situation in which the administration and the elected members did not agree. A conflict might result in which members would refuse to vote money. All sorts of problems could arise. Normally, the matter would be referred to the electors who could elect a new council or re-elect the same members. With this provision, the administration would know that it had the power to give the voters of the Yukon Territory or the Northwest Territories an opportunity to express their view if there should be a crisis. I know that for years and years this power has never been exercised. The hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) should know I am the last person to be very autocratic.

Mr. Nielsen: I don't know.

Mr. Chrétien: This will provide a lot of flexibility to the operation at a time when we are moving as never before in the direction of having elected members in the administration.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, would the minister permit a question? Would he not agree that this power has never been exercised?

Mr. Chrétien: I agree, and I do not intend to exercise it, but we never know. If there should be a complete disagreement we could be in an inflexible position for four years. If the minister should be a tough guy who does not give a damn about the people of the Yukon—you know, if the Tory administration ever came back, which will not be the case—there would be no chance for the people to debate.

Mr. Nielsen: Amend the act.

Mr. Chrétien: Oh, yes, but you know the problem in respect of amending legislation. Members of the House of Commons always have a lot of good ideas with which we have to cope. Why should we create problems when we can have flexibility in the legislation? The hon. member would have us establish a system which is imported directly from the United States. What the hon. member wants to establish by his amendment is a sort of congressional system, such as exists in the United States, where the members sit for two years or four years.

Mr. Nielsen: You have to be out of your tree.

Mr. Chrétien: No. That is the same system they have. In Canada when there is a conflict between the administration and the legislature, the people have the right to have an election to decide between the two. I believe so much in the Canadian institution that I do not wish to deprive the people of the Yukon of that right.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Chrétien: I think my hon. friend has overlooked that aspect of the problem and, for that reason, will not pursue his amendment.

• (2:20 p.m.)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe it was agreed before we embarked on the debate on all these amendments that the votes on all of them would be put at the end of the day. I will not disagree if the House wishes to reverse its decision, but I think that was the agreement.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: That was the proceeding I was following. The question has to be put to determine whether a vote is required and if five hon. members rise, I will defer the vote.

Mr. Nielsen: I rise on the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. I understood that it was agreed that all questions would be put at the end of the day, whether or not five members rose.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The proceeding is a fairly common one at this stage of our proceedings. The question is put, and if a decision is required, the division is deferred.

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Before the question is put, may I make a few comments since I second this very reasonable amendment. I was quite surprised at the explanation given by the minister, for whom I feel a great deal of affection and kindness. In explaining this particular amendment to the House, I cannot say that the minister deliberately misled the House but he certainly confused the House, so far as I am concerned, because the amendment advanced by the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) is so simple.

I am surprised that the young, energetic and emancipated Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien), and the government which prides itself on advocating participatory democracy, is propounding such a sterile, ancient and archaic provision. The House of Lords and House of Commons in England would look like good bedfellows if they ever tried to apply such a sterile type of provision to the House of Commons in Canada, which they might have done in the old days. As the hon. member for Yukon said, what this clause does is to avoid a free expression of the will of the people of the Yukon. We also have disagreements in this House from time to time, but surely if the minister is trying to bring in an emancipated form of government in the north that would be progressive and independent, then the worst way of trying to do it is through this type of provision in the act which tries to treat people in the north like children. In effect, you are saying to them: "You will be a grown up boy now. You can go to school, but mind you come back at five o'clock, and if you do not do so we will whip you".

Mr. Lachance: You are not speaking on the point of order.

Mr. Nowlan: No, I am speaking on the amendment.

Mr. Lachance: You are not on the point of order.

Mr. Nowlan: No. Mr. Speaker, could you explain to the member what I am doing? I am

speaking on the amendment. I know he has not done much homework.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I would request the co-operation of the House. The hon. member is rising to speak on the motion, and every hon. member has the right to speak on this motion.

Mr. Nowlan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The point I was trying to make is that if the hon. member can sit in this chamber and not even appreciate the fact that another hon. member is rising to speak on the motion, then we need more discussion so that members opposite will appreciate the purport of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Yukon. I sincerely believe that there is not a member across the way or on this side who believes that an elected council should be dissolved *ab initio*, with the stroke of a pen, just because there is a disagreement between the council and the commissioners. If this is the way in which the minister wishes to build up confidence in the government of the Yukon and the Northwest Territories, then I am afraid that no matter how sincere he may be he is mistaken. As I said, this provision is archaic and ancient; it reflects against the good people of the Yukon and the Northwest Territories because it will impede the development of self government in the north rather than enhance it, which is what the minister says he wishes to do.

For that reason, I have no hesitation at all in asking hon. members to find out what is involved in this debate. If the hon. member for Lafontaine (Mr. Lachance) does not appreciate when an hon. member speaks on Motion No. 2, then I hope he will take the time and make the effort to read the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Yukon to see whether he agrees to an elected body being chopped off tomorrow with a stroke of a pen by the Governor in Council, which is the cabinet in Ottawa. If he says he thinks that will enhance confidence in the minister's stewardship of the activities in the Yukon and the Northwest Territories, then I will not accept that because I have a higher opinion than that of the hon. member.

There is not a member of this House who would like to see the House of Commons and the House of Lords in England and the so-called Governor in Council over there—if the BNA Act were so construed, and perhaps at some time it was—completely disregard this House. So far as Nova Scotia is concerned such an act did exist in connection with the old legislative council, the old imperial governor in council, whereby such a thing was possible. As my friend the hon. member for Yukon says, this is just a travesty carried on in history. I would have hoped that in the revision of this bill the minister might have rid us of such a sterile section because history indicates that even 100 years ago legislative councils were upended if their action did not conform to popular will. This is just what this provision is trying to do.

I hope that hon. members will give serious consideration to such a reasonable amendment. All it is asking is that we remove from the Governor in Council the supreme power to completely castrate the efforts and work of the council. The minister explained his dilemma by posing a hypothetical situation in which the council and the commissioners might be at loggerheads and the government in the north might break down. I come back to what the hon. member for Yukon suggested, that the minister can bring in his amendment to take care of that situation at that time. There is no necessity to maintain a provision which is so stupid it has not been used as yet. If we are going to make stupid laws in the House, it is no wonder that the people in this country really wonder what goes on here.

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): It seems to me that the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien) has begun to slip back to the paternalistic attitude that has always been held by the Indian section of the branch, the paternalistic attitude toward government itself, particularly in the Northwest Territories. Here we have a situation where the movement in the Territories is toward self-government. This will come about slowly and gradually. This bill is a step in the right direction and there is some hope that eventually the council will run the affairs of the Territories completely and that they will have something in the nature of provincial status. If there is to be a council of the Territories, I cannot understand where there is any logic in retaining in Ottawa, in the bureaucracy here so many miles away from the north, the right to decide, when there is a quarrel going on in the Territories, that the people there cannot settle it themselves. If that is the attitude, then what is the point of the whole exercise? I grant you that there must be a power to dissolve a council, a legislature, or a Parliament.

• (2:30 p.m.)

But that power of dissolution should be with the council itself and not with the Governor General, so that the council members themselves would have some idea of how long they will be there and what sort of planning they can undertake. The minister said that if there were a lot of quarrels among the councillors which they could not resolve, they would have to be settled from Ottawa. That will not bring organization to self-government. The councillors must be at least able to plan ahead, and in many cases they will have to plan contrary to the government in Ottawa.

The problem with Indian Affairs and Northern Development is that Ottawa has always had the power to make the final decisions, and it seems to be retaining that power. In this particular case I think the final decision should rest with the council. I could see some logic in a slight reversal of the government's proposal. I could see some logic in the council recommending to the Governor General that it be dissolved, in the same manner as happens in this House.

There is a provision in the bill that the Governor in Council may, after consultation with the council, dissolve a council at any time. Consultation is a word that can be used in a very loose way. In this case it could merely mean Ottawa saying, "We intend to dissolve the council," and the council replies, "No, we don't like that." Then the government can say, "Well, we have consulted with you, and you are out."

The council should have a reasonable length of time in which to plan. I really do not understand the minister's attitude with regard to this amendment. I thought he would come forward and say, "We want the council to have the maximum amount of self-determination. We want to give you, the council, all the power to run the show, and we will sit in the background and let you work it out." But the minister did not say that.

This power, albeit the minister says he is not likely to use it and no other minister is likely to use it, is still there. If he is not going to use it, then it should not be held as a club over members of the Territorial Council to make them fall in line with policies directed from Ottawa. I think it would be reasonable to accept the amendment and allow the council to try to work things out without a club being held over them from Ottawa. There is this threat to dissolve the council any time it incurs the royal displeasure, and His Majesty, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, exercises the final power.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like about two minutes to add a footnote to the remarks made by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien). I suppose that what I want to do is put in one paragraph that should have been in his speech but that he must have forgotten. He said that in this institution when we get at loggerheads and people decide, and he wants things to be that way in the north. I wonder if he has forgotten February, 1968, when we were at loggerheads in this House and the opposition, by a majority vote, defeated a government measure, a certain 5 per cent tax bill. According to the dictum given by the minister today the public should have had a chance to decide then, but somebody overruled that and we stayed here, and even the description of what happens in such a situation got changed in the Canada Year Book. I think that should be made part of the record.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay?

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 75(11) the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred. The House will now consider Motion No. 3. The Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien), seconded by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Cadieux) moves:

That Bill C-212, an act to amend the Yukon Act, the Northwest Territories Act and the Territorial Lands Act, be amended by striking out lines 12 to 15 on page 1 and substituting the following:

"longer, but the Governor in Council may at any time, after consultation with the council where he deems such consultation to be practicable or, otherwise, after consultation with each of the members of the Council with whom consultation can then be effected, dissolve the Council and cause a new Council to be elected."

Mr. Nielsen: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The House has disposed of amendment No. 2, or at least will when the vote is taken. The committee, in the reprinted bill, has an amendment before the House. By disposing of amendment No. 2, my submission is that the House has disposed of the question contained in amendment No. 3, and I submit that under the rules we cannot vote twice on the same matter. We have already disposed of it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I would, without consulting the two motions in detail which I probably should do before saying anything, say that would really depend on the outcome of the vote, and that has not been taken yet. The vote has been deferred. Perhaps the point of order would be more properly taken at the time when the vote on motion No. 2 will have been completed. Then, I will study the two motions with greater care. The Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, if the minister will permit my interruption, with great respect I doubt very much whether it would be in order for the House to proceed with the debate on No. 3 unless some sort of ruling were made now. If that means taking a vote now on No. 2 perhaps that is what should be done. But I do submit that if it is ruled out of order in the future, it would be improper to debate it now.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: My original ruling provides the grounds upon which we have to proceed. If a vote is deferred it cannot automatically preclude debate. There is a procedure in our Standing Orders which allows for deferral. This deferral was made at the request of the hon. member. It seems to me that if all subsequent debates and all submissions were ruled out as a consequence of the House voting a certain way, it would be quite unfair.

• (2:40 p.m.)

Mr. Nowlan: A point of order. With all due deference to Your Honour, I think that portion of your verbal judgment in which you said it depended on how the vote was taken, even on the deferred vote, is irrelevant. The matter will be disposed of one way or another when the vote is put. The subject matter relates to the same clause, and looking at Motions Nos. 2 and 3 you find, that in fact, the very same lines in the bill are mentioned. I submit it is irrelevant whether the vote is going to be for or against Motion No. 2. The fact is that Motion No. 2 and Motion No. 3 deal with the same clause and in fact, in large measure, deal with the same lines in that clause. The minister may want to clarify that point when he rises to speak on the point of order.

My submission, Mr. Speaker, is that your preliminary judgment from the chair that it depended on how the vote was determined on Motion No. 2 is irrelevant. History and precedent will show the relevant point. The House will dispose of Motion No. 2 one way or another and therefore it has adjudicated on Motion No. 2. You cannot slip in by the back door, just because we are deferring by convenience, another vote on the same motion. If that were the case, on the last occasion when something like this occurred while we were in committee of the whole debating an amendment to the transportation bill which was defeated, the then minister of transport, the Honourable Mr. Pickersgill, instead of trying to bring in another motion, could have avoided this difficulty by trying to defer the vote. The authorities will show that it is the subject matter which is the relevant factor in deciding whether you are dealing with the same thing, not when you vote or how a vote disposes of the issue.

For these reasons, I take exception with respect to that portion of your preliminary judgment. With respect, Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps you should reflect upon what should be decided. Perhaps the simple solution is to put the vote on Motion No. 2.

Mr. Chrétien: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. If we were to accept the point of order proposed by the hon. member for the Yukon and the hon. member for Annapolis Valley I think we could not move any more than one amendment. The amendment proposed by the hon. member for the Yukon was to have a fixed term and that there should not be any election within a period of four years. That was the purpose of his amendment.

I submit we can have as many amendments as we want as long as they are not amendments of the same nature. What I am proposing is to clarify the word "consultation". I said if we should call an election in the meantime we could not do it without consultation with the members of the territorial

council. I should like to submit to the Chair that these are two completely different matters, and that the point of order should not be entertained. We should discuss this amendment and the House will have the right later on to say whether they agree or disagree with my amendment. I am quite convinced, with due deference Mr. Speaker, that they will agree when I have a chance to explain.

Mr. Stanfield: You have your troops there.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, we seem to be discussing what has been referred to as a preliminary judgment from the Chair. I think this is an unusual situation but I should like to support the position that Your Honour has taken in this preliminary judgment which is now being supported by the minister.

Could I ask hon. members to look at this in as simple as possible terms? In ordinary proceedings it has happened time and time again that an amendment is made to something that is before the House—somebody has something else that he wants to propose by way of amendment and he is told to wait until the first one is disposed of. But when the first amendment is disposed of, then it is possible to move another amendment, and that goes on all the time. The fact that an amendment has been moved, whether carried or defeated, does not deny the right to subsequent amendment.

What we have in the report stage is a convenience. Rather than taking all the recorded votes at one time, we defer that and take the different amendments at the same time. We have been through this a number of times. When we were at the report stage of last year's omnibus Criminal Code bill there were amendments on the abortion question both ways, indeed all ways—some wanted to enlarge the provision, some wanted to restrict it and some wanted to remove it from the code altogether. We had debate on these different amendments before finally taking the votes.

Sometimes the Chair has to rule that once a vote has been taken certain other amendments fall but until the vote has been taken I think it would be hurting the rights of members generally to say that having had discussion on one amendment, no others could take place. Suppose the minister's amendment had appeared on the order paper ahead of that of the hon. member for the Yukon—he could not have had his discussed. I ask members to think this through a little more carefully. In this instance I think you were right, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I appreciate the comments of hon. members and I must state that I think my original preliminary ruling will be my final ruling as well. Perhaps I used the word preliminary ill advisedly. I obviously was rising to the point of order not having looked at the two motions very closely and that was probably an error of judgment. In any event, I will put the motion now.

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, the amendment that I should like to propose to the House is quite simple. In its wisdom, the committee made the amendment and I have no objection to it. It said that if the Governor in Council wants to cause a new council to be elected he should consult with the council. We see that this could create a lot of problems. I want to clarify the word "consultation". If the members of council were not sitting at the time the Governor in Council decided to call an election he would have to call them in just to consult about the advisability or inadvisability of calling an election.

I want to add a few words that will permit consultation in a different form if the council is not in session. This would have the effect of permitting the minister to get in touch with each member of the council by letter or other communication and to consult with them about the advisability of calling an election.

In the last analysis, the power in the legislation remains the power of the minister, but we have decided to follow the pattern established in the Yukon and the Northwest Territories, that is to consult at length with the members. This is something quite new and something with which the people of the Yukon and the Northwest Territories agree.

The purpose of the amendment is to permit the minister to consult with the members of council in the best way possible if council is not in session, in order to arrive at a decision. The same amendment will appear two or three times more. If I can elaborate on it, suppose, for example, there were a disaster, a big oil spill, and the minister saw fit to change the land use regulation right away. Under the terminology in the legislation at the moment, he will have to wait until the council is in session. What I am proposing is that if the council is not in session and the minister wants to proceed quickly to change the regulation, he will have the right to com-

municate and consult with the members of council.

• (2:50 p.m.)

I know the problems of distance in the north. If an elected representative, for example, of the Northwest Territories on Baffin Island were to be called to Yellowknife for the purpose of making a small amendment in a regulation, he would need to fly, say from Pond Inlet. Sometimes at least he would need to travel from Pond Inlet to Frobisher, from Frobisher to Montreal, from Montreal to Edmonton, and from Edmonton to Yellowknife. This procedure is a bit too rigid, and these amendments would permit us to achieve some more flexibility for the purpose of consulting with the member before we introduce any new regulation. The same type of amendment will be discussed three times more in future, and I wanted to elaborate on this point right away.

So, I think that these amendments are only logical. They are brought in to cover all the points that were not predicted by the committee when it made that proposition which the minister accepted. Before taking my seat may I say that I had the opportunity of discussing this matter with the hon. member for Northwest Territories (Mr. Orange) who unfortunately cannot be in the House today. I discussed this with him and he asked me to inform the House that he is in agreement with these amendments.

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, what the minister has just said, and I say this with all the kindness I can muster towards him, displays his abysmal ignorance of the north. This amendment has nothing to do with the Northwest Territories absolutely nothing; so that his remarks about getting in touch with members on Baffin Islands and elsewhere in the Northwest Territories and consulting them about something happening in Yellowknife are absolutely irrelevant. His own amendment is being advanced to amend that portion of the bill dealing with—

Mr. Chrétien: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the minister rising on a question of privilege.

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I think the hon. member is playing on words on this question and taking my meaning out of context. I said that the remarks I was now making were to apply to many amendments. I agree with him that this amendment we are discussing has to do with the Yukon.

Mr. Nielsen: On a point of order—

Mr. Chrétien: I admit that this amendment has to do with the Yukon, but I made the reservation to the Chair that I was directing my remarks to the whole situation in the north. The point I made about the Northwest Territories perhaps does not apply to the Yukon. I took that example because I did not want to rise every time and repeat the same argument. I did it to save the time of the House, and only for that reason. I do not think the hon. member should be too unkind about what I said, and should understand why I said what I did.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, that was about as spurious a question of privilege as I have ever heard.

An hon. Member: You are never here.

Mr. Nielsen: I am sure that the Chair will give us an equal opportunity to raise similar questions of privilege and time, in addition to our debating time, to answer the minister each time he rises on such spurious questions of privilege.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. May I point out to the hon. member that it is not an uncommon practice in the House to allow a member who feels he has been misinterpreted the opportunity of rising to explain and clarify what he intended to say. That is a courtesy held out to all hon. members. Sometimes the Chair may be too indulgent. Having said that, I recognize the hon. member for Yukon.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the minister's kindness, may I point out that that was not a question of privilege.

An hon. Member: Cheap.

Mr. Nielsen: If the hon. member who asserts I am cheap will kindly rise and say that, I will answer him, too. The minister made himself quite clear when he said that this matter concerned difficulties experienced in getting in touch with people of Baffin Island, and so on. Respectfully, I say that it has nothing to do with Baffin Island.

Mr. Chrétien: I explained that.

Mr. Nielsen: The amendment has to do only with the Yukon.

An hon. Member: The minister explained all that.

Mr. Nielsen: I know what the minister said by way of explanation to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin). I also know that the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien) and I are good friends, and if we cannot have a violent clash of ideas on these questions, there is something wrong with this chamber. I intend to have that violent and thorough clash with the minister, because this is an important matter not only for Parliament but for the people I represent and the people the minister is responsible for above the 60th parallel. There is nothing wrong with that.

The minister said that he discussed the question of the amendment to sections of the Yukon Act with the hon. member for Northwest Territories and that the hon. member agreed to those amendments. He can say something like that when dealing with amendments to the Northwest Territories Act, but we are not dealing with that Act now. We are not there; we are dealing with an amendment to the Yukon Act. Really, what the minister's officers have done here is to disguise a most odious and pernicious amendment affecting the principle of consultation that was written into this clause by the committee, I might say unanimously by all including the Liberal members on the committee.

If hon. members will consult the original version of the bill they will see that the Yukon Act, on page 1, gave the Governor in Council the absolute power to dissolve the council at any time he pleased. That meant that the power resided in the minister. This matter did not concern any quarrel between the members of the council and the commissioner, who is a public servant taking his directions from the minister, but a quarrel that might arise between the minister and the elected representatives of the people of the Yukon. It has to do with the Yukon, and not the Northwest Territories.

In its wisdom and in accordance with the precepts of participatory democracy, the committee thought that it would be a good idea if the minister, in exercising this power, could say to the elected members of the Yukon Council, seven in number, "All right boys, pack it up. Go home. You are to have another election." So, unanimously the committee said that the Governor-in-Council can only do that after he has consulted with members of the council. What does the minister's amendment on the notice paper do? It says that he may consult with the council only if he deems such consultation to be practicable. That lets him off the hook immediately. It does not stop there.

Mr. Chrétien: No, the hon. member is incorrect.

Mr. Nielsen: Not only need he not consult with the council if he does not think it practicable to do so, but he can avoid doing so if for any other reason he deems it unnecessary to consult. He need not do so because of these pernicious words, "or, otherwise." This sort of language dates back to the Norman conquerors.

Mr. Aiken: The Normans have landed.

Mr. Nielsen: I am told that the Normans have landed. He further confuses the issue by saying that if he wants to consult he may determine whether he will do so by writing a letter, by telephone, by sending a carrier pigeon, by sending somebody on a skidoo, or by using any other form of communication that is as slow as he may wish, at his own discretion. That is what is suggested by the amendment. It says in part, "after consultation with each of the members of the Council with whom consultation can then be effected."

I can understand the spirit of this amendment applying in the Northwest Territories, because it is difficult in an area covering 1,300,000 square miles, to get in touch with people. But there is absolutely no difficulty in the Yukon, where every community is served by telephone or radio telephone, and where most communities are served by road or air. There is no difficulty in getting members of the Yukon council together on twenty-four hours' notice. It has been done before and can be done again. So, when the minister says in his innocent fashion that he is only attempting to clarify the word "consultation", I say to him, "hogwash", sir. That is precisely what it is. What he has done with this amendment, which was passed unanimously by the committee, is so to constrict it with excessive verbiage and stifling conditions as to make it completely inoperative.

He talked about oil spills. Oil spills have nothing to do with this amendment of the minister. They might have something to do with the Territorial Lands Act amendment when we get to it. Clarify, indeed! Call individual members of council! I remember a former Prime Minister of the same political

stripe as those sitting opposite who had the principle of divide and conquer. That is precisely what the motivation seems to be here. The minister can tell all of the council members "Look, you don't want to dissolve, do you?" or "You will dissolve, won't you?"

• (3:00 p.m.)

Surely, consultation, in what the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) so proudly called participatory democracy two years ago, has only one meaning. That meaning is to sit down with the elected representatives of the people and ask their opinion. That is precisely what the reprinted bill provided. It is precisely what this Parliament should provide if they have any understanding in depth of what participatory democracy means. We are fed up with being held under the thumb of "Louis Quatorze". That is what we have here, a colonial system that seems to be perpetuated despite what appeared to be some forward looking amendments.

The committee took hold of the amendments and, crossing party lines, approved them unanimously. Then the minister, I am sure with the advice of his bureaucrats in the ivory tower who are so pathologically reluctant to release power, confused the amendment by constricting and throttling any democracy the committee tried to infuse into the amendment in the first place.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Speaker, I rise on this amendment to point out that if the minister really means that he intends to consult and take advice from his territorial council, he is not setting a very good example as far as the parliamentary committee is concerned. As the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) has pointed out, this is the very same situation as when the parliamentary committee made some suggestions. The minister not only consulted with them, but he received some amendments from them. After consultation, they were then in a position to recommend to the House what amendments would be suitable. In the same high-handed fashion that the minister dealt with the parliamentary committee he is now going to deal with the territorial council.

Mr. Nesbitt: Right according to form.

Mr. Aiken: If that is consultation, consultation has no meaning. The words that have been added to this amendment do not mean anything more than the original act meant. They mean nothing more than if the previously considered amendment by the hon. member for Yukon were accepted.

[Mr. Nielsen.]

As hon. members know, consultation is nothing more than a communication of intentions unless you really intend to make it something more realistic. There is no indication from the minister that in consultation he intends to do anything more than make a telephone call, write a letter or even sit and hear opinions. It still does not withdraw this club he has over the head of the territorial council, "If you do not go along with me then I will dissolve you". I do not think that is either participation in the government of the Yukon Territory or consultation in its proper form.

On various occasions consultation has been requested between the government and some other body so that there would be some advance notice of the government's intentions and objections could be raised. In the case of the council, the government has decided that consultation with the council is of no value whatever because they are the people being affected. Unless the government made a firm decision to dissolve the council, consultation would serve no purpose except for twisting the arms of the members of the council to come around to the viewpoint of the government on any given matter.

I made my point about self-government on a previous amendment. There is no point in leaving this residual power with the minister because by doing so the minister could wipe out the council and call a new election. If that power is left there, there will be no self-government.

Mr. Nowlan: I also wish to speak to the amendment of the hon. member for Yukon. It again illustrates the dilemma the minister is confronted with by trying to invoke an archaic, absolute power to dissolve a duly elected council by the stroke of a pen without any real terms of reference or consultation with those who have been duly elected by the people of the north.

As the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken) pointed out, the people of the north are not reassured by the minister's interpretation of consultation, yet there was a unanimous recommendation of the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development that there should be this power. I disagree that the power should even be there. The committee recommended that it should only be exercised after consultation with the council. There is an inference that there must be some type of consultation by the minister or Governor in Council with the council duly convened.

I was interested in the minister's explanation of why he wanted to amend the bill that the committee, regardless of party lines, unanimously recommended to this House. The minister says these people can be called on the phone because there are difficulties in getting them together. If there is to be such an absolute power given to the Governor in Council to dissolve a duly elected assembly, surely that power should only be exercised after due diligence, care and with some discretion. It should not be done on an individual basis of getting one councillor on the radio telephone, getting another councillor on the telephone or going on the ski-doo to someone's home or igloo to talk to him individually.

If something so absolute and basic to the rights of the northern people is to be done, it should be done only with the assembly duly convened. That is obviously what the committee thought when they said that such an absolute power should only be invoked after consultation with the council. It certainly should not be done by letter or telegram. There should be no attempt to do this on an individual basis. Yet by the minister's own amendment to the bill, in spite of the unanimous recommendation of the committee, this is what will happen.

• (3:10 p.m.)

The minister could single out individual members of the council and call on them under the midnight sun to discuss individually with them the pros and cons of dissolution, to suggest to them little plums or carrots in connection with what they should or should not do. I suggest that when an elected committee of the House, after hearing different views, recommends that such power should be invoked only after the council as a whole has been consulted, this is the only way in which it should be done. The minister has put forward an amendment which makes a mockery of consultation. If anyone doubts this, he has only to read the terms of the motion which has been placed before the House. How can there be meaningful consultation if it depends upon the minister to decide whether or not it is practicable? This is as wide as it is long; it is as broad as it is high. It opens up the whole can of worms. If there should be any restriction placed on the minister's interpretation of what is practical, he can rely on the all inclusive words which have been written into every dictatorial document since the time of King Canute—if he ever wrote one, and I am not so sure he did.

I refer, of course, to the words "or otherwise". There cannot be consultation when it is left entirely to the government to decide whether it is practicable or not. The very words used by the minister in attempting to justify this amendment are words which confound his argument. The vast distances of the north, the rigour of the climate and the uncertainty of transport would enable the hon. gentleman to tell the House whenever he wishes "I tried to get hold of the council but it was not practicable because the temperature was 50 degrees below zero and the wind was blowing at 100 miles an hour." So he might have had to sit in Yellowknife, or Whitehorse and amuse himself by gambling, or something. He could then write a bulletin saying "I tried to get to you, Harry; I tried to get to you, Sam, but it was too damn cold; it was not practicable; the dogs were not working that day." And, as I say, if any problem arose about practicability the minister could confound us by the words "or otherwise".

No member of the committee which produced this recommendation can accept the minister's recommendation if he believes in the value of consultation. If there should be any doubt about what I am saying, if hon. members think I have gone too far in my interpretation, if it is too extreme, if the term "flexibility" has not been clearly defined, or if the term "otherwise" can be given a different interpretation, let us come back to the last restriction contained in the minister's amendment. I refer to the provision regarding consultation with council members "with whom consultation can be effected." The minister wants this phrase included because of the distances encountered in the north, because of the extreme cold which prevails there. These are the reasons he can use for saying it is not practicable to consult members of the council. I have no hesitation in speaking against such a spurious amendment, one which makes a mockery of the word consultation. I am informed that the bill as it presently stands was approved by a committee which said there should be no limitation as to consultation. The committee said clearly, concisely, and constructively—

An hon. Member: And unanimously.

Mr. Nowlan: —and unanimously that the governor in council might, after consultation with the council, do certain things. What a calamity it is that a sincere minister who is trying to bring new life to self government in the north should decide to make a mockery of consultation by substituting this amendment

for an unanimous recommendation by a committee. By using these words "where he deems such consultation to be practicable, or, otherwise, after consultation with each of the members of the council with whom consultation can then be effected" he builds a little snow fence or ice fence. Perhaps the council cannot get into town. Then, he will pick the members off one by one. If, as the hon. gentleman says, there are problems about transport in the north, cannot the existence of those problems be used to suggest that it was not practicable to consult with the council? The minister is caught by his own words; he is hoist with his own petard.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The House has heard the motion proposed by the hon. minister. All those in favour please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those against, please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion, the yeas have it.

Pursuant to Section 11 of Standing Order 75 a recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

As I indicated earlier in the sitting, I have doubts about the admissibility of amendment No. 4 and also amendment No. 5. I am prepared to hear procedural arguments in this connection should hon. members wish to advance them.

Mr. Nielsen: I raised this matter, too, on March 13 as a point of order. The Speaker at that time had reservations about it. I will deal with the arguments very briefly, but when introducing this legislation on May 13, the minister had this to say, as reported at page 6924 of *Hansard:*

• (3:20 p.m.)

Before I deal with the provisions of the bill in detail, Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out that there is a major step in the constitutional development of the Yukon Territory which does not appear in the bill.

I draw to Your Honour's attention the words:

—a major step in the constitutional development of the Yukon territory which does not appear in the bill.

The minister continued:

In order to have the members of the council of the Yukon participate more fully in the executive functions of government I will be instructing the commissioner—

[Mr. Nowlan.]

That is, the minister's appointee.

—to establish an executive committee which will assist him in the exercise of his responsibilities as chief executive officer of the territory.

In other words, he is going to smuggle some civil servants into the legislative function.

This committee is to consist of two members of the Yukon council to be selected by the members of council, the two assistant commissioners, who are officers of the Yukon administration, and the commissioner himself who will be the chairman of the committee.

This means three bureaucrats and two elected representatives of the people in the Yukon.

This change in the executive structure of the government of the Yukon has great potential for the future.

Mr. Chrétien: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nielsen: The minister is the only one who applauds. Everyone in the Yukon is shedding tears of bitter disappointment.

I will be following it closely. If the changes now being introduced prove successful, they could point the way to further constitutional progress.

Then, on May 14, when a question was raised as to this method of proceeding, the minister had this to say, as reported at page 6978 of *Hansard.* This is what I have been saying in this House for a good many years, not only to this minister but to ministers who preceded him in both political parties:

It is true that this is not provided in the bill—

That is, the setting up of the executive committee.

—but this is because we want more flexibility.

He wants more power.

The fact that no provision is made for this in the bill means nothing at all, since the commissioners always act on the direction of the minister.

In other words, they take his orders, presumably as assistant commissioners.

My submission is that this constitutional development—it was correctly called a constitutional development and is about the only accurate statement in the minister's remarks that I have read today—is in fact just that. The Yukon Act is a mini-BNA act. It spells out the legislative powers the council that has been set up by this Parliament acquires.

In 1960 a constitutional development occurred which was embodied in the Act, and it was intended to have an embryo effect under the act at that time. This amendment in 1960 appears in the present Act as section 12, which set up an advisory committee on

finance consisting of three members who were selected from among the seven elected members of council. The commissioner was required to consult those three members who composed the advisory committee on finance, and this consultation is made mandatory by subsection (3) of section 12.

I submit that the only way in which the minister or this Parliament can set up an executive committee to intrude upon other sections of the Yukon Act is by altering the Yukon Act itself. Section 9 of the Yukon Act sets forth that there shall be a council of the Yukon territory consisting of seven members. It sets forth certain powers the council has under section 16. Those powers are legislative powers. The commissioner in council has all of those powers that are enumerated in section 16.

What the minister is purporting to do here by ministerial power is to create a committee that is neither fish nor fowl, one dominated by civil servants and which clothes two elected members of the council with a legislative function. It may be a direct legislative function in the sense that they can pass laws; they still have to be passed by the commissioner in council pursuant to the Yukon Act.

The first intention is as the minister expressed it on the record on May 13 and May 14 last, namely that they are going to be asked to accept ministerial responsibility. That means the drafting of legislation and the introduction of legislation in the council. Here I think is where the minister and his advisers are constitutionally incorrect. Quite apart from the undesirability of the whole design and structure of what he is trying to do—which, as I have said, is to smuggle civil servants into the legislative process, rather than the other way around—I submit it is simply unconstitutional for the minister to attempt to usurp the power of the Parliament of Canada, which is the only authority that can set up any such bodies as an executive committee and an advisory committee on finance, which it set up in 1960 under section 12. The Parliament of Canada is the only authority that can clothe such committees with any kind of power whatever.

If that not be so, and if that not be the proper constitutional approach, what we have here are two elected members who are elected under the provisions of an Act of Parliament, the Yukon Act, and the minister is going to direct them as to what they are to do on the executive committee. This seems to me to be absolutely inconsistent with any constitutional position or development.

I do not know what Your Honour's specific doubts were in respect to the acceptability of this amendment. I assume that, simply because the bill was silent as to the setting up of the committee mentioned by the minister, Your Honour has concluded that it goes beyond the purpose of the bill. However, I think I have clearly demonstrated that, notwithstanding the fact that the bill does not include provision for the setting up of the executive committee, the intention of the minister is to give a direction to the civil service to set up a committee, which involves half of the legislative function set up by an Act of Parliament. I say that only Parliament has the right to alter the structure of council in any way, shape of form and that the minister has no power whatever to give any direction in this regard.

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, on the question of procedure, may I point out to the hon. member that he is not debating the procedural aspects of the question, but rather the question itself. I could enter into a debate right now—

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Yukon is rising on a question of privilege.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I rise to take advantage of the courtesy that is normally extended to members of the House to correct the minister's interpretation of my intention. I rose to explain a procedural point, and my objection to the doubt that Your Honour has is one of procedure only. The point that I am making is that it is not within the constitutional power of the minister but only within the constitutional power of this Parliament to set up the kind of committee of which he speaks.

• (3:30 p.m.)

Mr. Chrétien: In any event, Mr. Speaker, on the question of procedure I think amendments Nos. 4 and 5 put forward by the hon. member are far beyond the scope of the bill. The hon. member would like to introduce something new into the bill. There will be an executive council. We have said that many times. I should like to point out to the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) that we even received a telegram from the Speaker, speaking on behalf of the members of the Yukon council, congratulating the government for its

wisdom in providing two members for the executive council.

Mr. Nielsen: He had no authority to do that.

Mr. Chrétien: In terms of the main issue, perhaps the intentions of the hon. member are good. On the other hand, perhaps the hon. member is wrong. I shall not make a clear case even though it would be easy to do so. In terms of procedure, I believe these two amendments are not within the scope of the bill and should not be received by the Chair.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak to the point of order. I assume part of the difficulty Your Honour has concerns the possibility of the expenditure of funds without a recommendation by the Governor in Council in respect of the setting up of this executive council. It seems ludicrous to me that the Commissioner of the Yukon Territory may establish a committee to assist him, and presumably pay the members of the committee as has been suggested by the minister, but that a member of this House of Commons cannot even propose such a body. If this is the line of reasoning which Your Honour has to consider, then I suggest there is something terribly wrong with it. As an example I would point out that Information Canada was operating for weeks before there was any legislative authority in respect of it. Similar organizations have been appointed, have commenced work and their members have been paid without there being any parliamentary authority.

It would seem that we are drawing the line much too closely if we say that a Member of Parliament cannot even propose the appointment of a committee or a commission. Surely this was not the intention of the rules concerning the expenditure of public funds. We know of instances where many people have been appointed, employed and paid from public funds. Surely in a situation like this a recommendation by the Governor in Council is not required in each case. I appeal here again, Mr. Speaker, against an ever-increasing series of rulings by the Chair which make it almost impossible for private members to put forward any proposals in respect of government legislation except concerning tiny things which do not mean anything. I contend that the suggestion which has been made in the form of an amendment is reasonable. When a minister states that the commissioner intends to appoint such a committee, it seems very strange that a member of this House of Commons cannot even propose such a body.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I thank hon. members for their contributions to the procedural argument concerning motions 4 and 5. In respect of the final point raised by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken), it would seem to me that if he has a valid point—and he may very well have one—the remedy lies with the Members in the House. The grievance he has lies not with rulings of the Chair but with the practice, which may be open to re-examination, of restricting amendments to bills to the scope of the royal recommendation. Having said this, however, I should like to say further that this is not the area of doubt in respect of these two motions.

The point that I made in respect of the first motion is involved here. It would seem to me that amendments 4 and 5 go behind Bill C-212 and seek to amend provisions of the main act which are not covered by Bill C-212. I suggest, therefore, that these proposals are irrelevant and beyond the scope of the bill. In this respect I would refer hon. members to the following citation which appears at page 549 of May's seventeenth edition:

> An amendment is out of order if it is irrelevant to the subject matter or beyond the scope of the bill, or if it is irrelevant to the subject matter or beyond the scope of the clause under consideration.

For these reasons I cannot put Motions Nos. 4 and 5 in the name of the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen).

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to speak to Motion No. 5 before Your Honour ruled it out of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am prepared to accommodate the hon. member, but in the first instance I pointed out that motions 4 and 5 were similar and I invited comments on both. If the hon. member feels strongly about the procedural difficulty—although I do not see how there is much room for argument, having made the ruling which I have—I am not anxious to be any harder than I am obliged to be under the rules.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I shall save the time of the House by saying merely that the minister's proposal would have the executive committee dominated by three civil servants, while my proposal in Motion No. 4 would place the committee entirely in the hands of the five elected members of the council. If Motion No. 4 is not accepted, Motion No. 5 is

intended to give the elected members a majority on the committee. However, since Your Honour has disallowed both amendments I will save the time of the House, without accepting the principles the minister has espoused in his amendment, by not insisting on a procedural argument in respect of Motion No. 5.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The next amendment is Motion No. 6 in the name of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien).

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development) moved:

That Bill C-212, an act to amend the Yukon Act, the Northwest Territories Act and the Territorial Lands Act, be amended by striking out subclause 2 of clause 5 on page 3 thereof.

[*Translation*]

He said: Mr. Speaker, I should like to explain to hon. members why we have to propose this amendment. We do not want to limit the authority of the elected members of the Council of the Yukon Territory but only to maintain, as I explained earlier, in the Northwest Territories and in the Yukon, the constitutional development which took place in the Canadian legislatures and is mostly derived from the British parliamentary system.

Under sections 54 and 90 of the British North America Act, in our parliamentary system, it is forbidden to pass resolutions, addresses or bills proposing the allocation of public funds or taxes whithout recommandation from the Lieutenant-Governor in the case of legislatures or from the Governor General in the case of Parliament.

If we agreed to the amendment moved by the committee members, who have done so in good faith, in order to meet the objectives of the administration, that wanted the members of the Council of the Yukon Territory to vote themselves the amount of their indemnity in addition to the expenses involved to go to their riding or to the seat of the Council, thus exempting them from considering this appropriation of money, done without the consent of the Commissioner of the Territories, we would be going against our parliamentary tradition and against the one we intend to establish in The Yukon where, for the first time, will be established an Executive Council made up of two members elected by the Assembly and two other appointed members and of the Commissioner of the Yukon Territory as well.

Now, as I have said several times, it is hopefully a first step toward the establishment of an Executive Council whose members will all be appointed by the elected members of the Territorial Assembly. However, I cannot forecast when this will happen. If we were to pass this amendment, we would completely deny Parliament the basic executive power which, under a British parliamentary system, gives it the exclusive authority to introduce legislation involving the spending of public funds.

And since we want a continuity in attitude and approach to constitutional development in Canada, we think that such a precedent would be totally contrary to sections 54 and 90 of the British North America Act as regards the administration of the provinces and of the federal government, and would be contrary to the recognized constitutional practices of our parliamentary system.

However, so as to reassure the House, I would say that the salaries recommended by the members of the Territorial Councils will be approved by the administration. I have every reason to believe they will be very easy to approuve, unless of course they are exaggerated. But, according to the conversations my officials and I have had with the members of the Councils, it seems the salaries they intend to vote themselves will be altogether acceptable to the minister. Indeed, we do not intend to create any difficulties.

• (3:40 p.m.)

Obviously, what I am now saying may not be completely in line with the decision made by the committee, but hon. members will understand that we do not want to create a precedent that might be absolutely contrary to the attitude and approach taken so far about constitutional development in the Northwest and Yukon Territories. In any event, I am sure we will accept readily the recommendations of the members from the Territories when under the law, they set themselves their own salaries. Then, the administration will present a bill to the assembly for the expenditure of public funds, as is usually done according to the British tradition which prevails in the administration of parliamentary institutions in our country.

[*English*]

Mr. Nielsen: What the minister was speaking about was the practice that was in vogue 100 or 200 years ago. It appears that for a long time to come the Yukon and Northwest

Territories will continue to be even more backward than some of the colonial countries in Africa.

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question? He used the word "backward." Does he mean by that, that the Parliament of Canada, Canadian legislative assemblies and Westminster have a backward system of administration?

Mr. Nielsen: A good deal of improvement could be made there as well. What I meant to say to the minister—I and every member of the Yukon Council have told him this many times—was that we feel the system that this Parliament continues to impose upon the Yukon is a colonial system. For the minister to speak of this great reform toward autonomous government is a hollow mockery. I really cannot understand the Parliamentary Secretary who is sitting next to the minister. He voted in support of every one of these amendments that we have considered so far, particularly the one with respect to consultation, the words of which almost came out of his mouth in the committee. We are considering the inapplicability or otherwise of section 24 in allowing the seven elected members to set their own indemnities. He voted for that amendment in committee, as did his Liberal colleagues. Now they are about-facing simply because the minister has been advised by his civil servants that it is not a very good provision and this power should not be lost because the old ivory tower will start crumbling.

Mr. Honey: The hon. member is anticipating.

Mr. Nielsen: I hope the hon. member will be here and will vote on these amendments in the same way as he did in committee. But I doubt that he will, if he wants to keep his job. The fact is that the Yukon Act which is under consideration here can be amended in any way we please. Parliament is the master, not the minister and not his departmental officials. This House of Commons and the other place are the masters of what design the Yukon Act will take. What is the matter with modernizing it a little? Why does the minister, to quote a well-worn phrase, have to be dragged, kicking and screaming into the twentieth century of constitutional development?

The Yukon Act as it now stands sets up a separate consolidated revenue fund, and what the minister is asking the House to swallow in the form of a red herring, that the members of council are paid out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada, is fiction. If he does not know it is fiction, he had better read some books on constitutional law. Perhaps he has been away from his office too long. Maybe he should get back there and familiarize himself with some of these finer constitutional points. But the fact of the matter is that the act contained provisions setting up a separate consolidated revenue fund. In that fund there are no compartments setting aside certain areas into which territorial revenues will fall and certain other compartments into which the federal grant will fall; no more so than it is in the provincial consolidated revenue funds, and from there he draws his example.

• (3:50 p.m.)

He says he wants it to be the same as the constitutional structure in the provinces. What is so different between the constitutional structure in the provinces and that which I suggest should prevail in the Yukon Territory, where the members of the elected council should have the power to set their own indemnities without a civil servant telling them what indemnity they are to get? Believe me, Mr. Speaker, this minister is going to tell the commissioner what he should do. He has already said this, as recorded in *Hansard* of May 14, at page 6978:

> The fact that no provision is made for this in the bill means nothing at all, since the commissioners always act on the direction of the minister.

You had better believe it, Mr. Speaker: they always act on the direction of the minister, and that is what we resent. The commissioner is the horse and the minister is the driver. The minister has reins 4,000 miles long, trying to drive that horse, and he is making a darn poor job of it.

Mr. Chrétien: We have a good telephone system.

Mr. Nielsen: Exactly, there is a good system of telephonic communications, so why did you need that last pernicious amendment with respect to consultation, a requirement to consult each of the councillors if they are available, if it is practicable, if it is wise? With a good system of communication there is no need for that kind of nonsensical and unnecessary provision.

I am sure it was unintentional, but the minister distorted the constitutional picture. The analogy between the provinces and what should be taking place in the territories is that in the territories the people who are

elected to govern should govern. To draw an analogy with respect to this House—I hope hon. members will forgive me for raising the matter, in view of the editorial in today's *Globe and Mail*—we recently passed a bill to increase members' pensions.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Shame.

Mr. Nielsen: And I hear rumours abounding that perhaps our salaries are going to be increased.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Nielsen: Under the provisions of this bill the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien) would have to go cap in hand to the Deputy Minister of Finance and say, "Please, we would like a little more pension," or, "a little more salary." That is what members who are elected to the council in the Yukon are expected to do. They have to go to a civil servant—

Mr. Chrétien: To me.

Mr. Nielsen: To the minister, through a commissioner. In any event, it is through a civil servant first. They have to go to him, he gets in touch with the assistant deputy minister, who gets in touch with the deputy minister, who gets in touch with the minister. This business about consultation is not going to wash. The committee introduced these amendments on consultation because there has been no consultation with respect to the Yukon and the Northwest Territories.

Surely the elected representatives of the people should not have to go cap in hand to a civil servant and say, "Look, there is some business we would like to do in Watson Lake, 300 miles away. Could we have 10 cents a mile for gasoline if we use our own cars?" Surely an elected representative should not have to say to a civil servant "I want to make a telephone call, on government business, to Beaver Creek. It will cost $1.50. Do you think you could pass that?" Why should not the representatives have the right to pass these expenses themselves? If that democratic principle is wrong, what are we doing here in raising our own pensions and salaries?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): A good question.

Mr. Nielsen: The minister made much in saying that this creation of an executive council is a great step forward in constitutional development. My goodness, Mr. Speaker! Here we have three civil servants who have invited two elected representatives of the council to sit with them, with the three civil servants forming the majority. Can anyone tell me that those three civil servants will take instructions from the two elected members? Surely the democratic principle is that the majority of the elected members should govern. How are they going to govern with a minority on a committee that in effect will be told what to do by the minister?

For the information of hon. members who do not have any idea of the extent to which this pernicious principle applies, it goes this far: if the minister wants to cut out the teaching of social studies in our schools, he can do it. He will tell the commissioner to direct the committee to do this, and introduce a bill in council, or whatever method he chooses, and it will be done. The minister may structure the educational system exactly as he pleases. Should not that power lie in the hands of the local people, and not here in Ottawa? Where does that power lie in the minister's own province, and how jealously does that province guard its right with respect to that particular power? Why shouldn't we have the same kind of power in the Yukon for the elected representatives of the people? Why should we be governed in that regard by the bureaucrats?

The minister says that the amendment represents a first step in this direction. That is not the case. The first step in this direction was taken in 1960 through section 12 of the act, when an advisory committee on finance was established. It would have been a simple matter to amend this section to make that committee the executive committee and leave the civil servants out of it. So much for the power of committees, Mr. Speaker. So much for participatory democracy. In the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development, party lines were crossed by the NDP, the Liberals and the Conservatives—even by the Parliamentary Secretary to the minister and by the hon. member for Northwest Territories (Mr. Orange) who is the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. They all voted for the amendments and for this particular one that the minister wants to toss out.

We are told that the committees system is working well. We are told there is much more force now in the committees system, and backbenchers are being used so much that they can make a really effective contribution to government. We are told that this is really

participatory democracy. But as soon as committees bring forward something useful, out it goes because the government does not want it. What is more deplorable is that the same Liberal members who voted for these reforms in the committee will probably be told to vote against them in the House of Commons. Certainly the Parliamentary Secretaries will toe the line. Maybe one or two of the Liberal backbenchers will have the guts to vote the same way as they did in the committee.

The minister is afraid of giving the council this power although he still has the power of disallowance: it is in the existing act. He has two years within which to disallow any piece of legislation passed by the council, the same as the power to disallow resides here in respect of provincial legislation. Under the terms of this bill, that period is being shortened to a year. At any time within a year the minister has power to disallow any bill passed by the Yukon council. With that umbrella of power, what is he afraid of? It is no deviation from the prostitution of the principle of democratic government to say, "I have spoken with the elected members of the council of the Yukon. They seem like reasonable fellows. I do not think they will abuse their power to raise their indemnities, and whatever they say I will accept." This measure is an exaggeration. This is not local government. This is not decentralization. This is not democracy. This is Simon Pure colonialism with "cela va bien, Louis XIV."

• (4:00 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: I my opinion the yeas have it. By virtue of the Standing Order 75(11) this division will be postponed until later, by agreement among members of the House.

The Chair may now be in a position to strike a further blow at hon. members' efforts toward participatory democracy. We have on the Notice Paper four notices, Nos. 7, 8, 9 and 10, all standing in the name of the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen). There is no particular urgency in the matter, but I wonder whether the hon. member would like to argue these proposed amendments individually or en bloc. We might consider No. 7 first. The hon. member will realize the difficulty of the Chair. This motion seems to want to amend the act rather than the bill; the first words of the proposed amendment indicate that rather clearly. I would be pleased to hear the hon. member on the subject.

[Mr. Nielsen.]

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, to save the time of the House I think we can deal with all of them, if Your Honour will permit me to simply deal very briefly with the principle of the amendment, which is rather necessary to lay the groundwork for my argument. Section 24 of the Yukon Act is in essence the same as section 54 of the BNA Act which prohibits the introduction of any money legislation into the Yukon legislative council unless by message of the commissioner, similar to the message of the Governor in Council or the Lieutenant Governor in Council of the provinces.

Motion No. 7 endeavours to permit a member of council to introduce such money legislation. If that is not accepted, alternatively, an advisory committee could do so. If that is not accepted, the majority of members of council could introduce such a bill and, alternatively, if none of those methods is accepted then the executive council—or, as the minister has termed it, the executive committee—could introduce it.

The first argument I should like to submit in support of the assertion that these amendments are in order is a ruling made a few moments ago when we were dealing with a point which I raised in connection with amendment No. 3. This was ruled in order notwithstanding the fact that it had been discussed in amendment No. 2. We have just finished dealing with an amendment moved by the minister, No. 7, which dealt with section 24 of the Yukon Act. Section 24 was introduced into the bill by an amendment of the committee duly constituted by this House. The debate which has just concluded, the vote upon which has been deferred, concerned the amendment of the minister as follows:

That Bill C-212, an act to amend the Yukon Act, the Northwest Territories Act and the Territorial Lands Act, be amended by striking out subclause 2 of clause 5 on page 3 thereof.

Subclause 2 of clause 5 on page 3 reads in part as follows:

"The provisions of section 24 do not apply to this section."

So, Mr. Speaker, we are already in the middle of dealing with clause 24 of the act. Whether one calls that coming in via the backdoor or via the front door, the fact is that this House has been debating clause 24 of the act. I make it very clear from the outset that the amendments are in the alternative. If Your Honour rules any one of them in order, I have proposals with respect to the order in which they are called, because they have not been published in the Notice Paper in the order I had intended.

I have another argument with respect to the acceptability of these amendments. All these motions propose to amend section 24 of the Yukon Act. That section is not expressly amended by any provision in Bill C-212 as it was originally printed. However, my submission is that section 24 is amended, by necessary implication, through the amendment proposed in clause 5 of the bill. Section 24 of the Yukon Act is similar to section 54 of the BNA Act, which provides:

It shall not be lawful for the council to adopt or pass any vote, resolution, address, or bill for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue of the territory, or of any tax or impost, to any purpose that has not been first recommended to council by message of the commissioner, in the session which such vote, resolution, address or bill is proposed.

Section 23 of the Yukon Act provides that all public moneys and revenues over which the Commissioner in Council has the power of appropriation shall form a fund to be known as the Yukon consolidated revenue fund. Therefore, the public revenues referred to in section 24 are in the consolidated revenue fund. Looking at clause 5 of Bill C-212, we find that the proposed amendment therein contained relates to the consolidated revenue fund of the Yukon. The exact intent of that amendment is by way of exception to section 24 of the Yukon Act. The amendment provides for payment of indemnities and expenses, out of that fund, to members of the council and members of the advisory committee under the authority of the Commissioner in Council.

In other words, it is a statutory vote of indemnities and expenses out of the Yukon consolidated revenue fund and abolishes the requirement in section 24 of the act that such payment be conditional upon a message of the commissioner, to be followed by a vote. The legal effect of clause 5, therefore, is to operate by way of amendment, by necessary implication, of section 24 of the act. This purpose of clause 5 is set out in the recommendation that accompanies Bill C-212. I would refer Your Honour to that recommendation once again because it is of the utmost importance. It reads:

His Excellency the Governor General has recommended to the House of Commons the present measure to amend the Yukon Act and the Northwest Territories Act respecting the payment of indemnities and expenses to the members of the Yukon Territory and of the Northwest Territories—

The rest is irrelevant. Pursuant to this purpose, and under the provisions of the amendment in clause 5, it will not be necessary to abide by section 24 of the Yukon Act with respect to such indemnities and expenses. In effect, section 24 is amended as effectively as it would be in the amendment proposed by me, in the alternative, on the Notice Paper. In fact, this amendment and the amendment proposed in clause 5 both relate to the message of the commissioner and to the method of appropriation. Clause 5 would abolish the necessity for the message, in certain circumstances, and the vote for an appropriation of the moneys recommended by that message. The amendment proposed by me would vary the method of the message only. There is that argument and there is also the argument that Parliament has seized itself already of section 24 and has dealt with it, albeit by way of deferred vote. Parliament has dealt with it as effectively as though the vote had been taken.

I have one more point to make, Mr. Speaker, and I should like to quote from an authority respected in the past as being an authority on legislative forms, precedents and constitutional law. Mr. E. A. Driedger, a former Deputy Minister of Justice and Deputy Attorney General of Canada, in 1963, in a pamphlet entitled "Legislative Forms and Precedents" dealt with the English, as compared with the Canadian practice, and the ability to bring amendments that were not confined precisely within the terminology of a bill. His argument was set out in part on page 1, as follows:

• (4:10 p.m.)

The title, therefore, must accurately define the scope of the bill, and an amendment is out of order unless it falls within the scope as defined in the title.

The title of this bill is "An act to amend the Yukon Act, the Northwest Territories Act

and the Territorial Lands Act." In my submission, that is a pretty broad title. Mr. Driedger says:

> At one time the United Kingdom parliamentary rules respecting titles to bills were closely followed in Canada, but lately there has been considerable relaxation. A wide range of discussion is permitted on any bill, even though it may not be strictly relevant to the terms of the bill, and amendments are generally permitted even though they do not fall strictly within the terms of the bill.

Mr. Driedger's argument, Mr. Speaker, is the weakest argument I can bring, with all respect to him. The strongest argument I can make is that Parliament has already seized itself of section 24. My third argument, but second in order of importance, is that by necessary implication section 24 is capable of amendment.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to prolong the debate on this subject, but I wish to point out to the Chair that all the amendments moved by the hon. member go far beyond the scope of the legislation that was proposed and which is before us. The argument brought forward by the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen), to the effect that because we succeeded at the committee stage in bringing about a debate or in moving an amendment to section 24 of the Yukon Act does not justify in any way the attempt to do so at this stage. I have reason to believe that this proposal should not have been accepted at the committee stage. In any event, all the amendments moved by the hon. member are irrelevant. They may be of value but I cannot even discuss their merit since they go far beyond the scope of the legislation proposed by the government. Therefore, I must ask Your Honour to rule out of order the amendments proposed by my hon. friend the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen).

[*English*]

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. In normal circumstances the hon. member for Yukon could not speak a second time. However, since this is a very interesting point, perhaps the House would allow him to make the additional point which I think he is now seeking to make, which may enlighten the Chair.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I did not wish to deal with another point but merely to add something I had forgotten to mention. I simply wish to say that page 3 of the bill as reprinted contains subclause 5 of clause 5, so that section 24 of the Yukon Act is before the House.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the hon. member for his assistance. I have to tell him that even in light of the very cogent and interesting argument he has submitted for the guidance of the Chair, I find it difficult to overcome my original misgivings. The hon. member must realize that even if we are seized, as he proposes, with section 24 of the original act, even if, as he says, it is indirectly before the House by virtue of subclause 5 of clause 5 of the bill, and even if there is reference in the royal recommendation to section 24 of the act, all that put together does not indicate that the section itself is in the bill and can be amended.

The argument is very interesting. I am quite prepared to admit that something can be said for the argument that we have, in an indirect way, section 24 of the act before us. When I first saw these amendments I immediately went to the act because I noticed that in the original bill we touched on sections 22 and 26. We did not touch on section 24. I felt that obviously we were trying to go behind the bill and amend the act. I had not thought of the arguments which have been advanced by the hon. member. Even in light of these amendments, even though we have indirectly to concern ourselves with section 24, I do not think that under our rules it is possible to use this argument to justify the amendment of an act which is not before us.

It is well known to the hon. member for Yukon and to the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), who listens to this ruling with intense interest, that we cannot at this stage, in committee or at any time, introduce an amendment which goes beyond the terms of the bill itself, when it is an amending bill, and attempt to amend the original statute. It is very difficult to do this. I have very seldom seen it done satisfactorily. Let me say that perhaps the hon. member has come very close this time. He has given us good authority for doing so, and I certainly respect the authority of Mr. Driedger to whom the hon. member referred.

Against that I must put the authority of Messrs. May and Beauchesne; they, too, must be taken into account. I believe that in previous rulings this afternoon Mr. Deputy Speaker brought to the attention of the House the

citation in May's seventeenth edition, page 549, and the often quoted citation in Beauchesne's fourth edition at page 406. Both citations, essentially, provide that we must limit amendments to the bill that is before the House and that we cannot go behind the bill in an attempt to amend the statute which is being amended. In this way the hon. member is really proposing substantive legislation; he is proposing his own bill, in a way. It may be that some day he can take on the responsibility and perhaps even be in the position of amending the bill himself. But at the moment I would not think that the rules allow him to achieve the purpose which he has in mind.

While the hon. member proposed his procedural argument he had a chance to advance argument which he might have advanced in the substantive defence of his case. I hope that perhaps in some other way the hon. member can propose to the House the legislative changes which he wants to sponsor.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, there is always more than one way to skin a minister. May I, on behalf of hon. members of the House, seek some guidance from the Chair?

Mr. Chrétien: The hon. member does not want to skin the minister.

Mr. Nielsen: The minister has just heard the translation. Mr. Speaker, we must deal with the reprinted bill, and subclause 5 on page 3 will undoubtedly be voted on. We have already deferred a vote on the motion with respect to the amendment to section 24 which was not part of the original bill. Would it not, in view of Your Honour's ruling, be appropriate to rule out of order that portion of the reprinted bill and the minister's amendment thereto, in order to sort of perfect Your Honour's ruling, which of course needs no perfecting?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is seeking too much perfection. I do not think I would have the power to do that at this stage. The motion now before the House is No. 11.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development) moved:

That Bill C-212, to amend the Yukon Act, the Northwest Territories Act and the Territorial Lands Act, be amended by striking out lines 23 to 27 on page 5 and substituting the following:

"but the Governor in Council may at any time, after consultation with the council where he deems such consultation to be practicable or, otherwise, after consultation with each of the members of the council with whom consultation can then be effected, dissolve the council and cause a new council to be elected and appointed."

Mr. Nielsen: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. If the minister will consider that his remarks have been said, I will consider mine as having been said. We have already debated this principle.

Mr. Chrétien: I agree, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: The division will be postponed as agreed previously by special order of the House. The House will now deal with Motion No. 12.

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development) moved:

That Bill C-212, to amend the Yukon Act, the Northwest Territories Act and the Territorial Lands Act, be amended by striking out lines 1 to 5 on page 7 and substituting the following:

"(2) Subsections 4 and 5 of section 12 of the said act are repealed."

He said: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. member for Yukon would agree that we should not repeat the very interesting debate we had on the same principle a few minutes ago.

Mr. Nielsen: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Section 19(a) of the Northwest Territories Act is the same as section 24 of the Yukon Act. We were trying to accomplish for the Northwest Territories the same democratic reform which the committee had approved for the Yukon, including, I might add, the hon. member for Northwest Territories (Mr. Orange).

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I discussed this point with the member for the Northwest

Territories. He asked me to convey to the House the fact that he agreed to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: The division will be postponed. The House will now deal with Motion No. 13.

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development) moved:

That Bill C-212, to amend the Yukon Act, the Northwest Territories Act and the Territorial Lands Act, be amended by striking out lines 5 to 19 on page 9 and substituting the following:

"3A. Where he deems it necessary for the protection of the ecological balance or physical characteristics of any area in the Yukon Territory or the Northwest Territories, the Governor in Council may, after consultation with the council of the Yukon Territory or the council of the Northwest Territories, as the case may be, where he deems such consultation to be practicable or, otherwise, after consultation with each of the members of the council with whom consultation can then be effected, set apart and appropriate any territorial lands in that area as a land management zone.

3B. The Governor in council may, after consultation with the council of the Yukon Territory or the council of the Northwest Territories, as the case may be, where he deems such consultation to be practicable or, otherwise, after consultation with each of the members of the council with whom consultation can then be effected, make regulations respecting"

He said: This is the same situation, Mr. Speaker. We have already had an interesting debate on the principle of consultation. That was discussed under the Yukon Act. We decided that the debate would be the same with regard to the Northwest Territories Act. I do not think it would be advisable to take the time of the House to repeat the debate under the Territorial Lands Act. Perhaps the hon. member for Yukon would agree on that point, as he did a few minutes ago with regard to the Northwest Territories Act.

[Mr. Chrétien.]

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I will not take issue with the minister with respect to his version of consultation and my version of consultation. They are about as far apart as the distance between Ottawa and Whitehorse. Something appears to be missing from the reprint which I know was passed in committee. I refer to the amendment which requires publication in the *Canada Gazette* and which provides an opportunity for making representations to the minister with respect to setting up land management zones. I do not see it here, although it should be.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): It is on page 10.

Mr. Nielsen: I thank the hon. member very much. I wish to make a comment with regard to page 9, clause 24 of the bill, sections 3A and 3B. The committee, again unanimously, inserted the consultation clause because of the extremely wide powers that the bill as originally printed would have given the Governor in Council.

In effect, any trapper who wanted to build a log cabin would have to obtain a permit from the civil service before he could do so. Indeed, if he were out trapping and were caught in circumstances where he had to get firewood, he would have to get a permit from the civil service to do so. I am not saying these things will happen, but the power is there. Before a prospector prospecting for mineral claims cut any line, he would have to get a permit to do so. On some occasions this would involve travelling many hundreds of miles.

Before embarking on any exploration, an exploration company would have to obtain a permit from the bureaucracy spelling out the kind of vehicle that would be used, the weight of the vehicle, the number of wheels the vehicle would have, how far and how fast it could go, how long it would remain in any part of the country, when it would go in and when it would come out. All these matters would be within the regulatory power the government is asking for in this section. That is the reason the committee in its wisdom and fairness inserted the consultation clause which would require the Governor in Council to consult the elected representatives of the people of the two territories.

The only difference between the consultation which was recommended by the committee in the reprinted bill and the consultation that is no longer there in the minister's amendment is that we have reverted back to

the original section of the bill. That is a very sad and retrograde step. I am very sorry that on this one occasion the minister did not stand up to his officials and say, "No, sir. Democracy is going to work in this instance. We intend to consult these people."

• (4:30 p.m.)

One of the minister's supporters put it very neatly. This is what he said: "I have heard of zoning parts of municipalities, but I have never heard of zoning 40 per cent of Canada." This is precisely what has been done. The minister will be sitting on his throne, directing his bureaucrats. I say this kindly. They are going to write out permits enabling some trapper to build a cabin on his trapline or to enable some outfitter or guide to take a few horses into an area to hunt, and the like. The power is unending. Perhaps Your Honour will permit me to be irrelevant in closing, and to say that this is all part of the same pattern. The government wants to become an absolute oligarchy and it is going about the process in the right way.

Mr. Rod Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, listening to dissertations on home rule for the northern territories, I imagined I was in the British House of Commons. If there had been an Irish lilt in that voice I would probably have been persuaded to vote for Irish home rule—in this case, home rule for the northern territories. I will say nothing about the legal technicalities involved in the argument because I am not an authority in that field, but it seems to me the minister might consider allowing more local authority, local control and local responsibility, in some areas at least.

I would not go so far as the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) would wish, because I feel these people and their governments are subject to such great economic pressures; that they might not be able to stand up to the big companies. However, while I have some reservations, in general I support the idea of increased home rule for the Northwest Territories and the Yukon.

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words on that aspect of the matter. I do not want to be too bad for the people there, but we have these powers for controlling the use of the land because we are trying to make sure that in the north we do not repeat the errors we have made in the south. Everyone is aware of the delicate nature of the northern ecology. We have to make sure that the development which takes place in the north is rational and under control. If there are trappers or other people who suffer from the exaggerations of those who are in the bureaucracy and enjoy it too much, I think they have a recourse which is most useful. They are supposed to have a Member of Parliament here who can raise hell in the House of Commons—when he is in Ottawa, of course. I think this would be a way. It is all very well to say there is no democracy, and so on, but in the north there is still a special responsibility for the natural resources of the territories and the Yukon.

The hon. member for Battleford-Kindersley (Mr. Thomson) mentioned a few moments ago the pressure which can be exerted by big companies, whose effects on a small population might be too great. There is, of course, the presence of elected members in this House of Commons, in addition to representation on the executive, and the special interest of the minister in the affairs of these territories and the Yukon.

An hon. Member: When he is there.

Mr. Chrétien: Yes, but I have been told by the people of the Yukon that the Minister of Northern Affairs is more often in the north than any other minister before him. I enjoy being there. I think it is a wonderful place. Since people are now beginning to go into the north, one of the rewarding aspects is that so many would like to go with the minister or the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) on these visits. Indeed, I think a plane should be available for the minister for that purpose.

Mr. Nielsen: You should invite me more often.

Mr. Chrétien: I believe that with the representation now afforded in Parliament and on the council, we can make sure that the rights of the little people in the Yukon will be protected. When I was with the hon. member in the wonderful little place called Old Crow, the people there raised a local problem about an industry which had moved in without bearing in mind the local resources and the activities of the people in trapping and hunting. We corrected the situation on the spot.

Mr. Nielsen: We did not need legislation to do it.

Mr. Chrétien: That is right. I used moral suasion. But perhaps when really big interests are involved it will be more difficult in the

future. I will go as far as I can with moral suasion, but I shall be back with good strong legislation which will protect all the people of Canada, because we shall develop the north in a proper fashion, with wisdom, to ensure that pollution and all that kind of problem will not occur in the north as it is in the south right now.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nielsen: Would the minister permit a question? I was most interested in his last sentence. Is he aware that a predecessor of his some years back, Mr. Lesage, installed a water and sewage system in Whitehorse, without a treatment plant, and that it is now discharging raw sewage into the Yukon River? Is he taking steps to have the government make money available to construct a treatment plant to prevent this pollution which is now unlawful under the terms of the Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act?

Mr. Speaker: Order. With respect, it seems to me the question goes somewhat beyond the motion which is before the House. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion? All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it. Pursuant to section 11 of Standing Order 75, a recorded division on the motion stands deferred. Is it the wish of hon. members to confirm by order of the House that these votes shall be deferred until some time on Monday?

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, there were informal discussions and I believe the agreement was that they should be taken on Monday at 10.30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: It is so ordered.

• (4:40 p.m.)

AERONAUTICS ACT REGULATIONS BILL

PROVISIONS RESPECTING REGULATIONS MADE PURSUANT TO SECTION 4

The House resumed, from Wednesday, June 10, consideration of the motion of Mr. Jamieson for the third reading of Bill C-218, respecting regulations made pursuant to section 4 of the Aeronautics Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

[Mr. Chrétien.]

BILLS OF EXCHANGE ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING BILLS AND NOTES

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-208, to amend the Bills of Exchange Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs) moved that Bill C-208, to amend the Bills of Exchange Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: When shall the said bill be read the third time?

Some hon. Members: By leave, now.

Mr. Basford moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, we made our position on this bill very clear on second reading, and we also made our position clear in committee. With the usual responsible and co-operative attitude taken by the official opposition, we are prepared to let the bill pass, get on its way and afford the measure of protection to the consumers that it contains.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, this is a co-operative afternoon. I, too, shall be very brief. We agree to the passing of this bill on third reading. I rise only to say a few words on behalf of my colleague from Broadview (Mr. Gilbert) who has had to leave, whether or not with permission under Standing Order 5. May I say he is grateful that the Standing Committee accepted the amendment that he proposed in the committee. He and his colleagues feel that this is a worthwhile piece of legislation.

However, on his behalf I should like to make the point that the legislation will be even more effective than the minister hopes if something can be done at the provincial level about disclaimer clauses and cut-off clauses. The hon. member for Broadview would like me to urge the minister, in the most persuasive way I can, to use his good offices with his counterparts in the provinces to have something done about their legislation with respect to these two aspects of the matter. With that comment, we are prepared to let this bill have third reading today, though if the minister has something to say we would welcome it.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, may I thank the hon. member for St. John's East

(Mr. McGrath) and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), who spoke on behalf of the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert), for their intervention this afternoon. May I also thank hon. members for agreeing to let the bill be passed now so that, hopefully, with some dispatch in the other place the bill will be the law of the land before the summer recess. I thank the hon. member for St. John's East for his participation in the debate on second reading as well as for his contribution in the Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs. I also thank the hon. member for Broadview for the amendment he introduced, which was worked out co-operatively with the drafting officials of the Department of Justice.

There is among some of the experts dispute as to whether there is in fact a loophole, but I was happy to accept the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Broadview. In the event that there was a loophole, we hope we have been able to effectively fill it. That is why I am happy to see the amendment made.

With regard to the last remark of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, we have already been in communication with the provinces urging them to pass complementary legislation in connection with disclaimer clauses and cut-off clauses. I have received an encouraging response from some of them at least, and I will use all my persuasive efforts to get them to act. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre also has contacts with some provincial governments and provincial oppositions and I hope that he and his party members will do the same thing.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

NUCLEAR LIABILITY

MEASURE RESPECTING CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES CAUSED BY INCIDENTS

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-158, respecting civil liability for nuclear damage, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources) moved that Bill C-158, respecting civil liability for nuclear damage, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: When shall the said bill be read the third time?

Some hon. Members: By leave, now.

Mr. Greene moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, we are quite prepared to let this bill pass on third reading, but since there was no debate on the report stage I should like to add a few reservations to what was said in the committee. This bill dealing with nuclear liability is admittedly a measure that has never had any testing. The type of insurance offered here has never been proposed before. The committee laboured quite long and hard over the matter and heard a lot of witnesses on the question of insurance for civil liability from nuclear damage. Several things came out of the committee by way of amendments which are now included in the bill and which certainly improve the measure. There were a number of other suggestions made which the committee did not adopt, but since the bill is an interim measure it will require further consideration as time goes on. However, I think the committee did the best it could with a new type of government-backed insurance, and as amended by the committee we hope it will meet the need. I merely rise to say that I will not be surprised if the bill does require further amendment as time goes on.

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, may I say a few words on this piece of legislation. Our committee spent a great deal of time on the bill, devoting at least 12 full meetings to it. I agree with the last speaker that we had a pretty thorough discussion. A number of the groups appearing before the committee were not too happy with the legislation as now drafted, but after hearing the general evidence and the evidence of members of the justice department the committee felt inclined to go along with the drafting that they had presented to the committee, though I still have one or two doubts about several parts of the legislation.

Sometimes a layman is faced with pretty tough decisions to make when on the one side there is a great deal of legal talent telling you that everything is okay, and on the other side there is an equal amount of talent telling you that some of the definitions are not too clear. This is what the members of the committee were up against when this legislation was before them. I am satisfied that basically the legislation is good, though we might have to make some changes to it another year, as the

previous speaker indicated. During the interval we will have a chance to take a look at it and to talk to people who will have to write insurance under it. We will be in a better position another year to bring in any amendments that are needed. I have no hesitation in letting the bill pass at this stage.

Mr. Rod Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, my comments will be brief. Some of the witnesses who appeared before the committee complained about high insurance costs. They indicated that, particularly as far as exporting atomic energy equipment was concerned, the margin was very narrow and that the high cost of insurance significantly affected that margin. They felt, for this reason, that the cost of insurance certainly should not go up but, rather, should come down.

• (4:50 p.m.)

We know that the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene) has had difficulty obtaining sales for Canada's atomic energy plants. We certainly do not wish to add to his difficulty in this regard. We would like to see something done so that he can offer a better product at a lower price. I think it has been indicated already that we might have to review this bill in another year to make sure that this type of legislation is in line with what it should be. Since this is a new field, underwriters of insurance do not want to commit themselves in the they would in respect of any other type of insurance.

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank the members of the committee for the very fine work they did on this difficult bill and for the improvement that were made as a result of their deliberations. Very often I think the public does not appreciate how much tough slugging and useful work in Parliament is done in the committees and how little public coverage is given to the efforts of members of committees. Certainly this bill is a very good example in respect of a completely new field and a difficult and esoteric area where improvements have been made. These improvements were made possible as a result of the very effective work of the committee. I wish to thank the members of the committee for their very great contribution in this regard.

I quite appreciate that we probably do not have all the answers. This is a new field. I think it is important that this measure be carried out. Of course, the greatest hope of all of us is that the tragedy it is made to cover will never occur, because if it should I suppose our legislative efforts will not be long remembered thereafter. Certainly the committee was most useful in this regard, and I wish to thank members of the committee and hon. members of this House for their co-operation in this matter.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

NATIONAL ENERGY BOARD ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING DEFINITIONS, ADMINISTRATIVE POWERS, ETC.

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-190, to amend the National Energy Board Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: An amendment has been proposed at the report stage by the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Harding). I must again confess to difficulty about the admissibility of the amendment. I am prepared to hear argument, but it would seem to me that the proposed amendment goes beyond the scope of the bill.

Mr. Harding: Mr. Speaker, the amendment which is on the Order Paper is a clearly defined amendment. I do not think it goes beyond the scope of the bill. It would add to and perhaps define a little more clearly the jurisdictional aspects of the commission which will be given an opportunity to check, in this particular case, the environmental, ecological and pollution risk aspects, for example in respect of the building of an oil or energy pipeline which might affect the ecology of the northern parts of Canada. For that reason I suggest the amendment would not place an untoward task before the commission. It would slightly widen, and I believe clarify, the duties which we would expect the commission to perform in assessing the value of certain of the projects. Have I permission to proceed, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources.

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, on the question of the admissibility of the amendment

may I say that the bill as presented does not encompass, of course, the whole National Energy Board Act as originally drawn. The specific amendments are referable to certain particulars, such as the increase in the size of the National Energy Board and certain considerations in respect of how in its accounting procedures the board will consider such things as depreciation, and so on, in determining rates. The bill does not really in any way encompass the aspect the hon. member has in mind concerning safety from an ecological standpoint with regard to pipelines. I submit, with respect, that the amendment goes considerably beyond the context of the bill.

I know the very great interest of the hon. member in this matter and the great contribution he has made to our thinking in respect of pollution. With regard to air, water and soil pollution I do not think any other member of this House has given more attention to the matter or has been more concerned or so well informed. Knowing of the hon. member's concern, I should like to advise him that when I brought his amendment to the attention of the officials I was assured that they would examine very carefully, before granting the right to construct a pipeline, the very considerations my hon. friend envisages in respect of his amendment.

This apparently is not clearly spelled out in the exact words referred to by the hon. member, but in the general authority of the board in granting permits one of its major concerns is that it never grant a permit unless it is sure the pipeline will be constructed in such a way, and over such terrain, that the ecology will be protected and pollution will not ensue. So while the bill is not clearly worded in the terms the hon. member has suggested, I can assure him that in practice the National Energy Board, I am advised, is very much concerned about this question in the granting of permits.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I thank hon. members for their contribution to the procedural aspect of this matter. I may say that my original doubts are the same. It seems to me that the amendment proposed by the hon. member goes beyond the bill before the House, and in fact goes behind the bill to amend the act. As I have pointed out several times this afternoon, this renders the proposed motion irrelevant and beyond the scope of the bill. I would simply remind the House of May's cogent rule on this matter which appears at page 549 of May's seventeenth edition and reads as follows:

> An amendment is out of order if it is irrelevant to the subject matter or beyond the scope of the bill, or if it is irrelevant to the subject matter or beyond the scope of the clause under consideration.

For these reasons I must rule that the motion is inadmissible.

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources) moved that Bill C-190, to amend the National Energy Board Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: When shall the bill be read the third time?

Some hon. Members: By leave, now.

Mr. Greene moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, may I speak very briefly on the third reading stage of this bill. It is not my intention to hold up its passage. I appreciate the words of the minister when he indicated that he feels the spirit of the amendment I suggested is in effect being implemented by the National Energy Board in its interpretation of the general tenor of the legislation. This is somewhat reassuring. Nevertheless, I am one who feels that sometimes it is a pretty good plan to lay down exactly what we mean and what we expect the board to look into. Then they will know their duties and I think the general public will have a better idea of the duties of the board.

• (5:00 p.m.)

I draw the attention of hon. members to a rather interesting event which took place in the last couple of weeks. I am referring to the rupturing of our pipeline. I do not think it had anything to do with the ecology of the area, such as permafrost causing a sloughing and a breaking of the pipeline. But let us not kid ourselves that we will not have a host of major problems arising, particularly in Arctic areas when we build pipelines and similar facilities there. If we reach the stage where oil is transported by pipeline southward to where it can be picked up by other pipelines, where it can be readily accessible to rail lines and other types of transportation, I am convinced we will run into a host of problems which we never imagined might exist. For

example, I know that a great deal of trouble has been experienced in the northern parts of the Soviet Union in the building of pipelines. The same thing is happening in Alaska, where in the experiments and survey work which has been undertaken exceptional problems have been encountered.

I feel that putting such a provision into the act would give the Energy Board much more power in defining exactly how, where and when a pipeline or other means of energy transmission should be built. I am convinced that before too long we will have to draft other legislation and other codes to protect our northern ecology. I believe that we cannot strengthen this act enough, and that we cannot make it too clear to the companies who will build these lines and exploit our resources that we in Canada will insist on very high standards being met and that we have a real policeman set-up in the members of the Energy Board, who will insist on proper standards being met and maintained in the interests of Canada generally.

We do not oppose the bill. I just felt that this provision would tighten up the bill. I thought this was the time to make the few remarks I have made, in the hope that the minister, perhaps in another session when amendments are moved, will consider bringing in a similar provision and will tighten up some of the other clauses to make absolutely certain that we protect fully the precious ecology of our Arctic areas.

Mr. P. M. Mahoney (Calgary South): Mr. Speaker, I also wish to take only a few moments because I know the anxiety of hon. members opposite to get home. The comments which I wish to make principally relate to the increase in number of members of the National Energy Board members, from five to seven, as provided in clause 2 of the bill. The increasing importance of petroleum as a primary source of energy for the world is, I think, recognized in this increase. Petroleum, natural gas and crude oil are now providing 62.6 per cent of the primary energy of the free world. In Canada, the figures are even more impressive. Oil is providing 47.6 per cent, natural gas 18.4 per cent, making a total of 66 per cent. The other two main sources are coal, at 11.1 per cent, and hydro power at 22.8 per cent.

One of the criticisms of the Energy Board as presently constituted, a criticism that has been directed at it principally from the petroleum industry, is the shortage of people on the board who have experience in that industry. At present it is suggested that only one of the five members has a background in this industry, and his was derived in service on the Petroleum Natural Gas Conservation Board of Alberta. In other words, he too came up through the public service, as have most of the board members.

The increase in the number of members on the board from five to seven presents a very clear challenge to the people in the industry who have been criticizing the board. Here are two vacancies which, certainly on the basis of the importance of petroleum and natural gas in our energy picture in Canada, representing as they do something like 66 per cent of energy production, provide an opportunity for people in the industry to step forward and make themselves available to perform a function of public service that is necessary and desirable and will certainly add a great deal to the knowledge and expertise of the board.

How many of the people who are critical of the board from time to time are prepared to take a cut in salary to $20,520 a year will be a question that we will look forward to answering with interest if any of them choose to ask it. However, I think that in light of the criticism that the industry has levelled at the board over a period of time, very clear opportunities are now being presented to it. Also, there is a real challenge to the industry and to public-spirited people in the industry to stand up and be counted and say that they are available to serve the public.

I would note in closing, and with a degree of regret, that while I do not feel all government departments can possibly be decentralized out of the national capital region, a board such as this might very well be located in the province of Alberta. Even though the distance between the two cities is only 180 miles, the provincial government has chosen to locate the Petroleum Natural Gas Conservation Board in Calgary rather than Edmonton. It seems to me it would be appropriate, if the federal government is at all serious about the indications of decentralization that have been made over the years, for it to give serious consideration to establishing this board in Calgary.

• (5:10 p.m.)

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to delay the passage of this bill, but I wanted to place on the record a small caveat and at least a whisper of concern on behalf of the Atlantic provinces, British Columbia, the

Northwest Territories and the Yukon, since it deals particularly with the provisions of section 69 of the act. This section deals with the conveyance or transfer of the right to minerals underneath existing pipelines and transmission lines. I raised this matter in the committee but it was not adequately answered there. I recognize it is a new field and I hope the minister will keep it in the back of his mind when he gets around to further amending the act in ensuing months. The amended act, without saying so conveys to the federal authority sole right in respect of the granting of rights to minerals underneath a pipeline, if the federal authority controls the land over which the pipeline passes. I assume that the federal authority takes the same right in law from this measure as would a private or any other interest.

When an application is made for a pipeline to remove natural gas or oil from offshore—I am speaking of the continental shelf off Canada's east coast, but this point is also applicable to the west coast and to the Arctic—the federal government will have the authority to grant such an application covering the minerals and other resources lying underneath the pipeline. To the best of my knowledge, the question of the ownership of the resources of the continental shelf has not been finally resolved. It was before the courts in a specific instance, but I submit it is a policy matter. In many respects it is a constitutional question, but in the broader realm of politics. This is the caveat I would like to place on the record: the province of Nova Scotia does not accept the claim of the federal government that it has absolute jurisdiction and, in the right of all Canadians, holds the resources that are on the continental shelf.

I do not believe that this question can be resolved in the courts. It must be resolved at the negotiating table. Until it is resolved, the acceptance of amendments which grant these powers should not be construed by the federal government as a right to exercise an authority which it does not yet possess respecting resources on the floor of the seas and under the continental shelf.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Speaker, I am rising on a point of order to suggest that since we have made very good progress this afternoon, in the usual co-operative spirit that the opposition tenders, it might be a good time to adjourn.

Mr. Francis: I would like to thank hon. members for their co-operation. We have certainly had a very good afternoon. I join in the hon. member's suggestion that we call it six o'clock.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I was about to make the same suggestion. I would just like to point out that the Government House Leader gave us five items of business today. He went away, and we have done six.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to special order made Thursday, June 18, 1970, this House stands adjourned until 11 o'clock a.m. on Monday next.

At 5.17 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to special order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, June 22, 1970

The House met at 11 a.m.

[*Translation*]

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CANADA ELECTIONS ACT

MEASURE TO CONSOLIDATE AND REVISE

The House resumed from Wednesday, June 17 consideration in committee of Bill C-215, respecting the franchise of electors and the election of members to the House of Commons—Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale):—Mr. Béchard in the Chair.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. When the committee adjourned on Wednesday, June 17, 1970, it was considering subclause (3) of clause 14 as well as the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Matane. Before resuming the debate, could I point out that subclause (8) of clause 13 has been allowed to stand. The committee is now considering subclause (3) of clause 14, at page 24 of the bill. The motion presented by the hon. member for Matane is now before the House and reads as follows:

That subclause (3) of clause 14 be struck out.

On subclause (3) of clause 14—*Certain British subjects deemed electors.*

[*English*]

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, perhaps it might be of some assistance to the committee if I tried to summarize the state of proceedings at the present time. By agreement we had a further discussion on Wednesday last when this particular clause was under consideration, and there were at least five proposals which were set before the committee at that time for consideration.

There was, of course, the first of the five proposals, the amendment actually before the committee, that is to say, the amendment by my colleague, the hon. member for Matane, which would remove altogether from British subjects other than Canadian citizens the right to vote in federal elections.

A second alternative was proposed by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra, which would continue the voting arrangement as it exists under the Canada Elections Act in favour of British subjects for a further period of five years, during which period of time they could exercise the option of taking out Canadian citizenship, thereby becoming qualified as Canadian citizens, but the right to vote as British subjects would end at the end of the five-year period. There was a modification of that suggested by the hon. member for Ontario to change the term "British subjects" in the Act to "persons."

Then there was the proposal of the hon. member for Brandon-Souris that the provision that exists in the Elections Act as it now reads, that is to say, any British subject who has been continuously resident in Canada for a period of one year, would continue in favour of British subjects but it would also be extended to citizens of France.

Finally, there was the proposal of the hon. member for York-Sunbury which, as I understand it, would continue the existing provisions in the Elections Act of special advantage to British subjects only who have been continuously resident in Canada for a period of 12 months. So we have a spectrum of choices. In addition, there was the recommendation by the committee which has been adopted in the draft bill, that is to say, that the right to vote would continue for any British subject who had that right in the last general federal election provided he remained continuously resident in Canada.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Chairman, I myself intended to move an amendment identical to the one proposed by the hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané) on June 16, 1970. I find it a logical amendment because its adoption would make all citizens equal in Canada, whether they are called "Prud'homme", "Prudhomson", or "Prudhomski".

Moreover, I wish to say that I would reject the amendment if I detected any anti-British feelings in it.

To avoid repetitions, I make mine the comments the hon. member for Matane made last Tuesday when he introduced his amendment and in his brilliant speech of June 17.

I sincerely believe that all Canadian citizens must be treated as equals whatever their ethnic origin.

I would like to point out to the member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie) of Prince Edward Island, my excellent friend and travelling companion, that the province of Prince Edward Island saw fit to revoke this privilege as early as 1954 and that the province of Quebec did so in 1945. What is good for two provinces should certainly be good for all Canada in 1970.

I do not share the views of the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard): only one year's residence in Canada to have the right to vote does not seem enough to me. Incidentally, there is a bill in my name on today's order paper aimed at reducing to three years the time of residence for any immigrant wishing to become a Canadian citizen. The measure also provides that Canadian citizenship be compulsory for all immigrants.

• (11:10 a.m.)

I recognize the need for granting British citizens, who have enjoyed some privileges up to now, some time to conform to these new rules, if the amendment from the hon. member for Matane is agreed to and put into effect before the next general election. Until then, on the occasion of a by-election, we should maintain the *status quo,* and in this way British subjects who are not yet Canadian citizens would still be able to exercise their franchise before they become Canadian citizens, because I presume that at least two years will elapse before the next general election is held. We will even suggest to the minister responsible for Canadian citizenship to accelerate and facilitate the process in order to help the many British subjects who have not yet deemed it appropriate to apply for Canadian citizenship.

Obviously, I cannot approve of the comments of the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale), our excellent friend, asking that the same privilege granted to British subjects be extended to citizens of French origin.

At this stage, I believe it is only fair to point out that we, of French origin, have never claimed special privileges, because we are one of the two founding races of Canada. Actually, during the debate on the Canadian flag, it had been suggested that a fleur-de-lis appear on that flag, in order to recall the past of citizens of French origin, which we could not accept. We have a country which is called Canada, which is a distinct country and has no need for any symbol to link it with the past. We would rather live for the future.

I think therefore that we cannot agree with the suggestion of the hon. member for Brandon-Souris who, guided by a generous impulse, felt that citizens of French origin should be granted the same treatment enjoyed by British subjects.

I agree with my colleagues the members for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce and Papineau (Messrs. Allmand and Ouellet), whose remarks have been discussed, that there would be enormous difficulties in carrying out the enumeration for the next general election.

The amendment moved by our colleague the hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra (Mr. Deachman) also seems to be unacceptable as, to my mind, a principle has to be either accepted or rejected. It is not logical to say: Some changes are in order, but let us extend the privilege for one or two years longer. Either we accept the *status quo,* or in a reasonable way we decide to make the necessary changes at the present time and perhaps complete them later on when the minister responsible for citizenship introduces in the House his bill on Canadian citizenship. Then citizenship would be brought more in line with the wishes expressed here today. If the bill is adopted as drafted, it will create two kinds of British subjects. And let us try to visualize the resulting difficulties for enumerators who visit all homes and will have to ask the residents: "Where you a British subject, as your name is Wilson, or Stanfield, or any other? Were you a resident of Canada before June 25, 1968?" As some of my colleagues have pointed out, some who were not 21 years old at that time will have to abide by the new act, whereas those who were Canadian residents before June 25, 1968 will continue enjoying the same privilege.

One can readily imagine how frustrated, and angry all citizens of British origin will be when, upon being asked by enumerators whether they are British subjects, they have to reply that they were residents before June 25, 1968 but that their son was not.

It is frustrating for citizens not of British origin to be asked: Would you please produce your citizenship certificate if you want to be on the list, because your name is "Prudhommeski", "Prudhommian" or of any other possible origin.

Mr. Chairman, I appeal to my colleagues, and I repeat, before concluding my remarks, that if I detected the slightest hint of anti-

British feeling in that amendment, I would be the first to reject it. But I suggest this is a positive amendment, a new step toward the goal contemplated by the former Prime Minister of Canada and every new member of Parliament, whatever his ethnic origin.

We want Canada to be for Canadians, with no distinction whatsoever between those belonging to the two founding races and those who left their countries to come here and live with us.

We should not create second-class citizens or privileged social classes in Canada, but we should rather try, as far as possible, to make every citizen equal and make them understand that, to be able to vote at the next general election, they will have to be Canadian citizens and be at least 18 years of age.

• (11:20 a.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, I just came in and listened with interest to the remarks of the hon. gentleman who preceded me, whose eloquence and persuasiveness usually bring forth a favourable reaction from me. But this time I think he will allow me to disagree with the viewpoint he expressed. I think that Canadians as a whole will resist what has become apparent in the actions of this government, namely, in the face of difficult economic conditions the like of which we have not seen in this country—

Mr. Cafik: Since you were in office.

Mr. Diefenbaker: —the government brings before Parliament matters such as this that can only divide the Canadian people further as a whole.

The hon. member referred to second-class citizenship, against which I have always stood throughout the years and still stand. But it has become apparent week after week and month after month that this government is determined to remove any vestige of our British tradition in this country, indeed, to a degree that would have been shocking to French-Canadians such as Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Right Hon. Mr. Lapointe, whose speeches can be read not only with interest today but with value.

I say to the government, is it not about time that you put a stop to the accelerating rate by which our British tradition is being swept aside in this country? So far as those of the French race are concerned, I do not want to point out again but sometimes it has to be repeated that in my own province in 1922, when it was unpopular to do so, believing that the French language had its place in the schools of Saskatchewan constitutionally because of its existence in the territorial days, I acted for two French-Canadian trustees on an appeal. They were prosecuted and convicted for permitting the use of the French language in a school to a degree that was not considered appropriate under the education act. I took the appeal. I was widely criticized for having done so, but I was successful on that appeal, and any hon. member that wants to look up the record of almost 50 years ago will find that in the case Boutin and Ethier I took that stand and have consistently followed it through the years.

When I was Prime Minister I realized that French Canada was not receiving its fair share of appointments to the senior ranks in the civil service or in external affairs. One of the first directions given was that there should be a realization that those of French origin were not receiving their fair share of top level appointments, and action was taken accordingly. Furthermore, to make Parliament bilingual, as it was under the BNA Act, we brought in the provision whereby simultaneous interpretation was adopted. These things had not taken place under Liberal administrations. We also made other changes in order to ensure that French-Canadians should not be in a secondary position with regard to citizenship.

I know the meaning of second-class Canadianism, and if you read my speeches through the years when I was in opposition you will find that I brought before Parliament over and over again the need for action to be taken to ensure that those were proud of having "Canada" on their shoulder straps in the days of war would not immediately become separated into various racial origins on their return. Back in August of 1944 I dealt with this matter at length during the course of a debate in the House, and the Right Hon. Mackenzie King who was Prime Minister said that when the war was over he would join the hon. member for Lake Centre, as I then was, and others of like mind to bring about these changes so that we would build a true Canadianism.

I say to the government: Remove this amendment now; do not continue a course that is becoming clearer day by day.

I do not want to speak at length—I have no notes before me—but I speak from the heart when I say that under this administration and

its predecessor a determined effort has been made to obliterate our traditions. English-speaking Canada has the right to speak out on matters such as this and to ask this government to bring an end to the trend.

Think of what has happened in recent years. I have before me a record which has just been sent to me demonstrating actions to degrade the Crown. The Queen is the head of the executive branch of government. She is an integral part of Parliament, but she has been placed in a completely inferior position by this government as of July 1 last in that in the directions sent out to the various departments of government in what might be called the catalogue of public relations a change was made in effect making the cabinet the executive head. Of the Speeches from the Throne that have been brought before Parliament recently, all that remains is the fact that the throne still appears in the description of the speech that is given. The degree to which Her Majesty has been placed in an inferior position is apparent from the fact that she was not mentioned in a recent Speech from the Throne and in the one made in 1969 written by the Prime Minister and spoken by the Governor General in which the following statement appeared:

> May I say, too, that Her Majesty's interest in Canada and in Canadians and their affairs will bring the Queen—

To Canada. Her interest in Canadian affairs! Parliament cannot exist without the Queen being a necessary element in Parliament. Indeed, in the same book to which I referred, which deals with the organization of the government of Canada, other, similar changes have been made.

• (11:30 a.m.)

Why is there this pell-mell rush to obliterate one part of our tradition? People are asking themselves why, and why there is not more opposition to it in Parliament. Governments, being human, are always prone to advance those things they believe in even though they are based on uncertain principles, where there is no direct opposition. Another example in the unification of the armed forces might be cited, which was brought about for one purpose only, to remove what were regarded as British uniforms. And what has happened to the armed forces today? By reason of the tinkering of this government, nowhere in the world is there a greater degree of uncertainty, accompanied with loss of morale, than in our armed forces.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Mr. Diefenbaker: It is all part of the picture. The removal of the Queen's portrait from the citizenship courts is another example. We have ministers of the government occupying the highest positions who have advocated the establishment of a republic in Canada.

An hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: There is one who is able to speak out by simply tapping his desk and not identifying himself.

Mr. De Bané: A question of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

The Deputy Chairman: Order, please. The hon. member is rising on a question of privilege.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The hon. member will have an opportunity to speak later.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): He is rising on a question of privilege.

[*Translation*]

Mr. De Bané: Is the right hon. member aware that his colleague the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle) is also in favour of the republic and the abolition of the monarchy?

[*English*]

The Deputy Chairman: Order, please. That is not a question of privilege.

[*Translation*]

This is not a question of privilege, but a question.

[*English*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member simply rose to speak under the guise of rising on a question of privilege. May I proceed? Three members of the government have advocated a republic for Canada. Apparently they are steering the course of Canada today in that direction.

An hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: Again, one solitary person is pounding his desk. Sir, a further example is the recent removal of the coat of arms from certain ministerial stationery. Was this as result of a decision of the government? The coat of arms has been on ministerial stationery throughout the years, and now it is removed in some departments. In place of the coat of arms on the stationery of two government departments is a monogram with the letters "CL", which stands for "Department

of Labour". A horizontal bar on the top of the "L" forms the facsimile of the letter "T", for "travail". I am unable to determine what is implied by the design of the "C" therein. It looks to me as if there are three heads thereon. Perhaps it is a heraldic interpretation of the troika. But this kind of action should not be taken by ministers unless there has first been approval by the cabinet and after discussion by Parliament. These things happen again and again. They are dividing our country unnecessarily.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: Such changes are driving people to the belief that we cannot establish unity in Canada. Unity is not a one-way street. We who are of a racial origin other than French have gone a long way to bring about unity in Canada. We have given up some of those things that we regarded as sacred to our citizenship—and I speak as one of mixed origin.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Chairman, on a question of privilege.

[*English*]

I should like to point out to my right hon. friend, and this is a question of privilege, that if I were sure that what I am doing this morning is dividing this country I would refuse to associate myself with such an amendment. I am trying to work in this country and this House to unite people and not disunite them. I repeat again to my right hon. friend, if I were sure that this kind of amendment would divide the people of this country I would refuse to associate myself with it. I think he knows that quite well, because I have spoken to him quite often privately. I do not agree with him when he asserts that in trying to build a better Canada for today and tomorrow we are forgetting our past. We have a great deal of respect for the Canada of yesterday and we believe in traditions in this country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: I always respect the integrity of the hon. gentleman. He says that if he were sure the amendment would divide Canada he would not support it. He ought to go farther than that and say that if there is any doubt about it he will not support it, on the basis of his beliefs throughout the years.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: How is it possible to establish certainty? Socrates tried; other philosophers ever since have tried and have found it impossible. I am placing my views before this chamber in a dispassionate way.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is the Liberal attitude. They say, "Oh, oh." They alone have custody of sincerity. They alone are trying to build this country. It is apparent from their interruptions that they think that those who do not agree with the course being taken are not entitled to be heard.

Sir, I mentioned removal of the coat of arms; on the substitution there are three little images that might possibly represent a troika. Who knows whether they might not be the Secretary of State, the Prime Minister and the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion? I do not know, but I think there ought to be identification. It is only fair that those who have come into the government from other parties and who have been raised to dominant positions in the government party should make it clear whether the next step is the creation of a new order, a new triumvirate, in this country.

Speaking seriously, I hope that the government will not press forward with such actions. I cannot be optimistic about it because it is apparent that, notwithstanding the doubts of those who believe in a united Canada, these people will push through what they want regardless of the divisions that are being caused.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, when the right hon. member for Prince Albert rose to speak he acknowledged that he had not been present at prior proceedings.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I did not say that at all. I said I did not know what was coming up today.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I was trying to assist the right hon. gentleman. If he had followed this debate he would know very well that this amendment was not brought forward by the government and that I specifically said that the government took no position on it. The position which the government has taken is the position taken in the bill and the position taken by the standing committee, I believe unanimously. Certainly the hon. member for Hillsborough supported the idea that a change of the kind set out on page 24 of the bill should be made. In fact, I refer the

right hon. member to the statement of the hon. member for Hillsborough at page 8255 of *Hansard*.

• (11.40 a.m.)

I think there was a general disposition within the standing committee that the position which had previously existed, not so much discriminating in favour of British subjects but discriminating against those Canadian immigrants of origins other than the United Kingdom, should not persist. The stand taken generally by the standing committee at that time was that the position should be that any British subject other than a Canadian citizen who had been entitled to vote in the last election should not have that right taken away but that in future British subjects who have immigrated to Canada, as well as other immigrants such as Italians, Ukrainians and Poles, should be on an equal basis. Once they have taken out Canadian citizenship they should have the right to vote, but not before. That is the position of the government with regard to this bill. In fairness it should be put on the record that the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Matane, which is his right, is the initiative of the hon. member. It does not in any sense represent the view of the government.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I fully realize what the hon. member has said. However, whatever the amendment may be, the stand taken by the government on this and many other matters to which reference was made is not apologized for or defended by the minister. He could not deny the fact that this government is determined to push its way through to bring about a republic in Canada. I have nothing to withdraw in that connection. That has been the attitude of some ministers of the government. They have stated they are in favour of such action. One of them voted for the Liberal Party abolition motion. The Prime Minister of Canada said he did not vote for the abolition of the monarchy because he did not think it was a matter of sufficient importance. Indeed, he regards the question as even less important than skiing or even snowshoeing.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I wish to take only a few moments of the committee's time to raise a problem. I wish to point it to the particular attention of the hon. member for Saint-Denis. It concerns the latest passport and citizenship regulations. I do not think this matter has been brought to the attention of the House. While it involves directly only the amendment before us, it also relates to other amendments. It is of such concern that even several members of this House are not, according to these latest regulations, Canadian citizens. I do not think the member for Swift Current-Maple Creek will mind if I mention his name, but he is one of these. I do not know where this puts the hon. member and others in similar circumstances in so far as their right to sit in the House is concerned. The fact is that under the present statutes and the current passport regulations a person born in Great Britain, no matter whether he has lived here for 40 or 50 years, served in the armed forces or held public office, is not a Canadian citizen. I mention the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek because that is the position he is in, having been born in Scotland. I can see this happening with the amendment now before us as it relates to a British subject, living in this country at the last election, having the right to vote in any future election.

Last Saturday I received a telephone call from a man in my constituency who is well into his seventies. He was literally weeping over the telephone. He had received an urgent call and wanted to return to Great Britain for a visit. He came to this country prior to World War I. In fact I think it was in 1907. He served in World War I in the Canadian army. He is now being denied the right to receive a Canadian passport until he becomes a Canadian citizen.

Mr. Deachman: Wrong.

Mr. Thompson: I challenge that.

Mr. Deachman: You have your facts all wrong.

Mr. Thompson: He cannot receive a passport except on a temporary one year basis. Even though he has had ten passports in the past, he must now verify his personal record and take out a Canadian citizenship certificate before he can receive a current passport. The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra should verify what he is saying because it is not true.

Even though a British subject has lived in this country 60 years, has assumed the rights of a Canadian citizen, has had passports in the past and has served in the armed forces, until he takes out a citizenship certificate, which I admit is not a very difficult process, he is denied a passport. The member for Vancouver Quadra is in error when he denies that. This did not only happen last Saturday

but has happened at least 50 times in the past few months. I have been able to assist these people to get their certificates, but that does not lessen the injustice.

Mr. Deachman: May I ask the hon. member a question? Do the passport regulations not now require proof of citizenship which, if you were a British subject and acquired citizenship by virtue of your British citizenship under the Canadian Citizenship Act of 1947, simply means that you must produce your Canadian citizenship certificate or, if you were born in Canada, simply produce your birth certificate? Is there not a difference between simply producing a certificate to indicate your Canadian citizenship and taking out citizenship, as the hon. member suggests?

Mr. Thompson: There is practically no difference. To answer your question—

Mr. Deachman: Just a minute. Practically—

Mr. Thompson: Let me answer. A person born in Canada is one thing. If he has his birth certificate or other proof of his Canadian birth he is automatically a Canadian citizen. That is true. However, a British subject who has been in this country for X number of years is not entitled to a passport until he can provide proof of Canadian citizenship which he can only acquire by taking out a citizenship certificate.

Mr. McGrath: That is a fact and the hon. member knows it.

Mr. Thompson: This situation arises day after day in the passport office. It is necessary to have a special staff to deal with the situation. This is a travesty of justice. It does not make for the just society that some hon. members opposite like to talk about.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: To return to the hon. member's question—

Mr. Prud'homme: May I ask a simple question? These are very difficult problems but I think we can talk about them in a reasonable way. With all due respect to hon. members, is it not a fact that the majority of the Canadian people find it reasonable that you have to be a Canadian citizen? I accept the fact that up until now it has been possible, but is it not reasonable that you must be a Canadian citizen to sit in the Canadian House of Commons? Is it not reasonable that you should be a Canadian citizen to have a Canadian passport? There should be no discussion. It is a fact. Is that not reasonable?

Mr. Thompson: I say to the hon. member for Saint-Denis that I raised this question because I believe it should be brought to the attention of this House and I do not recall it being done in the past. I think the situation I have been describing is very inequitable and unjust. With the present amendment this problem can well be duplicated and can cause similar problems. The hon. member for Saint-Denis referred to the fact that it will be difficult to provide the proof of citizenship rights that would be necessary under this amendment. I question the practical aspect of it.

As the hon. member mentioned, I am sure there must be some reasonable solution, but the matter is not that simple. Regardless of what the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra has said, I question the legal and technical right of some hon. members of this House to sit here, including some who have been here for a number of years but who, strictly according to the present law, are not Canadian citizens. This is completely wrong and unjust. I leave it at that. I wanted to bring it to the attention of the House.

• (11:50 a.m.)

Mr. McIntosh: If I might add briefly to what my hon. friend has just said, the objection I take to the present procedure with regard to passports is easily explained. The hon. member for Saint-Denis said he thought we should be reasonable, that we would like to be Canadians. Well, most of us thought we were Canadians by virtue of previous acts. But the government, in its wisdom, regardless of whether or not a man has sat in this House and served over one-third of his life in the public service, now says: If you want a passport you must provide proof of citizenship.

I would have thought that since I spent six years in the armed services the department would have proof that I was a Canadian, or that I wore Canadian badges in the war. I wonder what would happen to me if I were travelling in Europe, after fighting for six years for what I thought was my country, and then found I could not get back into Canada.

Mr. Osler: Would the hon. member permit a question? I respect the hon. member's feelings but I think his argument is fallacious. I was in the Air Force where I was surrounded by Americans who thought enough of the cause to join that service. They had no inten-

tion of becoming Canadians, but they served beside us for a long time and then went back to the United States. Surely the fact that a peron served in the Canadian Forces could in no way be an indication of Canadian citizenship.

Mr. McIntosh: No one asked me to join the armed services. I did so of my own accord and for my own reasons. I do not know whether the hon. member was in the armed forces or not, but I felt it was my place to be there and I am proud to have served in the Canadian Army. I think I did my job. I thought I was a Canadian.

Mr. Osler: On a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman, I think I should make this perfectly clear. I served in the Canadian Air Force for four and a half years.

Mr. McIntosh: A gentleman of the air force. We were men of the army. My point is this. I was quite prepared to answer the communication I received from the new minister of information. The letter he sent to each member asked us to provide certain information. I sent in my application but it was returned to me—they would not take my word that I was a Canadian citizen. The application had to be signed by a notary public, or someone like that. I have not done so.

Mr. Baldwin: They take your taxes, though.

Mr. McIntosh: Oh yes, they take my taxes every month. My right hon. friend from Prince Albert has voiced an objection which many Canadians feel. I conclude by saying that if there is any doubt whether amendments of this kind tend to divide Canada, I can assure the hon. member for Saint-Denis that this is indeed the case. I, at any rate, am deeply resentful of this type of legislation.

Mr. Coates: My remarks will be few, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member for Saint-Denis suggested that if, in his opinion, the amendment would cause ill feeling or disunity in the nation he would not support it. I put it to him that the example which has been brought forward today by my hon. friend for Swift Current-Maple Creek emphasizes the difficulties which are being created and illustrates the effect on the country of the type of proposal contained in the amendment. If this is happening, and if a man who has served his country and who has been a Member of Parliament for many Parliaments, finds it inexplicable, if it has happened to him and he feels resentment, if he feels hurt to think that at this late stage he is not regarded as a Canadian citizen in every sense of the word, then there must be tens of thousands who feel themselves similarly offended. I am sure no one in this country would take the view that he is not a Canadian citizen. Regardless of what the law may say, I am sure everybody in Canada is proud of the fact that he is a Canadian and a Member of Parliament. He has been a contributing Canadian as far as I am concerned, and no law is going to change that situation.

As I say, there are many hundreds of thousands of people in this country who find themselves in the same position as my hon. friend from Swift Current-Maple Creek. And do you know what they say, Mr. Chairman, when they read about a debate of this kind? If they are British, they say: Then I am a second-class citizen in this country and have been ever since the Pearson government took office in 1963. This is what concerns me. This type of legislation will drive the people of Canada apart. This type of amendment is a classic example of the way we shall destroy ourselves if we keep going on the same lines.

Let us stop this foolishness before it is too late, if it is not already too late, and let us recognize the things which have always attracted people to this country, regardless of their place of origin. Let us say to the English, to the Scots, to the Welsh and to the Irish, and to the people of the Commonwealth: We are still part of the same family and we shall always give you the same rights; you are a special part of us because of the contribution you made to the development of our country in 1867 and before that time. Let us not try to downgrade and remove and sneak away by stealth the things these people hold dear in the hope that doing so will upgrade the position of somebody else in this country. Nothing is accomplished by running somebody down. If it is felt we should help Canadians who live in the province of Quebec—and, like my right hon. friend from Prince Albert, I have no objection to that whatsoever—let us not attempt to do so by taking things away from someone else. Rather, let us give them something in addition to what they have already, should it be felt this would assist them to play a greater part in the building of this country. Let us have no part of amendments like the one before us which only take away, only destroy, only help to cause further disunity.

I believe that the hon. member for Saint-Denis is a fair-minded man who means what he says. I say to him: think it over. I urge him to withdraw his support for this amendment and, in doing so, to recognize that the proposal does, indeed, contain a further threat to unity and, second, that in his view every Canadian should feel equal.

• (12 noon)

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Chairman, I again rise on a question of privilege. May I say in answer to my hon. friend that I have held my view for many years, which perhaps is one reason I am sitting here in Ottawa rather than Quebec City. My question of privilege is that I believe Italians, Germans and Ukrainians are also a special part of us in Canada.

May I also say that I refuse the generosity of the hon. member for Brandon-Souris, who suggested we include as a special category immigrants of French-speaking origin. I refuse this generosity because to me every Canadian, whatever his country of origin, is a special part of us in Canada. No longer is he a German, Scandinavian, Greek, Armenian, Arab, or whatever the case may be.

I repeat that I see nothing wrong with the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek taking out his citizenship, but am I downgrading him? Up until now he has been able to take his seat in this House. However, the decision is for him, not for us. My contention is that everyone in Canada is equal in the matter of citizenship. The only difference between Canada and most other countries in the world is that we have two official languages. Certainly there is no special privilege granted to English or French, or should not be.

If there are to be privileged groups in Canada, then perhaps they should be the Eskimos and Indians rather than the two founding races. I am getting tired of hearing this expression used by hon. members opposite. I have said hundreds of times when I have been in western Canada, and I repeat it again today, that I sometimes wish my name was Prudomski so that I could make people understand better. But because my name is Prud'homme it sounds as though a special case is being made for French-speaking people in Quebec. There is no such thought in my mind, and there never has been and I hope never will be. As far as I am concerned, everyone in Canada, regardless of racial origin, should be treated equally.

As honourable men, I say immigrants should take out Canadian citizenship if they want to vote in general elections. To be eligible to vote in Canada you must be 18 years of age or over and a Canadian citizen. This situation is an honourable one and is far from being divisive.

Mr. Coates: Mr. Chairman, may I answer this so-called question of privilege in this way. First of all, the hon. member for Saint-Denis said he did not think what he was proposing was divisive, but if it were shown that it was, or if he thought it was, he would not agree with the proposition. I have endeavoured to show him it is, but he has ignored my comments and made some other proposition. I said that the proposition now put forward is divisive, and I have no doubt about that. If there is any doubt in the hon. members' mind, then he too should recognize it and oppose that proposition.

The second point I want to make relates to a quotation from Abraham Lincoln, who once said that you cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. I think that is a pretty important consideration.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Chairman, I must admit I am puzzled by the turn taken by this debate. I suppose that since this country was founded there has been a special type of arrangement made for those who come from the British Commonwealth countries; that is to say, almost immediately on their arrival in Canada they are entitled to all the privileges, including the right to vote. I do not want to be critical about that; this is part of our history.

As I understood what the right hon. member for Prince Albert and others had to say, they wanted this situation to continue, though some did not want the right extended to people who come to Canada from French-speaking countries. I come from a constituency where people of all ethnic groups, with the possible exception of people of French origin, have settled in large numbers. I represent over 20,000 people of Ukrainian origin, 12,000 people of Polish origin and large numbers of Czechs, Russians and Jews.

As I have understood the reasoning of the right hon. member for Prince Albert over the last couple of years, he has been arguing that all people in Canada should be treated equally. I agree with this proposition and should like to see it applied to our election laws. I am not too concerned whether we say that those who come to Canada must wait five

years before being eligible to vote, or whether we say that people who come to Canada are eligible after only one year; I am content with either proposition. I contend that all people in Canada should be treated equally, be they of British, French or any other origin.

In recent years the pattern of immigration to Canada has changed. Large numbers are coming to cities like Montreal, Toronto and other cities in Ontario from countries like Italy, Spain, Portugal and Greece. In the recent past substantial numbers have come to Canada from the Asian countries. I ask whether there is any member of this House who would say to these people: "You are second or third-class citizens. Certain people who come to this country can vote in elections after a stay of one year, whereas you have to wait five years or more"? I hope no one in this House would suggest that. If that is the case, no one should propose that some people should have to wait five years for the vote whereas other people need wait only one year.

I close by saying I am prepared to vote for any motion made by any member of the House that treats all people equally when it comes to voting at election time. I do not care whether these people are white, yellow, red, black or brown, whether they are British, French, Scandinavian, Greek or Dutch. Equally, I am prepared to vote against any proposal giving special status and rights to a particular group.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I should just like to make one comment on the remarks made by our colleague from Saint-Denis and to ask one specific question on the amendment before the committee. I speak not as a member of one of the two founding races; I belong to neither, though my name might give the impression that I do. I was not even born in Canada. Nevertheless, I am proud to call myself and to be a Canadian.

• (12:10 p.m.)

However, the point I want to answer in a very reasonable way, in relation to the suggestion that we are being unfair as far as the past is concerned, is that by this amendment a group of Canadians are being told that according to the law as it stands now and has been in the past, they are not Canadian citizens. I do not agree with the statement of the hon. member for Saint-Denis that the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek can take out citizenship if he wants to, because he should not have to.

[Mr. Orlikow.]

Therefore I think this amendment is wrong because I believe everyone who has been in the country under the regulations and the laws that have existed in the past should have these full rights that are due him. There ought to be some better way of making sure that all Canadians up to this point should be what the law has said they have been and what they thought they were. I think that is a reasonable answer.

This amendment is inadequate from this standpoint because I think everyone at this time who has been here and is technically and legally a Canadian citizen in the sense that he belongs to Canada should continue to have those rights which he has exercised in the past. He should not have to take action such as many Canadians are now having to do. This amendment is inadequate because it does not really fill the need. I am not talking about the broader principle of the bill. On that basis I agree with the hon. member who has just spoken, that all Canadians are equal and we must regard them as such. This is another point relating to the new legislation as far as the future is concerned but which does not really relate to the discussion on this particular amendment.

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, this is the first time we have been in the committee in the morning and perhaps that is the reason the debate is a bit more stimulating and aggressive than it has been on previous afternoons. I do not want to repeat what I said last week. I do think that this is the one amendment of the five which would actually be hurtful to our whole cause. I think it should be opposed because it does that which I think is not good, it diminishes the electorate and would have the effect of lowering the number of people who would participate in the franchise.

I am very much impressed by the fact that the new nations of the Caribbean Commonwealth as they set up their new countries were generous and considerate enough to reciprocate to Canadians there the rights people from the British West Indies resident in Canada obtain under the British subject provision. I do not want to be a party to deleting from the electoral rolls of Canada the very fine people from the Caribbean Commonwealth who are making their homes with us at the present time.

I am not in favour of anything which narrows the franchise. Our role should be to broaden it. As I said the other day, I hope we

might hold on long enough to this reciprocal aspect of the British subject in one country and another so we might be able to explore the possibility of extending it throughout the Commonwealth. It is in six or eight countries now, and I think this might be worth while.

I was impressed by Mr. Stewart MacLeod's Canadian Press article about the Prime Minister's new concern with the Commonwealth. This might be an avenue whereby we could foster a healthier sense of internationalism within the Commonwealth. I do not like this suggestion that people are espousing about second-class citizenship and third-class citizenship. They are saying that one group of people is better than another. I think this is unworthy.

The problem of the British subject provision is not that anyone thinks he is better and therefore entitled to something but rather that by law they were given a certain status. As I mentioned the other day, it is only recently that there was such an animal as a Canadian citizen. Sir Wilfrid Laurier was not a Canadian citizen, he was a British subject. Robert Borden was not a Canadian citizen but surely no one would be foolish enough to say that Robert Borden was not a Canadian. If fact, he was the architect of our independence. So it was 70 years before we set up a vehicle whereby people became Canadian citizens. One would find, I think if he looked over the roll of British subjects, that a lot of them do not bear the names such as Thompson, Forrestall, Macquarrie or MacRae. They get the franchise because at one time there were only British subjects.

I do not think there is any reason a country must freeze forever rights which were granted in the past. I would not hold to that opinion. Therefore I believe what the bill purports or suggests is in fact a better solution. What the hon. member for Matane would have us do in fact would be to retroactively divest people of rights which were given them by this country, rights which they had the right to believe would be extended to them. I do not like the idea of reaching back and taking from people a right which they have assumed was given them in good faith.

I am sure that the bill and the committee deal with this in a much less drastic and hurtful way than does the amendment of the hon. member for Matane. It would be regrettable if we should say today that this right is gone and there is no chance of these people recovering that right which they once had.

I heard a very fine speech the other day by the hon. member for Kamloops when he spoke about his people. He spoke about the length of time it took before they were extended the franchise. We know that in Canada today there is great soul-searching about the rights of his people. While I do not pretend to be an expert on all the ramifications, it seems to me that one of the elements which constantly comes through is the fact that many of the Indian people believe that a word given them has not been honoured. I would not want to be a party to dishonouring a word which had been given to any group of people in this country.

So I would say, let us find a reasonable way of dealing with this situation. Let us not abruptly disenfranchise people in this rather cruel and heartless way, because you do not really trot out your Canadianism with this particular device. Surely none of us is sticking out his chest and proving his Canadianism by taking from a group of those among us rights which were properly given them.

I must apologize to the hon. member for Trois-Rivières because apparently I created a source of amusement for him the other day through a misunderstanding. He said he was amused when I told the House about the wisdom of our forefathers. Actually the English expression "in their wisdom" is a figure of speech which quite often indicates that the person using that figure of speech does not think so much of the wisdom of these people.

The hon. member also went on to say that many young people today do not really believe that the older people are that wise. I tell him that young people in every age and of every generation have expressed the same point of view. I would not for one moment suggest that our ancestors in this place were any wiser than we are and, God help us, they were not any more foolish than we are. We are living in an age when we can get to the moon but cannot get to the heart of many of our cities. We can manufacture the finest instruments but we cannot seem to depollute our atmosphere. I am not sure that all wisdom resides either in the past or in the present. I am not invoking the wisdom of people in the past; I am invoking a fact of life. Our election laws were geared in this way and we are now dealing with what one might call the ethical and moral fallout of decisions which were made previously. I think we must deal justly with the people involved.

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question of my hon. friend? I should like to

know where he was, what he did and what he said in 1954 in his province when the provincial government took this right away from British citizens who were not Canadians and who have not had the right to vote in provincial elections since. As the hon. member knows, in his province this right has not existed since 1964. What action did the people take then and what was their feeling? Was the feeling divisive?

• (12:20 p.m.)

Mr. Macquarrie: May I say, since the hon. member asked me, that there was a little misunderstanding when the election was called, but with their usual wisdom the people of Prince Edward Island handled it quite well.

Mr. Cafik: I would like to say a few words on this subject. The general intention of Bill C-215 is to allow British subjects who have voted in previous federal elections to vote in the future. I have just been considering whether this provision in fact includes people of Irish descent. Under the previous Act those of Irish descent were considered to be in the same classification as British subjects, and I think it is quite clear that those from Southern Ireland are not so considered in Bill C-215. It may well be debatable whether the term "British subject" in fact covers those that the draftsman of the bill had in mind.

I should like to suggest later, as I did before in the House, that we clarify not only that point but other points. If the clause stands, I will propose the striking out the words "British subject" and replacing them by the word "person". The net effect is almost the same because those who were not citizens and who were eligible to vote in the last federal election were in fact either British subjects or, I suggest, citizens of Southern Ireland.

Speaking on the amendment of the hon. member for Matane I should like to review for a moment, if I may, what a Canadian citizen is and what the effect of the proposed amendment would be. First of all, I understand that a Canadian citizen is one who has taken out his Canadian citizenship papers. This can be done by one who has been in Canada for five years and who has made the proper application, if he is not a British subject, or, if he is a British subject he is given the special privilege of taking out Canadian citizenship after one year. In addition to going through these formalities, one has to pay a $10 fee.

[Mr. Prud'homme.]

The fee itself is not very significant for most people but I suggest that it may well be significant for many people who are retired. We all know the pressures that have been put on them, because of inflation. I suggest that perhaps it is not appropriate to ask them to pay the $10 fee particularly if they have lived in this country for 40 or 50 years, in order to take out citizenship in a country of which most of them really believe they are citizens now.

In addition, anyone who is born in Canada is a Canadian citizen, and so is a British subject under certain circumstances stemming from the passing of the Citizenship Act of 1947. That Act outlined that those then living in Canada who were landed immigrants for a period of five years prior to the passing of the Act were automatically considered to be Canadian citizens, and those who were not landed immigrants but who were British subjects and who had been in this country for a period of 20 years prior to the passing of the act were deemed to be Canadian citizens.

The implications of these two provisions of the Act of 1947 are quite significant to this debate. Let us look at the practical implications of the amendment before us, which in effect says that only those who have taken out Canadian citizenship or who were born in this country and thereby are Canadian citizens or who are Canadian citizens under the act of 1947 will be allowed to vote. The proposition in Bill C-215 allows those who could vote in the past to still vote in the future.

Let us find out who in fact would be disenfranchised if this amendment were to be passed. I am not prejudging the situation one way or the other, at the moment; I would just like to review the facts.

First of all, under this amendment landed immigrants who came to this country since 1942, unless they went through the formality of becoming Canadian citizens, would in fact be disenfranchised even though many would have lived here for a period of 26 years. This means that a person who has lived here for 26 years and cast a ballot in every federal election since that time would wake up one morning after this amendment is passed and all of a sudden, or perhaps more unfortunately just prior to the next federal election, find out he is no longer entitled to vote. Psychologically this is a very bad thing to do to such a person but, more important, consider the person who was not a landed immigrant in Canada but who is a British subject. He could

have had a period of up to 46 years in which he cast a ballot in every consecutive federal election. Under this amendment he would be disenfranchised without ever having the opportunity of voting again unless he does something different from what he has done in the past, namely, take out Canadian citizenstip. These two groups will be disenfranchised. I presume, that we also disenfranchise people from Southern Ireland who could vote in the past, because they are not included in the act or in the amendments.

I understand that the categories I am speaking about represent about 1,500,000 people in Canada who could have voted or did vote in the last federal election and who will not be allowed to vote in the next federal election unless they take out Canadian citizenship. It can well be argued that they should in fact take out Canadian citizenship, that this is a highly desirable thing. I agree and I would encourage every non-citizen, whether he is a British subject or of other origin, to do so. I do not think anyone can argue about that. I have no particular axe to grind for British subjects. I myself am of different ethnic origin. I am Ukrainian and I am proud of it, just as proud as anyone would be of their national origin. I think that would indicate I have no vested interest in this matter.

However, I believe it is a serious matter to say to people who have grown accustomed to a certain kind of rule, who have grown accustomed to casting a vote, that we are changing the law retroactively, as it were, and that they are no longer entitled to vote. I should like to ask those who think as highly as I do of Canadian citizenship—and there is no one in this chamber who values it more highly—what is the hurry? Surely we do not want a special class of citizens in this country. Surely we want to pass an Act under which everyone who comes to this country from abroad will be treated equally. However, is it necessary to say that those who have come to Canada under certain rules and who have grown accustomed to exercising a certain privilege will be denied the right to vote because we are impatient to make them toe the line, which I am not too sure in their case is that significant?

I beg of you to consider that problem. I do not think it is a simple or unimportant thing to take away one of man's most valuable possessions in a free society, the right of casting a ballot to determine the direction in which the country will go. It is not that simple to say to a man that he could vote yesterday but tomorrow he cannot do so. That does not seem to me to be fair.

It is true that we want Canadian unity, and I can see that giving special privileges to any class of people has a tendency to destroy national unity because other ethnic groups as well as the French, our other founding race, feel that a special privilege has been given to a certain class of people. Let us do away with that special privilege, but let us not back up. Why do we have to insult all these people? Is it necessary that we do it? I suggest that it serves no useful purpose in connection with Canadian unity.

• (12:30 p.m.)

I can think of a practical example of the emotional effect upon people. My mother, who is dead now, God rest her soul, died the day after the last general election. She was over 70 years old. She was of Scottish descent. She came to this country in the early 1900's. She had two husbands, the first of whom died in the First World War, and the second of whom fought and died as a result of the Second World War. Is it right that we should say to people like her that they can no longer vote in this country that they love, the country they have worked for and of which they are proud? I do not think it is fair or necessary to do that. All such persons should be encouraged to take out citizenship, but I see no need to force them to do so in order to exercise a right they have always had the privilege of exercising.

So far as I am concerned the bill is a little inadequate. I pointed that out in my opening remarks. I believe that the amendment that is put forward is even more inadequate. I did not believe so previously, but I did a lot of thinking about it over the weekend and I now feel we are in too much of a hurry. I do not make accusations but it will appear to many people that we are not only anxious to say that they are not special citizens but that we want to step on them in some way and say that they cannot do what they did previously. I do not see any useful purpose in that.

I can understand why people have divergent views on an issue such as this. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, it was almost a toss of a coin with respect to which side I was going to come down on, whether in favour of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Matane or in favour of the original bill. But I have thought about the matter and I do not think I have come down on a side that is

going to create preferential citizenship. Quite the contrary, this will see to it that in the future preferential citizenship ends. That is what I suggest we do. I do not think it is an unreasonable proposition.

Mr. Nesbitt: Mr. Chairman, it had not been my intention to make any remarks during these proceedings, but having heard a great many of the observations made this morning I would like to say this is one of the few genuine debates I have heard this session, an extemporary debate of the type that is supposed to take place in the House of Commons. If nothing else we are perhaps finishing off the session on a good note.

Most of my remarks have been adequately expressed by the hon. member for Ontario and the hon. member for Hillsborough, and I do not wish to take up the time of the committee with repetition. But there are one or two other points which should be brought to the attention of some hon. members for their consideration.

Even since I became a member of the House of Commons I have always supported legislation designed to bring closer together the people of French-speaking origin and those of English speaking origin, and I will continue to do so. But as was pointed out by the right hon. member for Prince Albert, trying to bring about unity in Canada is not always just a one-way street. It is not always what you do that counts. It is what you may appear to be doing that can be even more important. Like Caesar's wife, you must not only be pure but must appear to be pure.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, a certain impression has been created which was alluded to by the right hon. member for Prince Albert. It exists in parts of Canada, presumably in western Canada, perhaps in the Atlantic provinces, and I can tell you that most certainly it exists in large areas of Ontario. It is that an effort is being made by the present government to do a certain thing. This may not be true, it may not be the intention; I hope it is not. I certainly would not attribute such motives to the hon. member for Saint-Denis for whose sincerity I have a great deal of respect. But it is not a question of what one is doing; it is the impression that is being created.

I get around quite a bit, and during the last four or five years I have heard from all age groups and all classes of society remarks to the effect that the present government and its immediate predecessor have been doing everything they can to remove traditions of an Anglo-Saxon nature. I am sorry to have to say this, but some of the members on the government side, and some members to my left do not appear to know it. There is a feeling in English-speaking Canada that there are attempts being made to destroy traditions of an Anglo-Saxon nature but none to destroy those of a French-Canadian character.

This is not a good thing for the unity of our country. I am not suggesting that this is what is being done or what is intended, but that is the appearance that is being created in English-speaking Canada. Make no mistake about that, Mr. Chairman, and I hope some of my friends from Quebec will not make a mistake about it in the future. I am sorry to have to say this, but as we are talking about national unity I must say we are not going to achieve it by proceeding to step on one of the major ethnic groups, one of the major cultural groups, in this country. This is keenly resented.

I have no apology to make for making these remarks. I have supported every measure that has been presented by successive governments to bring about greater unity in this country. But I would point out, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Cumberland-Colchester North, the right hon. member for Prince Albert and others, that you do not create national unity by giving the impression—I do not say it is the intention—of deliberately trying to remove some of the background and traditions of those who make up a very large segment of the country. You do not help things by doing that, and certainly that is the appearance that is given.

I would hope that those in authority will give very careful consideration to this. It is often the appearance of things that causes uneasiness and ill will. After all, the cabinet is certainly dominated by members from the province if Quebec. The right hon. Prime Minister, the Secretary of State, and the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, whether they deserve the accolade or not, are generally regarded as running the government, and when one sees one action after another, and this is just one more link in the chain, it does not do anything to achieve unity.

I would hope that hon. members on both sides of the House, but particularly on the government side, listened with great care to what has just been said by my very good friend, albeit he is a member of the government party, from Ontario. He expressed views which are very much in the minds of those of us from that part of the country.

• (12:40 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak on the amendment brought in by the hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané) in order to say that we support it because it is logical.

Various views are expressed in the House, especially by Anglo-Saxon members who are indulging in sentimentality and this is blameful.

In my opinion this amendment has but one purpose: to give justice to all Canadian citizens. In fact, I think that in reading today's *Hansard* the population will understand why we have so much difficulty in creating unity in Canada. I think that there lies the harm developed through the years by such discriminatory action.

Mr. Chairman, I love Canada and I think that the first intelligent move to be made by every citizen who earns a living in Canada and really loves his country should be to apply for Canadian citizenship. I was shocked to notice that some British subjects who have been living in Canada for 20 or 30 years and are even members of Parliament have not yet applied for Canadian citizenship, which is, in my opinion, scandalous. I am a Canadian citizen and I did apply for my citizenship card. As we are all Canadians, I should ask those who do not want to apply for Canadian citizenship to go back to the country they love so much because they lack logic and do not love Canada enough.

The amendment would allow only Canadians to vote. For example, in the United States, a certificate of American citizenship is required to vote.

The amendment now before us aims at restoring justice, which will lead to the unity everyone desires. The reason for the disagreement is the existence of discrimination.

A moment ago, a member said that if this amendment were adopted, it would give the impression that British subjects are superior to the others. It is true. It is not only an impression, it is true. They have always been considered superior to the others. Now, today, we want them to be treated as all the others so that we can all be "true Canadians".

I think this amendment will achieve that goal. Everybody wants it. The New Canadians want it. The previous speaker tried to put the blame partly on the province of Quebec by saying that especially the French Canadians want it. No, all honest and logical people, all New Canadians, wherever they come from want Canadian citizenship and want to live in Canada as Canadians.

Others have said—and they repeated the words of a great American—that one should not weaken the strong in order to strengthen the weak. Unfortunately, that does not apply here at all. It is not a matter of the strong or the weak, but one of justice and injustice. If we want Canada to be strong and united, justice must be achieved by allowing Canadians to vote in Canada. Then, the situation will improve, and there will be less disunity.

It is said that this will restrict the franchise. Of course. I was astonished to hear that thousands of British subjects living in Canada would no longer have the right to vote. Did those people really have the right to vote legally, seriously and logically? They were entitled to the franchise through a special favour. Now, finally, they are to have the right to vote as Canadian citizens. Their being Canadian citizens will in no way restrict the right to vote they request. For instance, they could vote tomorrow if they have lived in Canada for 40 years.

I do hope, from the bottom of my heart, that today hon. members understand the importance of this amendment. I ask all members, old or young, whether they are British subjects or from some other groups, in short all those who came to live in Canada to think it over thoroughly before voting on this amendment.

I can understand—I always did—that every time the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) hears something about becoming more Canadian, he is likely to have a heart attack. I believe those who moved the amendment before us made a great step toward progress.

Some members said a while ago that one must not judge by appearances. But since Confederation, we have failed to live our real life, as we were always concerned about appearances.

Surely we are serious enough to forget about our forefathers. It is too late to feel sorry for them but it is time now to make one's life here in Canada. We have to stop crying. We do not feel sorry for France. We have to stop yearning for Great Britain and live in Canada. That is all I ask from new Canadians who earn their living in Canada and who wish for, as we do, a greater Canada, but it must not be done under false pretenses because I cannot see how a British subject would want a greater Canada.

I am 100 per cent Canadian. I want a great Canada but a united Canada and we will succeed in this by passing the proposed amendment. As long as there are some who vote against such amendments, the unity of Canada will be impossible to achieve. We have come to the heart of the matter and listening to those who oppose this amendment—fortunately there are not very many—I was shocked about their approach to life in Canada.

[*English*]

Mr. Pringle: Mr. Speaker, as a member from British Columbia where we are very proud of our British tradition—

An hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Pringle: I can say that we are very thankful for the great pioneering struggles of the British people who came to our country and assisted in the development of that area.

We are also proud of the Spaniards, the San Juans who came up into the Strait of Juan de Fuca and helped by their efforts, and we are proud of the German Mennonite people who have taken up farming in our area and who have done such an excellent job. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I would be the last person to say that we are anti any nationality. I would hope that at this time we might all forget the emotionalism which has been raised in the House today. I would hope that we might think in terms of the Canadian fact. I want to be pro-Canadian. I do not believe we have to be anti anything in order to be pro-Canadian.

• (12:50 p.m.)

It has been suggested that if this amendment is passed we shall be taking away a right. Frankly, I do not believe that. I have talked with a good number of British people in my area, principally about the change in the passport regulations. Some have been confused and some felt that it should not be necessary for them to become Canadian citizens. But I have yet to find one who has said that we are doing the wrong thing by insisting that people in Canada become Canadians. If we pass this amendment, we shall be helping some people to become Canadian citizens.

We change laws every day. We change speed limits. Is that taking away rights? We change regulations and amend laws and statutes to take away, in effect, certain rights of Canadians every day of the week and, hopefully, add rights which affect Canadians every day of the week. If that were not so there would be little use in the House of Commons sitting here day after day debating the issues of the day.

This amendment has nothing to do with unity. We are talking about Canadians.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Pringle: Does anyone here suggest that when we talk about Canadians we are going to create disunity among those people who are not Canadians? We are simply inviting those who are not Canadians to be proud enough of this country not only to live with us but to take out Canadian citizenship and help to govern this country. The amendment has nothing to do with preferred citizens. There cannot be preferred citizens. I do not think we have any and I do not know who they are. If it is alleged that there are preferred citizens in this country, then it is high time we made changes; nor should those changes consist merely of repealing certain parts of the Elections Act that confer special privileges on some.

If you were to walk down a street today and ask people about their nationality, I wonder how many would say to you that they are English, Scottish, French, German, Italian, and so on, or would they say, "I am a Canadian"? How many wish to be known as Canadians? It took many years before it was possible for Canadians to have Canadian citizenship. Some suggest that we are not doing the correct thing in this bill to demand that all voters be Canadians.

One could say much more about this amendment, but I feel that I must associate myself with the remarks of the proposer of the amendment. I support the hon. member for Matane as well as the hon. member for Saint-Denis in this matter. I feel confident that the British people in my constituency will accept the fact that they are being invited as British subjects to go a step farther and apply for Canadian citizenship. I believe that we need some patriotism in this country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Pringle: I believe we lack patriotism. What is the matter with going about the country and saying, "We are Canadians; we want Canadians to be patriotic"? We are

inviting all people in this country regardless of nationality to apply for Canadian citizenship and by so doing to obtain the right to vote and to help govern this country. Such people can then say, "This may be the country of my adoption but I now have the right to vote and to help in the choosing of the government, and I am a Canadian citizen".

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Chairman, may I make one or two comments. May I assure the hon. member who has just sat down that, while I support his view, if he had taken five minutes to read the bill we are considering he would not have been led astray, as I submit he has been, about the contents of the bill, because it says what the hon. member has been expounding.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Forrestall: Has somebody else on the government side not bothered to read the bill?

Mr. Nowlan: That is right. That is not unusual.

Mr. Forrestall: If others had bothered to come to some of the committee hearings and to take five minutes in which to read the bill, instead of merely talking about their own points of view, they would understand what the provisions of Bill C-215 contain.

Before calling it one o'clock may I say that I think it is regrettable that certain ministers of the government have not taken this opportunity of coming forward and making known their views through a precise statement. I regret that the Minister without Portfolio for York-Scarborough, whose absence from the chamber I regret, has not bothered to come forward and spell out for members of the committee and for all Canadians what his own views with regard to citizenship are. Shortly after assuming the responsibilities entrusted to him he told us that he had very definite views about citizenship. May I call it one o'clock, Mr. Chairman.

Progress reported.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): At two o'clock the House will revert to routine proceedings pursuant to the special order made on Thursday, June 18, 1970. It being one o'clock I do now leave the Chair.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

DRUGS

CLARIFICATION OF STATEMENT BY MINISTER OF NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE

Hon. J. C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, in the House on Friday I stated that the government would consider moving the drug marijuana from the Narcotic Control Act to the Food and Drugs Act. Outside the House I stated that the government was committed to this course. I got carried away and went too far. The entire government, including myself, was in support of the statement that I gave in the House. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) was quite correct in reiterating that the position of the government which was that they would consider such a move. To the House, to the press to whom I made the comments and to the people, I regret this course of action on my part.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Second report of Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs in English and in French—Mr. Francis.

[*Editor's Note: For text of above report, see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

There are some difficulties with the simultaneous translation system. I think that the translators are not here yet.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: In view of the difficulty referred to by the hon. member, it might be as well if the House were to wait for a moment or two before proceeding.

[*Translation*]

Due to the difficulties to which the hon. member has just referred, it would perhaps be advisable if hon. members agreed to wait a few moments before carrying on with the proceedings.

Filing of Patents Applications

I have been advised that the problem has been settled and that we can now resume our debate.

[*English*]

TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

CONCURRENCE IN SECOND REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. H.-Pit Lessard (LaSalle) moved that the second report of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications presented to the House on Thursday, December 11, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

PATENTS

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGREEMENT TO PROVIDE PROTECTION BY FILING OF INTERNATIONAL APPLICATION

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I should like to inform the House that on June 19 Canada signed a Patent Co-operation Treaty at the conclusion of a diplomatic conference held in Washington, D.C., in which 77 countries participated. The purpose of the treaty is to simplify the filing of patent applications on the same invention in a number of different countries. Currently, when inventors and businessmen attempt to obtain protection on the results of their research, they must apply in all the countries where they want patent protection. Under the new treaty, an applicant would be able to file an international application in the patent office of his own country, and the applicant would indicate the countries in which he desired protection.

The treaty is subject to ratification, and it may be some time before enough countries have ratified to bring it into force. We hope it may provide savings to Canadian investors and businessmen and relieve some of the examining burden on the Canadian Patent Office.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Since no member of the Official Opposition received a copy of the statement just made by the minister, we shall not make any comment on it.

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): I think we in the New Democratic Party should say the same.

[Mr. Speaker.]

MANPOWER

TABLING OF REPORT ON ADULT TRAINING PROGRAM

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I should like to table copies in both official languages of the report on the training of adults participating in the manpower training program under the Occupational Training Act.

SOCIAL SECURITY

REQUEST FOR TABLING OF WHITE PAPER— REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask leave of the House to present a motion under Standing Order 43. The requirement under that Standing Order is that there must be pressing necessity. Now that we have the white paper on unemployment insurance, and now that we have the report of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs, it is my view that the picture in this general field should be made complete, and without further delay the House ought to have the government's proposed white paper on social policy.

I therefore ask the leave of the House, seconded by my hon. friend for Vancouver-Kingsway, to move:

That this House requests the government to table, before the end of this week, its white paper on social policy.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members have heard the motion suggested by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. Before it can be put to the House, unanimous consent is required. Is there such unanimous consent?

There is not. The motion cannot be put.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre De Bané (Matane): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member rising on motions?

Mr. De Bané: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a motion under Standing Order 26—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will get a chance to propose his motion later on. I will recognize him in due time.

• (2:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

JUDGES ACT

AMENDMENT TO REDUCE AGE OF RETIREMENT AND CONTINUE RETIRED JUDGES ON RESERVE LIST

Mr. Hyl Chappell (Peel South) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-225, respecting the retirement of judges.

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Chappell: Mr. Speaker, this bill would allow all federally appointed judges to retire at age 70, but they could continue as reserve judges until age 75. They would be able to help clean up the backlog of cases and thus make the courts more immediately available to all people.

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

MAJOR'S HILL PARK

DESIGNATION AS AREA FOR PEACEFUL PUBLIC DEMONSTRATIONS AND EXPRESSIONS OF OPINION

Mr. Ralph Stewart (Cochrane) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-226, to designate Major's Hill Park.

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Stewart (Cochrane): Mr. Speaker, it is obvious to anybody who has looked at the order paper that there are a number of bills standing in my name today. I should like to say that my explanation of this bill will also cover the following bill. If the House so wishes, I shall give an explanation of the other 37 bills after Your Honour has called them.

Mr. Speaker: Order. It seems to me that we are now dealing with a bill for the designation of Major's Hill Park. I wonder whether this has anything to do with the other 37 bills to which the hon. member makes reference.

Mr. Stewart (Cochrane): Mr. Speaker, only the first and second bills standing in my name are similar. This bill deals with designating Major's Hill Park as a place similar to Hyde Park in London where people can demonstrate and do the sort of thing that usually goes on in or near the House of Commons.

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

CRIMINAL CODE

AMENDMENT TO MAKE CREATION OF DISTURBANCE IN HOUSE OF COMMONS AN OFFENCE

Mr. Ralph Stewart (Cochrane) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-227, to amend the Criminal Code.

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Stewart (Cochrane): Mr. Speaker, this bill recognizes the need for the inclusion in the Criminal Code of a provision that will make the disturbing of the dignity and decorum of parliament an offence punishable under the Criminal Code.

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

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I wonder whether the House would agree to making a special order with regard to the remaining 37 bills which, in effect, would allow all these bills to be moved in one motion. I understand that the principle involved in all is identical, and the hon. member could make his explanation on the one motion.

Mr. Speaker: The Chair was disposed to suggest this but has been pre-empted by the President of the Privy Council. Is it the wish of the House that we proceed in the manner suggested by the President of the Privy Council?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

FIRST READINGS AND ORDERS TO BE PRINTED

On the Order: Introduction of Bills.

June 19, 1970—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane)—Bill intituled: An Act to amend the Air Canada Act.

Mr. Ralph Stewart (Cochrane): The purpose of these 37 bills, Mr. Speaker, is to underline in a singular way the need for representatives of the people, the Members of Parliament, to be appointed to the boards of Crown corporations and agencies, thereby making our authority more commensurate with the responsibility given us by the electorate.

All these bills are identical in that they ask for a Member of Parliament to be included on the board of directors of each of these organizations with the exception of two, those

which deal with the CBC and the CNR, in respect of which we specifically ask for two Members of Parliament, one from the opposition and one from the government.

Bill No. C-228, to amend the Air Canada Act, Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill No. C-229, to amend the Atomic Energy Control Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill No. C-230, to amend the Bank of Canada Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill No. C-231, to amend the Broadcasting Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill No. C-232, to amend the Canada Council Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill No. C-233, to amend the Canadian Commercial Corporations Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill No. C-234, to amend the Canadian Dairy Commission Act (Consultative Committee)—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill No. C-235, to amend the Canadian Film Development Corporation Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill No. C-236, to amend the Canadian National Railways Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill No. C-237, to amend the Canadian Overseas Telecommunications Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill No. C-238, to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act (Advisory Committee)—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill No. C-239, to amend the Cape Breton Development Corporation Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill No. C-240, to amend the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill No. C-241, to amend the Company of Young Canadians Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill No. C-242, to amend the Economic Council of Canada Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill No. C-243, to amend the Export Development Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill No. C-244, to amend the Farm Credit Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill No. C-245, to amend the Fisheries Prices Support Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill No. C-246, to amend the Fisheries Research Board Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill No. C-247, to amend the Freshwater Fish Marketing Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

[Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).]

Bill No. C-248, to amend the Government Organization Act, 1969 (Medical Research Council)—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill No. C-249, to amend the Government Organization Act, 1969 (Royal Canadian Mint)—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill No. C-250, to amend the Livestock Feed Assistance Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill No. C-251, to amend the Municipal Development and Loan Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill No. C-252, to amend the National Arts Centre Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill No. C-253, to amend the National Capital Act (National Capital Commission)—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill No. C-254, to amend the National Defence Act (Defence Research Board)—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill No. C-255, to amend the National Film Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill No. C-256, to amend the National Library Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill No. C-257, to amend the National Museums Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill No. C-258, to amend the National Research Council Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill No. C-259, to amend the Northern Canada Power Commission Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill No. C-260, to amend the Official Languages Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill No. C-261, to amend the Saltfish Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill No. C-262, to amend the Science Council of Canada Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill No. C-263, to amend the Surplus Crown Assets Act (Crown Assets Disposal Corporation)—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill No. C-264, to amend the Telesat Canada Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

INQUIRIES ACT

MEASURE TO PROVIDE FOR THE TABLING AND DEBATE OF REPORTS

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-265, to amend the Inquiries Act (Publication of Reports).

An hon. Member: Explain.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, at the earnest request of my colleagues I will explain this bill. It is a recognition of the fact that the

reports resulting from inquiries commissioned under the Inquiries Act do in fact belong to the people of Canada, and not to the Government of Canada, and provides that the commissioners shall, within 15 days after completion of a report, table the same and that members of Parliament under a certain procedure may call for the production and debate of that report. There is a proviso, however, that there will be an exception if the report contains matters relating to security, and if it is so stated by the commission, that shall be accepted.

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

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

NAVAL AND ARCTIC OPERATIONS TASK FORCE

Question No. 131—**Mr. Skoberg:**

1. Who are the members of the federal task force presently considering a plan to unify the civilian and military naval and air operations in Canada's Arctic?

2. What are the specific terms of reference of the above task force, and when is it anticipated that its report wil be completed?

3. Will the report be made public?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1, 2 and 3. No, there is no federal task force presently considering a plan to unify the civilian and military naval and air operations in Canada's Arctic.

ARCTIC TRANSPORTATION TASK FORCE

Question No. 133—**Mr. Skoberg:**

1. Has an Arctic transportation task force been established within the Department of Transport and, if so, who are the members of this task force and what are their specific terms of reference?

2. When is it anticipated that the report of the task force wil be completed?

3. Will the report be made public?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. There is no departmental task force studying Arctic Transportation at the present time. However, there are several working groups studying various aspects of transportation, e.g. airfields, air navigation aids, marine navigation aids.

2. The working groups will have continuing responsibilities for the next year and they will report periodically.

3. Their reports will not be made public.

CORRESPONDENCE FROM A. G. HEAKES

Question No. 313—**Mr. Rondeau:**

1. Has the Prime Minister received letters dated October 16 from Mr. A. G. Heakes and did they contain enclosures of a letter to the Hon. John Robarts?

2. Did the said letters also contain letters dated July 11 to the Honourable A. A. Wishart, Attorney General addressed jointly to the assistant to the Ontario Public Prosecutor?

3. Has the Prime Minister received a copy of a letter from A. G. Heakes to the Hon. John Robarts dated October 17 and did the said letter contain an enclosure?

4. Was Mr. Heakes' letter dated October 16 acknowledged and, if not, for what reason?

5. If it has been acknowledged, was it answered in detail and, if not, for what reason?

6. Did the said letter dated October 16 from Mr. Heakes comprise a complaint and, if so, what was the nature of this complaint?

7. Has a letter dated June 4 from Mr. Heakes to the Solicitor General been answered and, if so, was it answered in detail?

8. Did the Prime Minister or his secretary acknowledge a file of documents in a letter from Mr. Heakes dated June 30?

9. What were the documents which Mr. Heakes enclosed?

10. (a) Did the secretaries to Mr. Trudeau write to Mr. Heakes at any time (b) did Mr. Heakes protest their letters (c) were their letters cited in the letter dated October 16 to Mr. Robarts and its enclosed complaints?

11. (a) Did the Prime Minister receive a letter dated August 5 from Mr. Heakes (b) has it been acknowledged (c) what was the nature of the said letter dated August 5?

12. If the said letters from Mr. Heakes to the Prime Minister and the Solicitor General have not been answered in detail, what is the reason?

Mr. J. E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister): 1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. Yes.

4. No.

5. Not applicable.

6. Yes; complaint against the Hon. R. Basford and against Mr. William J. Morris—willful attempt to defeat the course of justice.

7. There is no record in the Department of the Solicitor General of a letter dated June 4, 1969, from Mr. Heakes.

8. Yes; acknowledged by the Correspondence Secretary.

Questions

9. Copy of telegram from Mr. A. G. Heakes to the hon. Ron Basford. Copy of letter from the Hon. Ron Basford to Mr. Heakes. Copy of correspondence from the Hon. John N. Turner to Mr. Heakes. Excerpt from *Hansard* of June 9, 1961 (Page 6092 and 6093). Copy of correspondence, and enclosure, from la Ligue des droits de l'homme to Mr. Heakes. Copy of correspondence from Bishop Howard, Rupertsland to Mr. Heakes. Copy of unsigned statement. Excerpt from *Hansard* of June 2, 1969 (page 9316). Excerpt from *Hansard* of April 20, 1966.

10. (a) Yes; (b) Yes; (c) Yes.

11. (a) Yes; (b) No; (c) Mr. Heakes again claimed he was the victim of attempts to obstruct the course of justice and of police harassment and mail tampering. He requested an immediate R.C.M.P. investigation into the charges.

12. The flow of correspondence from Mr. Heakes is constant, frequent (often daily and sometimes more than one a day) and is of a repetitious nature. This correspondence refers mainly to the problems experienced by Mr. Heakes as a result of a bankruptcy in which he was involved several years ago but contains as well allegations by him of conspiracy and libel, of mail tampering and of police harassment. It has been pointed out to Mr. Heakes that his problems are essentially within the jurisdiction of the provincial government. For these reasons much of the correspondence received has been unanswered as it would appear to serve no useful purpose to continue to do so.

PURCHASE OF CF-5'S

Question No. 910—**Mr. Skoberg:**

1. What is the catalogue purchase price of the F-5, manufactured by Northrop Aviation, California?

2. How many CF-5's did the Canadian Government purchase from Canadair?

3. What was the purchase price paid by the Canadian Government for each CF-5, manufactured by Canadair?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of Supply and Services): 1. We are informed that the 1970 cost of a standard F-5 airplane would be approximately $1,200,000 including federal sales tax.

2. One hundred and fifteen.

3. Under present contractual arrangements a final price cannot be established until all payments are made and accounts audited at the completion of the program. However, it is estimated that the "fly-away" cost per airplane will be about $1,143,000. This does not include development, reconfiguration and support costs; and is subject to adjustment up or down as indicated by government audit of the costs incurred.

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCY OPERATIONS

Question No. 1,016—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. How many programs, studies and/or projects does the Canadian International Development Agency have underway at the present time?

2. Where is each to be carried out?

3. What is the total cost of each?

4. What is Canada's contribution to each?

5. How many (a) Canadians (b) others, are involved in each?

6. How many (a) Crown corporations (b) Canadian companies (c) other companies or organizations, are involved?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. 2,848. The Canadian International Development Agency has approximately 2,848 programs, studies and projects underway at the present time. These projects include the provision of economic assistance; that is, capital works, such as hydroelectric power dams, technical schools, transmission lines and irrigation systems and program aid such as food, commodities, and equipment, as well as the provision of technical assistance; that is, the sending of teachers, professors and technical experts overseas to developing countries and the bringing into Canada of students for study and training from developing countries.

2. The projects are carried out in developing countries to which Canada extends bilateral aid. These countries are located in the following geographic regions: South and Southeast Asia; Commonwealth Africa; Francophone Africa; and the Commonwealth Caribbean. In adidtion, there are development loan projects being carried out in the Latin America through the Inter-American Development Bank which acts as administrator for the Government of Canada.

3. Canada pays the foreign exchange costs of capital works and all the costs of program aid except shipping costs which are normally paid by the developing countries. These countries undertake in the case of capital assistance to absorb certain local costs such as the costs of labour and material to the extent

that these are available. Insofar as technical assistance is concerned, the developing countries normally undertake to provide housing free of charge to teachers, professors and technical experts. The local costs are not known on a project by project basis and, as a consequence, no estimate of the total local costs of all projects is available. It is, however, possible to give the total cost of Canada's contribution and this will be found in Part 4 of this question.

4. From the economic assistance aspects, the answer to this question would require the listing of each pre-feasibility study, each feasibility study and each capital works project, whether paid from Grant Aid funds or from Loan funds. It would also entail listing the names of each teacher, professor and technical expert in the developing countries and of each trainee because each one of these constitutes a project. There are approximately 900 teachers and experts overseas and 1,700 trainees in Canada at the present time. This listing would consequently require the enunciation of literally thousands of projects. The total Canadian contributions to all projects in the 1969-70 fiscal year was $136,609,601 out of bilateral Grant Aid funds, and $71,117,308 out of Development Loan funds.

5. (a) This information is not complete because many Canadians are abroad in the development field as employees of Canadian Companies, firms, organizations or educational institutions with which this Agency has master contracts, and as a consequence the responsibility for the provision of personnel rests with the contractors. The number of Canadians who are overseas under direct contract to the Agency is approximately 1,000. These are, in the main, teachers, professors, and technical experts. (b) Not known.

6. (a) Approximately five Crown corporations involved. (b) Approximately 131. (c) Not known.

SALE OF AIRCRAFT ENGINES AND PARTS TO PORTUGAL

Question No. 1,049—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. Did Canadian companies sell aircraft engines and parts to Portugal in 1968 and, if so, which ones?

2. Did any of the equipment have a potential military use?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): 1. Yes, various types of piston engines and parts produced on a sole source basis in Canada by United Aircraft of Canada Limited were sold to Portugal.

2. The equipment is for use with propeller driven general utility transport aircraft designed for commercial use; any potential military use would be limited by the performance characteristics of this older type aircraft.

CANCER RESEARCH

Question No. 1,229—**Mr. Chappell:**

What is the total amount spent by the federal government for cancer research during the past five years and by whom was such research carried out?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): During the past five years, a total amount of $1,900,000 was spent by the Department of National Health and Welfare for cancer research; this was in the form of Health Grants to the National Cancer Institute, which supports research carried out in Canadian Universities and other institutions; to the Institut de Microbiologie et d'Hygiène in Montreal; to St. John's General Hospital in Newfoundland; and to the Saskatchewan Cancer Commission Clinics. The Medical Research Council spent $6,583,350 in grants-in-aid to support cancer research; this amount does not include the figures for the year 1969-70 which are not yet available. The research in all instances was carried out by scientists on the staff of Canadian Universities and affiliated institutions.

WOOD ISLANDS-CARIBOU FERRY SERVICE

Question No. 1,230—**Mr. MacLean:**

What amount is provided in the 1970-71 estimates for the purpose of expanding the capacity of the Wood Islands-Caribou ferry service?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Although no amount has been specifically provided, a search is being carried out for a suitable existing vessel.

LEGISLATION REQUIRING THAT PRICING OF ALL GOODS FOR SALE INCLUDE ALL COSTS

Question No. 1,326—**Mr. Robinson:**

Will the federal government consider the advisability of providing legislation requiring that the placing of all goods for sale shall include all costs in connection with same?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): No.

Questions

HEALTH AND WELFARE—MINISTER'S VISIT TO PRINCE RUPERT

Question No. 1,352—**Mr. Howard (Skeena):**

During the time that the Honourable John Munro, Minister of National Health and Welfare was in Prince Rupert, B.C. recently, what is the name of each group with whom he met, the duration of each such meeting, the topic or topics discussed, the commitments made and the conclusions, if any, which were reached?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): I find it difficult to answer the hon. member's question because I did not meet with any group which had a name, nor did I time my meetings with people. The topics discussed covered a wide range, mainly medical health facilities. There were no commitments made in the City of Prince Rupert, which served only as a base from which myself, my officials and the press party visited the Indian communities of Kincolith and Greenville on the Nass River and Masset on the Queen Charlotte Islands. Commitments and conclusions were made with the Indians in their communities and not in Prince Rupert.

DE HAVILLAND AIRCRAFT OF CANADA LIMITED—FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Question No. 1,386—**Mr. Saltsman:**

1. For each year 1958 to 1970, what have been the federal government financial grants and subsidies to the De Havilland Aircraft of Canada, Limited?

2. What financial assistance has been given to De Havilland from the Government of Canada regarding STOL aircraft?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Insofar as the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce is concerned: 1. Financial assistance was provided by the Department to The de Havilland Aircraft of Canada Ltd., as follows:

Fiscal Year	Defence Industry Productivity Program	Program for Advancement of Industrial Technology
	$	$
1958/59	—	—
1959/60	341,300	—
1960/61	604,788	—
1961/62	465,441	—
1962/63	303,906	—
1963/64	6,004,482	—
1964/65	3,455,033	—
1965/66	1,319,841	—
1966/67	383,721	20,287
1967/68	581,023	30,244
1968/69	1,699,119	—
1969/70	1,739,951	—
(To Jan. 31, 1970)		

[Mr. Basford.]

2. The Department provided $12,968,552 (included in 1 above) to assist The de Havilland Aircraft of Canada Ltd. to develop and produce STOL aircraft of the Buffalo and Twin Otter type and to conduct the early development phase of the DHC-7 STOL aircraft.

Insofar as the Department of National Defence is concerned: 1. Contributions under the Defence Industrial Research Program, which was not instituted until the 1961-62 fiscal year are made by Defence Research Board as follows:

1961-62	Nil
1962-63	$663,164
1963-64	$536,587
1964-65	$641,898
1965-66	$691,915
1966-67	$635,131
1967-68	$462,862
1968-69	$462,708
1969-70	$333.757
1970-71	$181,095

2. $1,656,958.

NEW BRUNSWICK DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION—ASSISTANCE FROM ATLANTIC DEVELOPMENT BOARD

Question No. 1,398—**Mr. Corbin:**

1. Has the New Brunswick Development Corporation ever requested financial assistance from the Atlantic Development Board?

2. For what projects or studies was this aid required and what was the nature of each project or study?

3. For each project or study, how much did ADB contribute and on what dates?

4. Was any request for assistance refused by ADB?

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): 1. Yes.

2. (a) Westmoreland Industrial Park (Dorchester Point, New Brunswick) to provide basic facilities (wa'er, sewage and road). (b) Champlain Industrial Park basic facili'ies. (c) Fish Port Study, Charlotte County, New Brunswick. Cost of a Study to explore the feasibility of developing a modern fish port complex. (d) Multiple Industry Study to design and promote an industrial complex of metalworking industries as an instrument for the acceleration of economic growth in the Province of New Brunswick. (e) Water supply for Herring reduction plant at Head Harbour on Campobello Island.

3. (a) Westmoreland Industrial Park $1,-471,296, January 1967 and November 1968.

(b) Fish Port Study, Charlotte County, $55,000, February 1970. (c) Multiple Industry Study, $173,000, September 1969 and December 1969.

4. No formal refusal was made on Champlain Industrial Park or the water supply at Head Harbour but agreements were not finalized.

DOMTAR LIMITED, DOLBEAU

Question No. 1,437—**Mr. Gauthier:**

Has Domtar Company operating at Dolbeau submitted an expansion project to the government with a view to creating employment and, if so, what amount has Domtar received for the years 1965-66-67-68 and 69 for research in the Dolbeau area?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Regional Economic Expansion and Industry, Trade and Commerce as follows: No. Section 13 of the Industrial Research and Development Incentives Act prohibits the divulgence of information concerning any corporation. No monies have been made available through the Program for the Advancement of Industrial Technology or the Defence Industry Productivity Program with respect to Dolbeau, a facility of Domtar Ltd.

C.N.R. SALARIES

Question No. 1,449—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. What were the total wage and salary payments made by the Canadian National to its Railway employees for each year since 1960?

2. What were the total wage and salary payments made by the CNR to its employees whose wages and salaries were determined by collective agreements for each year since 1960?

3. What were the total wage and salary payments made by the CNR to its employees whose wages and salaries were determined other than by collective agreement?

4. (a) What was the average number of employees of CNR for each year since 1960 (b) what was the average number of employees of CNR covered by collective agreements in each year since 1960?

5. (a) What were the average annual earnings of employees of CNR covered by collective agreements in each year since 1960 (b) what were the average annual earnings of employees of CNR not covered by collective agreements?

6. What were the actual amounts, included in direct payments to employees, for vacation pay, for general holidays, for sick leave and for personal leave and what proportion of total labour costs do these amounts represent?

7. What were the actual amounts paid by the Company each year since 1960 or since the inception of the Job Security Agreement into the Job Security Fund and what proportion did this amount represent of total labour costs?

8. What was the Company's contributions to benefit plans including pension plans, to health plans including provincial medicare plans, for each year since 1960, and what proportion do these amounts represent of total labour costs?

9. Assuming a definition of total labour costs to be all direct and indirect payments to employees including the Company's contributions to Workmen's Compensation, to Unemployment Insurance and to Canada Pension Plan, what proportion of total costs were represented by labour costs for each year since 1960?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The Management of Canadian National Railways advises as follows: In view of the current and prospective labour negotiations between the Railway and the various unions representing most of the schedule employees on Canadian lines, it is not considered in the best interests of the Company to disclose the information in the form requested. Most of the data such as average number of employees, service hours paid for, total compensation, average hours paid for, average salaries and wages per hour and per year may be obtained in a more general form from Part VI (Employment Statistics) of Railway Transport published annually by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

SUBSIDY PAID TO MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY 1960 TO 1969

Question No. 1,463—**Mr. Robinson:**

What was the total subsidy paid to the manufacturing industry during each year 1960 to 1969 inclusive?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): The only assistance program involving subsidies, as listed by parliamentary appropriation, to secondary industries is for shipbuilding which provides capital subsidies for the construction of commercial and fishing vessels in accordance with regulations of the Governor in Council. The subsidies provided for fiscal years 1960-1969 inclusive, are as follows: The following amounts were paid out by the Canadian Maritime Commission under the Ship Construction Assistance Regulations:

1960-61*	
1961-62	$ 2,025,261.36
1962-63	22,500,000.00
1963-64	40,000,000.00
1964-65	32,000,000.00
1965-66	40,512,684.16
1966-67	26,778,277.11
	$163,816,222.63

*As subsidies were not introduced until May of 1961, there are no figures for 1960/61.

Questions

The following amounts have been paid under the Ship Construction Subsidy Regulations:

1966-67	$ 9,042,867.90
1967-68	39,331,611.73
1968-69	22,333,022.43
1969-70	14,214,941.52
	$84,922,443.58

CORPORAL PUNISHMENT

Question No. 1,482—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

1. Since in answer to Question Number 1,080 it is indicated in 1969 no sentence of corporal punishment was awarded by an institutional board of discipline, does this mean that corporal punishment has been suspended for use in federal institutions and, if so, by whom was the action taken and for what period of time is it to be in effect?

2. Is a similar action to be taken with respect to court orders?

3. What plans has the government with respect to the abolition of corporal punishment?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of the Solicitor General and Justice as follows: 1. No.

2. As for 1.

3. The government position on corporal punishment will be made known when action is taken to amend the Criminal Code.

AUTHORITY TO GOLDEN EAGLE COMPANY TO PURCHASE RUSSIAN NAPHTHA

Question No. 1,487—**Mr. Dumont:**

Does the Golden Eagle Company have authority to purchase Russian naphtha rather than Canadian naphtha?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): The Canadian government does not restrict imports of naphtha other than for use as a component in the blending of motor gasoline destined for consumption in Ontario, west of the Ottawa Valley. The source of this material is, of course, up to the company to decide.

[*English*]

WITHDRAWAL OF CANADA FROM WORLD HOCKEY TOURNAMENT

Question No. 1,499—**Mr. Thompson (Red Deer):**

1. What amount was paid by the federal government to cover the loss resulting from the withdrawal of Canada from the World Hockey Tournament?

[Mr. Pepin.]

2. What are the details of this amount, including any salaries for officials and hockey players?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. No moneys have been paid to date.

2. At present consideration is being given to pay the out of pocket expenses incurred by: (a) Canadian Amateur Hockey Association, $71,922; (b) Canadian Arena Company, Montreal, $23,000; (c) Winnipeg Enterprises Corporation (This includes the re-payment to the province of Manitoba of $25,962.09 which was a grant made to the Winnipeg Enterprises Corporation.) The Hockey Canada Corporation has agreed to pay these expenses and it is proposed the Federal Government reimburse Hockey Canada, $78,305. No payments are being made for salaries for officials and hockey players resulting from the withdrawal of Canada from the World Championship.

REGULATIONS REGARDING HEATING OF FEDERAL BUILDINGS

Question No. 1,540—**Mr. Skoberg:**

1. Are here any regulations established by the Department of Supply and Services regarding coal and fuel oil for use in heating of federal government buildings and plants and, if so, what are these regulations?

2. Are there any regulations regarding the maximum percentage of sulfur content on coal and fuel oil purchases?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of Supply and Services): 1. Yes. Coal and fuel oil for heating of Federal Government buildings and plants are bought in accordance with Canadian Government Specifications Board Standards. (Canadian Government Specifications Standards 3GP-2(d) d/31 Dec. 68; 18GP-2(d) d/24 Apr 62; 18GP-4(a) d/2 Sept 66; 18GP-5(a) d/2 Sept 66; 18GP-7 d/9 May 69; 18GP-8 d/10 Feb 67 and 18GP-3 d/24 Apr 52.)

2. These standards point out that the maximum level permitted of the sulphur content of the fuels is related to the particular heating plant design and local conditions. The accepted tenders require guaranteed sulphur contents to meet the requirements of the plant design and its location.

REQUEST THAT FARMERS BE PAID 1968-69 INITIAL PRICE FOR GRAIN

Question No. 1,547—**Mr. Southam:**

Will the government give consideration to farmers' requests that they be paid the 1968-69 initial price for grain delivered on deferred delivery permits?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): No, under the terms of the Canadian Wheat Board Act, it is not possible to make two different initial payments for the same grade of grain in any one crop year.

PROMOTION OF SALE OF CANADIAN GRAIN

Question No. 1,548—**Mr. Southam:**

Is it the government's intention to establish an overseas network of market experts to promote the sale of Canadian grain as advocated by the Canada Grains Council?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio) and Hon. Jean Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): The feasibility of this proposal is under study by the Canada Grains Council which has not yet made its recommendations to government.

NATO—SALE OR PURCHASE OF MILITARY ARMS

Question No. 1,618—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

1. What arrangements exist with our NATO allies for the sale or purchase of military arms or equipment?

2. Since 1960, what military equipment has been sold to our NATO partners and to whom?

3. What was the purchase price and what has been the eventual use of this equipment?

4. Since 1960, what military arms or equipment have we purchased from our NATO allies?

5. What was the cost and what has been the eventual use of these arms and equipment?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): 1. The sale of military equipment is not specifically dealt with in the North Atlantic Treaty or any other multilateral agreement among members of the Alliance. The purchase or sale of arms is a matter of individual national policy. There are, however, various arrangements within the Alliance for co-operation in the research, development and production of military equipment in which there is a common interest.

2. Since 1960, Canada has sold military equipment to our NATO partners in the following categories: aircraft, aircraft engines and related spares, airframes and related assemblies and spares, other aircraft equipment and supplies, ammunition and electronics and communications equipment. Items of equipment in these categories were purchased by: Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, United States and Britain.

3. The total value of Canadian sales on a contract basis was $2,754 million, which includes purchases by the United States in the years 1960-1969, and by other NATO countries for the period 1962-1969. Comparable statistics on purchases by our European NATO partners for the years 1960 and 1961 are not available. It is understood that the equipment is for use in carrying out roles within NATO. However, specific applications are a matter of national decision.

4. The following major equipments have been purchased: Aircraft C 130, Falcon, Albatross, Helicopters CUH-1H, IN, CH 113, 112. Ships, "Oberon" class submarines. Vehicles, Armoured Personnel Vehicles including Command Post and Recovery. Ordnance, M109 Howitzer, Honest John Rocket System, ENTAC and S11 Guided Missiles, Automatic Naval Guns, M72 LAW Weapons, 105 MM Pack Howitzer. Electronics and Communications: Anti-submarine warfare data systems, S654 Radar System, Inertial Navigation Systems, Radio Sets, Weather Radar. In addition minor equipments and components were purchased in the following categories: Aircraft, missiles, ammunition, electronic and communication equipment, ships, tank-automotive, weapons.

5. The value of Canadian purchases of military equipment from our NATO allies since 1960 is recorded as $2,058 million. The equipment purchased abroad has been taken into the Department of National Defence inventory for use in the fulfilment of assigned military roles.

LOBBYISTS

Question No. 1,644—**Mr. Robinson:**

Is there a federal government requirement for organized pressure or interest groups or lobbyists to be registered and, if so, (a) how many are there in Canada (b) how many have made demands on (i) the legislative (ii) the executive (iii) the administrative sectors of government, in each year 1960 to 1970 inclusive and to what extent did each achieve its purpose?

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

CANCER RESEARCH

Question No. 1,655—**Mr. Rynard:**

1. During each of the past five fiscal years, what has been the amount of grants paid by the Government of Canada to the National Cancer Institute, the Canadian Cancer Society or other organizations for the purposes of cancer research?

2. Has there been a reduction in the amount of such grants for the next fiscal period and, if so, what is the amount of the grants for the next fiscal year and what are the reasons for such reduction?

Questions

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. Under the Health Grants program, based on projects submitted by the provinces and the institute, federal assistance provided to the National Cancer Institute in support of research carried out in Canadian Universities and other institutions in the last five years was as follows:

1965-66	$350,000
1966-67	$350,000
1967-68	$350,000
1968-69	$350,000
1969-70	$350,000

Federal assistance is not currently provided directly under the Health Grants, to either the Canadian Cancer Society or other organizations for the purpose of cancer research.

2. For the fiscal year 1970-71, an amount of $250,000 has been approved for the National Cancer Institute under the National Health Grant where support is normally directed to short-term projects of an operational nature and of not more than three years' duration. The National Health Grant is not intended to provide annually, large blocks of funds to voluntary organizations in support of continuing programs. The Medical Research Council, which has been provided with increasing amounts of funds in the past few years, is the principal source of federal assistance for scientific research in the medical field, including that of cancer. The policy of the Council is to make its awards directly to researchers.

Thus the reduction in assistance from the National Health Grant need not represent a reduction in the level of government funds available for cancer research, but rather reflects a reorientation as to the federal agency from which such assistance might be sought and of the procedure to be followed.

REQUIREMENT THAT CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS MAKE PUBLIC YEARLY STATEMENT

Question No. 1,680—**Mr. Robinson:**

Will the federal government consider the feasibility of requiring all "charitable organizations" to make public a yearly statement of policy and programme and to what extent it has been carried out?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): The Department of National Health and Welfare has no authority or requirement for "charitable organizations" to make a yearly public statement on policy and programme. However, the policies and activities of "charitable organizations" receiving financial support from the Department are carefully monitored and regularly assessed.

INCENTIVE GRANT TO MOHAWK SPORTS EQUIPMENT LIMITED

Question No. 1,698—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, under the Regional Incentives Act, authorized or provided an incentive grant to Mohawk Sports Equipment Limited, Toronto, Ontario, and if so, what is the amount of the grant?

2. Who are the directors and executive officers of Mohawk Sports Equipment Limited and what is the address of each?

3. To what extent is this company non-resident or foreign-owned or controlled?

4. What is the name and country of the known non-resident ownership in this company?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion and the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs as follows:

1. This information was contained in the monthly report, tabled in Parliament on the operation of the Regional Development Act.

2. Mohawk Sports Equipment Limited was incorporated under the laws of the province of Ontario on February 21, 1969. No information is available on the names and addresses of the directors and officers.

3. No information available.

4. No information available.

INCENTIVE GRANT TO HERMES ELECTRONICS LIMITED

Question No. 1,699—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, under the Regional Incentives Act, authorized or provided an incentive grant to Hermes Electronics Limited, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, and if so, what is the amount of the grant?

2. Who are the directors and executive of Hermes Electronics Limited and what is the address of each?

3. To what extent is this company non-resident or foreign-owned or controlled?

4. What is the name and country of the known non-resident ownership in this company?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Regional Economic Expansion and Consumer and Corporate Affairs as follows:

1. This information was contained in the monthly report, tabled in Parliament on the operation of the Regional Development Act.

2. Hermes Electronics Limited was incorporated under the laws of the province of Nova Scotia on March 9, 1970. No information is available on the names and addresses of the directors and officers.

3. No information available.

4. No information available.

TRADE WITH SOUTH AFRICA

Question No. 1,755—**Mr. Brewin:**

1. Does the Republic of South Africa get the benefit of the British Preferential Tariff, as provided by the Customs Tariff Act, R.S.C., 1952 c.60 s.3?

2. Does Canada get the benefit of any preferential tariff granted by the Republic of South Africa?

3. What is the volume of imports into Canada from the Republic of South Africa and the items affected thereby for the last years for which figures are available since 1963?

4. What is the volume of exports from Canada to the Republic of South Africa which receives the benefit of a preferential tariff granted by the Republic of South Africa and what is the nature of the items so affected?

5. (a) Has any action been taken by the Governor in Council to withdraw the benefit of the British Preferential Tariff from the Republic of South Africa or is such withdrawal contemplated by reason of the fact that the Republic of South Africa has ceased to be a country within the Commonwealth of Nations for many years (b) in the review of external policy now being undertaken by the Government of Canada, has consideration been given to the withdrawal of the British Preferential Tariff from the Republic of South Africa with a view to underlining the fact that the apartheid policies of the Republic of South Africa are abhorrent to the people of Canada and contrary to the numerous international declarations on human rights and against racial discrimination?

6. What votes have been cast by Canada in the United Nations Security Council or General Assembly in respect of any actions or declarations of the United Nations or any agency thereof in respect to the maintenance of apartheid or other forms of racial discrimination within the Republic of South Africa since April 26, 1965?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Industry, Trade and Commerce and External Affairs as follows:

1. The Republic of South Africa continues to receive the benefit of the British Preferential Tariff as provided by the Customs Tariff Act, R.S.C. 1952, c.60, s.3.

2. The Republic of South Africa grants preferential tariff entry to certain Canadian goods in accordance with the terms of the 1932 trade agreement between the two countries.

3. Statistics of all imports from the Republic of South Africa in the years 1963 to 1968 have been published by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics in the December issues of "Trade of Canada-Imports by Countries" Catalogue No. 65-006. These publications are obtainable from the Queen's Printer and are available for reference in all public libraries and the Parliamentary library. In 1969 the total value of imports was $45.9 million. All South Africa goods are subject to the rates of the British Preferential Tariff if shipped directly to Canada.

4. Statistics of all exports to the Republic of South Africa can be found in the "Trade of Canada-Exports by Countries" Catalogue No. 65-003. In 1969, the total value of Canadian exports to the Republic of South Africa was $78.5 million. It is estimated that approximately $10.2 million was eligible for preferential tariff treatment. Principal goods exported to South Africa at preferential value were:—lumber ($5.4 million); newsprint ($2.9 million); canned fish ($851 thousand); and mechanics and artisans' tools ($500 thousand).

5. (a) No. (b) The Secretary of State for External Affairs stated in reply to a similar question in the House on March 23 that all aspects of our trade with South Africa will be reviewed.

---

6. United Nations General Assembly Resolutions on Apartheid

				Vote		
				For	Against	Abstaining
2054	(XX)	1965	A	80	2	16 (Canada)
			B	95 (Canada)	1	1
2202	(XXI)	1966	A	84	2	13 (Canada)
			B	99 (Canada)	1	1
2307	(XXII)	1967		89	2	12 (Canada)
2396	(XXIII)	1968		85	2	14 (Canada)
2506	(XXIV)	1969	A	101(Canada)	2	6
			B	80	5	23 (Canada)

Questions

During Canada's term on the United Nations Security Council (1967-68) there were no resolutions on apartheid considered by the Council.

Note: Above designations of "A" and "B" constitute parts of the same resolution upon which separate votes were taken.

HEALTH AND WELFARE—APPOINTMENT OF EARL DAWSON

Question No. 1,784—**Mr. Coates:**

1 Has Earl Dawson been appointed to the staff of the Department of National Health and Welfare and, if so, what are (a) his duties (b) his salary?

2. What qualifications has Mr. Dawson for the position?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. A contract has been entered into with Mr. Dawson to act as the Western Regional Representative of the Fitness and Amateur Sport program. He will be used as liaison officer to deal with special sports and recreation problems in Western Canada. The contract provides for a salary of $1,333 per month.

2. Mr. Dawson has a broad knowledge of Canadian Sports Development and has a great deal of practical experience in sport and related activities. He is and has been President of the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association since October 1968 (acting) and since May, 1969, President in his own right. Prior to assuming the presidency he served for a number of years as one of the senior executive officers of the Association. He has also given many years of long service to the Manitoba Amateur Hockey Association. He has been involved in the bidding, promoting and organizing of a number of championships including the World Hockey Tournament that was to have taken place in Winnipeg last March. He has led Canadian delegations to International meetings abroad in connection with his duties and three times has been Canada's official representative to the International Ice Hockey Federation meetings. In Canada he has been the Chairman of the Amateur Hockey Negotiation Committee in dealings with the National Hockey League. He has served many other community interests, including the Kiwanis groups and has been an active worker in community projects.

INCENTIVE GRANT TO SPRINGER-PENGUIN INC.

Question No. 1,787—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, under the Regional Development Incentives Act, authorized or provided an incentive grant to Springer-Penguin Inc., Amherst, Nova Scotia, and, if so, what is the amount of the grant?

2. Who are the directors and executive officers of Springer-Penguin Inc. and what is the address of each?

3. To what extent is this company non-resident or foreign-owned or controlled?

4. What is the name and country of the known non-resident ownership in this company?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): 1. This information was contained in the monthly report, tabled in Parliament on the operation of the Regional Development Act.

2, 3, and 4. This information is not presently available as this corporation is not required to report under any Act of Parliament.

FEDERAL GRANT TO FRONTIER COLLEGE

Question No. 1,835—**Mr. Nystrom:**

1. Is it the intention of the government to provide Frontier College with an operating grant of $50,000 for their 1970 program?

2. Has the government made a decision as to the amount of financial assistance Frontier College might expect in future years?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Manpower and Immigration and the Dept. of Labour as follows: 1. No. The Department of Manpower & Immigration decided to double its grant to Frontier College from $5,000 in 1969-70 to $10,000 in 1970-71. The Department of Labour has provision it its 1970-71 Estimates for a grant of $5,000 to the College.

2. No. However, beginning with 1971-72, the Department of Manpower and Immigration will assume sole responsibility within the federal jurisdiction for federal grants to Frontier College. Some financial support of an indirect nature can also be given in the form of purchases, by the Department, of training and research services under the Adult Occupational Training Act. In this connection, the Department has had many discussions with the provinces and with Frontier College in an attempt to increase such purchases, which under the law require provincial concurrence. Purchases have been relatively small, mainly for the reason that provinces consider that they can supply the training required through provincially operated institutions.

EXTENSION OF EXISTING COPYRIGHT LAWS

Question No. 1,836—**Mr. Yewchuk:**

1. Does the federal government plan to extend existing copyright laws to allow provision for libraries to make limited use of photocopying techniques?

2. Has the federal government received any representations from publishing houses or libraries, regarding the use of photocopying and its implications, with respect to existing copyright laws?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): 1. Copyright is among the matters referred by the Federal Government to the Economic Council of Canada. The report is expected towards the end of this year and until it is received and considered, it is not the intention to introduce amendments to the present copyright legislation.

2. Yes, through the Interdepartmental Committee on Copyright.

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD—AIR FARES FOR NEWS REPRESENTATIVES ATTENDING PRESS CONFERENCE

Question No. 1,856—**Mr. Burton:**

What was the cost to the Canadian Wheat Board of the air fare for seven news representatives to attend a press conference on or about August 21, 1969, as referred to in Question Number 1,573?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): The costs to the Canadian Wheat Board for the air fare for the seven news representatives was $532.

DAIRY PRODUCTS IMPORTED FROM IRELAND AND HOLLAND

Question No. 1,857—**Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse):**

Since April 1, 1970, has Canada imported from Ireland and Holland powdered milk or some other form of dairy products with a minimum protein content of 25 per cent and, if so (a) in what amount (b) for what purpose have these imported products been used?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): In so far as the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce, the answer is: (a) The classes of the Import Commodity Classification relating to dairy products are not based on protein content, therefore, the import statistical data as compiled and published by the External Trade Division of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics are not sufficiently detailed to provide a reply to this question. However, in the month of April, 1970, imports from Ireland of "Milk, cream and by-products, powdered" (under D.B.S. commodity class 51-59) amounted to 575 cwt. with a value of $14,000. In this period there were no imports of this material from Holland. (b) Information on end use of these imported products is not provided by the importers.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ENTERPRISE EMPLOYEES

Question No. 1,866—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. In each of the past ten years, with respect to federal government enterprises, what were (a) the number of employees (b) the gross salary?

2. In each of the past ten years in Canada, what were (a) the number of workers (b) the total of their salaries?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): The Dominion Bureau of Statistics reports that:

1. (a) and (b) In each of the past ten years, with respect to federal government enterprises, the number of employees and gross salaries were as follows:

Year	No. of employees as at March 31	Gross Salaries $'000
1958	130,376	544,309
1959	140,043	590,403
1960	132,360	623,514
1961	131,012	642,409
1962	127,858	651,494
1963	128,137	667,959
1964	131,028	708,655
1965	131,242	749,736
1966	135,041	813,323
1967	130,111	1,081,603
1968	127,322	927,267

2. (a) In each of the past ten years in Canada the number of employed paid workers estimated in thousands, was as follows:

Year	Number
1959	4,735
1960	4,843
1961	4,911
1962	5,089
1963	5,241
1964	5,466
1965	5,760
1966	6,096
1967	6,305
1968	6,490
1969	6,720

(b) Not available.

Questions

[*English*]

FISHERIES RESEARCH BOARD—POSITION OF CARETAKER AT FATTY BASIN PROJECT

Question No. 1,869—**Mr. Barnett:**

1. Since January 1, 1970, was a tender called to fill the position of caretaker at the Fatty Basin project of the Fisheries Research Board on Useless Inlet and, if so, how many offers to fill this position were received?

2. Has the contract been awarded and, if so (a) to whom (b) over what period (c) what is the amount of remuneration *per annum*?

Mr. E. F. Whelan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): 1. Tender called to fill position of caretaker and 41 offers received.

2. Contract awarded. (a) Initial contract, Fred Fraser, Port Alberni, B.C.; Subsequent contract, C. Murphy, P.O. Box 1112, Ladysmith, B.C. (b) Period, (i) March 24 to April 10, 1970; (ii) April 21, 1970 to March 31, 1971. (c) (i) $3,000 per annum; (ii) $3,600 per annum.

*CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD—CLOSURE OF POOL ACCOUNTS 1968-69

Question No. 1,882—**Mr. Burton:**

On what date or dates were the Pool accounts for the 1968-69 crop year closed for (a) wheat (b) oats (c) barley, as managed by the Canadian Wheat Board?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): The answer to part (a) of the question is as follows. The 1968-69 Wheat Pool account has not yet been closed. The answer to part (b) of the question is March 13, 1970. The answer to part (c) of the question is February 13, 1970.

LOANS GRANTED TO QUEBEC STUDENTS

Question No. 1,887—**Mr. Gauthier:**

1. Is the interest on loans granted to Quebec students refunded by the federal government?

2. What is the agreement with the Province of Quebec?

3. Can a student from Quebec get a loan guaranteed by the federal government?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): 1. The Province of Quebec does not participate in the Canada Student Loans Plan but operates its own student aid program. Under the legislation for the Canada Student Loans program provision is made for the payment of an alternate payment to non-participating provinces. The amount of alternate payment is calculated by multiplying the aggregate of all amounts paid to the lenders during the loan year, (i.e., interest payments on student loans made to students from participating provinces, loss claims paid on loans and fees for collections by lenders after payment of a claim) by the quotient obtained by dividing the estimated number of persons 18 to 24 years of age in the non-participating province by the estimated number of persons in the same age group in the participating provinces. For the loan year ended June 30, 1969, the payment made to Quebec under this arrangement was $2,915,698.49.

2. The arrangements between the Federal Government and a non-participating province are those set out in the legislation as outlined in 1 above.

3. Under the legislation, participating provinces determine the persons to whom Certificates of Eligibility shall be issued and any loans made count against the allocation made to them under the legislation. Since the allocation to participating provinces is based upon the population aged 18-24 years, loans are normally made only to residents of the participating province concerned.

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE—DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT

Question No. 1,892—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Finance have data processing equipment (automatic) and, if so, for how long?

2. What was the initial cost of the equipment?

3. What yearly costs are anticipated for data processing in the Department?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): 1. Computer services have been utilized on a service contract basis since 1967.

2. N/A

3. Estimated $60,000 for fiscal year 1970-71.

*CLOSURE OF POST OFFICES

Question No. 1,900—**Mr. Diefenbaker:**

In how many instances have closures of post offices been made in constituencies represented by Members supporting (a) the Liberals (b) the Conservatives (c) the NDP (d) the Social Credit?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): The answer to the first question is during the period of 25 June, 1968 to May 31, 1970. (a) 522; (b) 601; (c) 92; (d) 81.

*CLOSURE OF POST OFFICES

Question No. 1,901—**Mr. Diefenbaker:**

1. By province, how many post offices have been closed by order and direction of the government?

2. In how many cases, by province, have revocations of such closure orders been made?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): The answer to part 1 of the question is since 25 June, 1968: Newfoundland, 58; P.E.I., 31; Nova Scotia, 121; New Brunswick, 101; Quebec, 248; Ontario, 336; Manitoba, 62; Saskatchewan, 175; Alberta, 117; British Columbia, 46; Yukon, 2; Northwest Territories, 2.

The answer to part 2 is: Newfoundland, 12; Nova Scotia, 1; New Brunswick, 1; Manitoba, 1; Saskatchewan, 3.

PERCENTAGE OF FEDERAL TAX COLLECTION SPENT BY GOVERNMENT

Question No. 1,904—**Mr. Robinson:**

What percentage of tax collected by the federal government has been spent by the federal government in each year 1940 to 1969 inclusive?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): In each fiscal year from 1940-41 to 1968-69 total federal expenditures, including Old Age Security and contributions to provinces and municipalities, exceeded 100 per cent of the total federal tax collections with the exception of two fiscal years, 1947-48 and 1948-49 where they amounted to 89.6 per cent and 89.3 per cent respectively. It should be noted that in addition to being financed by tax revenue, federal expenditures are financed by other revenue sources, such as investment income, borrowing and reductions in the government's cash balances. Monies collected by the federal government and paid out to provinces under the Tax Collection Agreements, operative since 1962-63, have not been included.

*INDIAN AFFAIRS—DISCUSSION OF AGE OF ELECTORS

Question No. 1,907—**Mr. Howard (Skeena):**

1. Since January 1, 1970, what is the name of each Indian Band with whom the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development has discussed the question of the age of electors as defined in the Indian Act and the date of each such conversation?

2 What has been the view expressed by each such Band with respect to this question?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): 1. I have no official discussions with particular Indian bands on this question. However, the regional director in British Columbia discussed it with the chief of the Kitkatla Band and with the chief of the Nanaimo Band during the latter part of April, and discussions also took place in P.E.I. prior to the last provincial elections with the chief of the reserve. The union of B.C. chiefs have been informed of the new provincial legislation and were told that possible changes are being considered by the department. In other provinces no discussions have taken place. However, I have asked my departmental officials to speak with the band leaders to receive an expression of their views.

2. The views expressed by the band leaders in B.C. and P.E.I. who have discussed this subject with the regional director and his superintendents reveal a desire to have the provincial age of 19 apply to band elections.

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD—BROKERAGE FEES RECEIVED BY CARGILL GRAIN LTD.

Question No. 1,910—**Mr. Rondeau:**

How much has Cargill Grain Ltd. of Winnipeg, authorized agent for the Canadian Wheat Board, received in brokerage fees following the negotiations leading to the sale of 500,000 metric tons (18.3 million bushels) of wheat to the United Arab Republic?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): The Canadian Wheat Board does not pay remuneration to its agents for negotiating Canadian grain sales.

[*English*]

PRICES AND INCOMES COMMISSION

Question No. 1,912—**Mr. Coates:**

1. On what date was the Prices and Incomes Commission established and what has been the cost to the federal government to date?

2. Who is the Chairman of the Commission and what is his annual salary and what has been to date the amount of his expenses?

3 Who produced the recent pamphlet mailed by the Commission to many Canadians, what was the cost of the pamphlet, how many were mailed, was postage paid for the mailing of the pamphlet and, if so, what was the cost of the postage and if postage was not paid, for what reason and are Commissions also given free postage privileges and, if so, by what authority?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): I have been informed by the Chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission as follows: 1. (a) June 19, 1969. (b) (i) Fiscal Year 1969-70, $555,600; (ii) Fiscal Year (April 1, 1970 to May 25, 1970, $137,907).

2. (a) John H. Young. (b) Mr. Young is paid a salary in the range of a D.M. 3 ($37,000-$40,000). (c) (i) Travel expenses from May 7, 1969 to May 25, 1970, $4,745.70; (ii) Removal expenses $2,040.41.

Questions

3. (a) The leaflet was prepared by the staff of the Prices and Incomes Commission and printed by the Canadian Government Printing Bureau. (b) The invoice for the printing has not yet been received, but it is estimated that the cost will be about $25,000. (c) As of May 25, 1970 approximately 3.5 million copies of the leaflet had been mailed. (d) No. (e) The Commission is a department for purposes of the Financial Administration Act under authority of P.C. 1969-1294 of June 25, 1969, and as such qualifies for franking privileges, in accordance with Section 17 of the Post Office Act.

DEPARTMENT OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT—DATA PROCESSING

Question No. 1,914—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development have data processing equipment (automatic) and, if so, for how long?

2. What was the initial cost of the equipment?

3. What yearly costs are anticipated for data processing in the department?

Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. Yes, since January, 1968.

2. Nil, the equipment is on a lease basis.

3. $152,500.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL REVENUE—DATA PROCESSING

Question No. 1,916—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of National Revenue have data processing equipment (automatic) and, if so, for how long?

2. What was the initial cost of the equipment?

3. What yearly costs are anticipated for data processing in the Department?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister of National Revenue): In so far as the Department of National Revenue, Taxation, is concerned:

1. Yes, since 1960.

2.	1960-65 $	1965-66 $	1966-67 $	1967-68 $	1968-69 $	1969-70 $
Equipment Purchased	Not Available	150,110	—	—	1,422,000	621,345
Equipment Rented	Not Available	399,008	482,464	899,853	1,229,013	877,206
		549,118	482,464	899,853	2,651,013	1,498,551

3. 1970-71 anticipated rental of equipment $744,460.

In so far as Customs and Excise is concerned.

1. Customs and Excise has no data processing equipment at the present time. Excise Tax has a contract with the I.B.M. service bureau for an automated information distribution service to licencees. The system has been in effect for two years and costs approximately ten thousand dollars per year.

2. N/A.

3. Anticipated yearly cost, based on program forecast, for a proposed data processing department is: 1970-71, $156,000.

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE—USE OF COMPUTER

Question No. 1,918—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Finance have the use of a computer in its operations and, if so, to what extent is it utilized?

2. Is the computer programmed 24 hours per day, and, if not, for what reason?

[Mr. Basford.]

3. What is the number of hours planned for utilization of the computer?

4. What has been the annual cost of computer services for each year 1960 to 1970 inclusive?

5. How many programmes are in preparation for the computer at the present time and how will each affect the efficiency of the Department?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): 1. The Department of Finance uses a computer services bureau on a payment for service basis.

2. The computer service facilities are accessible at varying times but never used 24 hours per day. The services are used when needed so that computer operations are only charged for when the services are being used.

3. Utilization is estimated only in cost terms and the planned use in 1970-71 is expected to be about $60,000.

4. 1960-61 to 1966-67, Nil; 1967-68, $35,236.54; 1968-69, $76,904.20; 1969-70, $45,855.65.

5. None.

LOANS GRANTED BY CANADA TO UNDERDEVELOPED COUNTRIES 1960-69 INCLUSIVE

Question No. 1,919—**Mr. Matte:**

What are the amounts of interest free loans that Canada granted to underdeveloped countries in 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968 and 1969 and what was the amount to each country?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Interest free loans have been granted by Canada only from 1966 on. The amounts of these loans by country and year are as follows:

Calendar Year	Country	Amount (000's)
1966	India	$ 7,000
	Tanzania	450
	Guyana	1,800
1967	India	60,350
	Nigeria	1,150
	Tanzania	2,000
	Pakistan	21,000
	Ceylon	500
	Thailand	1,000
	Barbados	250
1968	India	51,140
	Nigeria	6,000
	Pakistan	2,000
	Ceylon	2,000
	Guyana	1,800
	Tunisia	2,600
	*Colombia	1,080
1969	India	67,000
	Tanzania	1,000
	Pakistan	34,500
	Ceylon	4,000
	Guyana	1,700
	Algeria	500
	Ghana	7,580
	Kenya	500
	Uganda	1,000
	Togo	2,800
	*Colombia	16,740

*These two loans to Colombia are interest free, but carry a ½% commission charge payable to the Inter-American Development Bank.

[*English*]

PRICES AND INCOME COMMISSION PUBLICATION "FIGHT INFLATION—SAVE JOBS!"

Question No. 1,921—**Mr. Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand):**

1. With respect to the recent mailing piece entitled "Fight Inflation—Save Jobs!" prepared by the Prices and Incomes Commission, what was the total number of letters on the topic sent out?

Questions

2. Who did the printing?

3. What was the cost of printing?

4. What was the total cost (hidden and other) of mailing?

5. To whom were they mailed?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): I have been informed by the Chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission as follows: 1. As of May 25, 1970 approximately 3.5 million copies of the leaflet had been mailed out. It is estimated that the total mailing would approximate 5.5. million copies.

2. Canadian Government Printing Bureau.

3. The invoice for the printing has not yet been received but it is estimated that the cost will be about $25,000.

4. The Commission is a department for purposes of the Financial Administration Act under authority of P.C. 1969-1294 of June 25, 1969, and as such qualifies for franking privileges, in accordance with Section 17 of the Post Office Act.

5. Generally, the mailing was directed to households and business establishments.

CANADIAN INVESTMENT IN MALAYSIA

Question No. 1,924—**Mr. Gauthier:**

Does Canada intend to invest $50 million in Malaysia and, if so (a) will this be a new initiative by the Bank of Canada (b) will it be taken from the Consolidated Fund, and (i) at what rate (ii) for how many years?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): The government of Canada has offered the government of Malaysia a development loan of up to $50 million which would be used to purchase in Canada goods and services required for the Temengor hydroelectric project. The project consists of a 260 megawatt dam on the Perak River in northwest Malaysia. The loan would bear a 3% rate of interest per annum and would include a 7 year grace period with repayment to be spread over a period of 30 years. This is not an initiative of the Bank of Canada as the loan would be taken from the normal Canadian International Development Agency loan fund i.e. vote L25.

[*English*]

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS—RETENTION OF PUBLIC RELATIONS FIRM

Question No. 1,926—**Mr. Sulatycky:**

1. Has the Department of Public Works retained or employed from time-to-time, from outside

its own permanent employees, any public relations firm or person, or any advertising firm or person for any purpose in the past five years and, if so, for what purpose?

2. What are the names of such firms or persons so employed in the past two years?

3. What was the total expenditure made for the services of such persons or firms in each of the past five years?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): 1. No.

2 and 3. Not applicable.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—RETENTION OF PUBLIC RELATIONS FIRMS

Question No. 1,927—**Mr. Sulatycky:**

1. Has the Department of Agriculture retained or employed from time-to-time, from outside its own permanent employees, any public relations firm or person, or any advertising firm or person for any purpose in the past five years and, if so, for what purpose?

2. What are the names of such firms or persons so employed in the past two years?

3. What was the total expenditure made for the service of such persons or firms in each of the past five years?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): 1. The Department of Agriculture has contracted advertising agencies to carry out campaigns in each of the past five fiscal years. Campaigns were (a) 1965-66 to 1969-70—information on dairy policy. (b) 1967-68—information on programs and services. (crop insurance, farm credit, livestock improvement, animal health, meat inspection and in Western Canada only, Prairie Farm Rehabilitation and Prairie Farm Assistance Administrations, and the Board of Grain Commissioners). (c) 1967-68 to 1969-70—Career opportunities in agriculture placed in a special annual edition of a national publication. (d) 1968-69—information on grading and inspection of Canada agriculture products. (e) 1968-69 and 1969-70—to encourage save and effective use of pesticides.

2. Tandy Advertising Company Limited, Toronto.

3. (a) 1965-66, $20,609; (b) 1966-67, $69,380; (c) 1967-68, $129,717; (d) 1968-69, $184,539; (e) 1969-70, $72,215.

DEPARTMENT OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT—USE OF COMPUTER

Question No. 1,935—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development have the use of a computer in its operations and, if so, to what extent is it utilized?

[Mr. Sulatycky.]

2. Is the computer programmed 24 hours per day and, if not, for what reason?

3. What is the number of hours planned for utilization of the computer?

4. What has been the annual cost of computer services for each year 1960 to 1970 inclusive?

5. How many programs are in preparation for the computer at the present time and how will each affect the efficiency of the Department?

Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. Yes the Department utilizes computer facilities provided by computer service bureaus on a rental basis, as required.

2. The computers used by the Department as managed by the cumputer services bureaus and hence their total usage is not known to the Department.

3. It is planned to utilize the equivalent of approximately 100 hours of large scale computer time in the current year.

4.

Fiscal Year	Cost
1960-1966	Records were not maintained
1966-1967	$ 12,553.82
1967-1968	80,189.10
1968-1969	97,314.92
1969-1970	129,846.60

5. Some 70 programs are in preparation for computer processing. These programs are intended to increase the efficiency of the Department by decreasing manual effort, or providing information previously not available or conducting research as necessary.

TREASURY BOARD—DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT

Question No. 1,936—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Treasury Board Department have data processing equipment (automatic) and, if so, for how long?

2. What was the initial cost of the equipment?

3. What yearly costs are anticipated for data processing in the Department?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): 1. Computer services have been utilized on a service contract basis since 1967.

2. N/A.

3. Estimated $150,000 for 1970-71.

REQUESTS FOR ASSISTANCE BY THE CANADIAN COMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRY

Question No. 1,944—**Mr. Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley):**

1. Has the government had requests from the Canadian Communications Industry for assistance

in development costs and, if so, in what fields or areas of interest were the requests made (a) computers (b) communications networks (c) data processing (d) telecommunications, etc.?

2. If development aid is given, will it be restricted to specific Canadian companies or administered by universities?

3 In what fields or areas of interest in communications has development aid been given?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): 1. Yes. The Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce continuously receives requests from Canadian Communication equipment manufacturing firms for financial assistance under its development assistance programs PAIT (Program for the Advancement of Industrial Technology) and DIP (Defence Industry Productivity Program). Requests are made in very many technological fields and typical of those under consideration at this time, are: (a) Computer Systems—computer terminals, video display systems, manufacturing process control and TV tape editing. (b) Communications networks—radio relay equipment, mobile radio equipment, broadcasting equipment and space satellite equipment. (c) Data processing—data logging equipment, telemetry and alarm activating systems and character recognition equipment. (d) Telecommunications—teletypewriter equipment, paging receivers, broadband switching equipment and multiplex equipment.

2. Development aid under PAIT and DIP is given to specific Canadian manufacturing companies.

3. Development aid has been given in the past in almost all the technological areas outlined in part 1 and, in addition, for the development of: television monitoring equipment, information display equipment, earth terminals for satellite communications, digital to video conversion equipment, character display systems and telemetering systems.

PORTNEUF, QUEBEC—WHARF

Question No. 1,946—**Mr. Godin:**

1. What is the water depth at low tide at the end of the Portneuf wharf?

2. When was the wharf built?

3. Who was the contractor and what was the cost?

4. To date, has the maintenance of the wharf involved major repairs and, if so, what was the total amount spent to date for such repairs?

5. Is there a guard service for this wharf and, if so, what has been the annual cost of this service for the past five years?

6. Must users of this wharf hold a docking permit and, if so, on what terms is such permit granted?

7. What has been the total operating costs of this wharf for the past five years?

8. What have been the revenues for the same period?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Public Works and the Department of Transport as follows:

1. 33 feet.

2. During the years 1956 and 1957.

3. The contractor was Gulf Maritime Construction Ltd. The total cost of construction, including surveys, inspection and inspector services, was $1,171,800.

4. In 1962-63 the cost of wharf improvements, including professional services, was $342,400. To date approximately $45,000. was spent for maintenance repairs, including surveys, inspections and inspector services.

5. Yes, wharfinger, part-time, paid from annual wharf revenues collected as follows: 1965-66, $333.25; 1966-67, $221.22; 1967-68, $464.60; 1968-69, $260.46; 1969-70, $46.43.

6. No.

7. $1,325.96 (wharfinger commissions).

8. Gross, $1,507.75; net, $181.79.

TREASURY BOARD—USE OF COMPUTER

Question No. 1,948—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Treasury Board Department have the use of a computer in its operations and, if so, to what extent is it utilized?

2. Is the computer programmed 24 hours per day and, if not, for what reason?

3. What is the number of hours planned for utilization of the computer?

4. What has been the annual cost of computer services for each year 1960 to 1970 inclusive?

5. How many programmes are in preparation for the computer at the present time and how will each affect the efficiency of the Department?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): 1. Treasury Board has contracts for the use through terminals of two computer service facilities. Since these computers allow concurrent use by several users at the same time, extent of use is not directly measurable except in cost terms.

2. The computer service facilities are accessible at varying times but never used 24 hours per day. The services are used when needed so that computer operations are only charged for when the services are being used.

3. Utilization, as stated in (1) above, is measurable only in cost terms and the planned use in 1970-71 is expected to be about $150,000.

4. 1960-61 to 1966-67, Nil; 1967-68, $20,-332.26; 1968-69, 17,289.71; 1969-70, 48,333.96.

5. A set of about 25 programs is being prepared to process historical expenditure data and forecast expenditure data which will permit a more thorough analysis of the full implications of recommendations for resource allocation.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT—DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT

Question No. 1,952—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Transport have data processing equipment (automatic) and, if so, for how long?

2. What was the initial cost of the equipment?

3. What yearly costs are anticipated for data processing in the department?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. and 2. Yes the Ministry of Transport has computer equipment as per the following schedule showing installation date and initial cost:

Location		Installation Date	Cost
Ottawa Headquarters	IBM 360/50	1969	$312,000 per annum rental
Air Traffic Control	IBM 1800	1966	$ 54,000 per annum rental $ 65,000 initial purchase
Telecommunications	SEL 810B	1969	$140,000 initial purchase
Telecommunications	PDP9	1968	$ 5,000 initial purchase
Met Central Analysis	IBM 360/65	1967	$348,000 per annum rental
Marine Traffic Control	Honeywell 516	1969	$170,000 initial purchase
Met Climatology	IBM 360/30	1967	$132,000 per annum rental
St. Lawrence Seaway	Burroughs 2500	1968	$108,000 per annum rental
Air Traffic Control (strip recorders)	3 IBM 1800's	1970	$102,000 per annum rental
Met Research & Train.	Univac 9200	1969	$ 90,000 per annum rental
Met Instruments	PDP15	1970	$ 45,000 initial purchase
Met Mill Village	SDS 910	1965	$ 25,000 initial purchase

---

3. The 1970/71 data processing costs anticipated are $3,100,000.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS—DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT

Question No. 1,960—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Communications have data processing equipment (automatic) and, if so, for how long?

2. What was the initial cost of the equipment?

3. What yearly costs are anticipated for data processing in the Department?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): 1. Yes. The Department of Communications was formed April 1, 1969 and has obtained some data processing equipment since that date. One of the organizations comprising the new Department of Communications was the Communications Research Centre at Shirley Bay, formerly of the Defence Research Board. The Communications Research Centre has had data processing equipment since 1963.

[Mr. Drury.]

2. Under the Defence Research Board, data processing and auxiliary equipment was purchased for the Communications Research Centre to the amount of $1,057,500 from 1963 to 1969 and by 1968 rentals reached an amount of $217,000 annually. Since the formation of the Department of Communications in 1969, data processing and auxiliary equipment has been purchased to an amount of $122,900 and annual rental of equipment has increased to $300,000.

3. In the fiscal year 1970-71, data processing costs for purchase and rental of equipment and auxiliary items for the Department of Communications is expected to be $477,000.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT—USE OF COMPUTERS

Question No. 1,965—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Transport have the use of a computer in its operations and, if so, to what extent is it utilized?

2. Is the computer programmed 24 hours per day and, if not, for what reason?

3. What is the number of hours planned for utilization of the computer?

4. What has been the annual cost of computer services for each year 1960 to 1970 inclusive?

5. How many programmes are in preparation for the computer at the present time and how will each affect the efficiency of the Department?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. The Ministry of Transport has the use of twelve computers in its operations. The average utilization is 77.5 per cent.

2. Those computers working in a real time environment (i.e. Air and Marine Traffic Control) are programmed 24 hours per day. Those in a research and/or business environment are in various stages of utilization. Increasing development work will add to the present load and move these installations toward 24 hour per day utilization.

3. The Ministry plans to fully utilize 100 per cent of available computer hours.

4. Annual costs for computer services to the Ministry for the years 1960-1970 follows: Prior to 1960-1962, No computing equipment installed; 1962-1963, $850,000; 1963-1964, $910,000; 1964-1965, $1,165,000; 1965-1966, $1,438,000; 1966-1967, $1,700,000; 1967-1968, $1,951,300; 1968-1969, $2,730,800; 1969-1970, $2,932,000; 1970-1971, $3,100,000.

5. The Ministry of Transport, in addition to the normal data processing requirements, has need of computers in the control of its day to day operations. Their use in the area of Air and Marine Traffic Control and in the simulation and forecasting of weather by the Meteorological Branch produces data and a response without which these operational branches would be unable to effectively perform their ongoing objectives. Currently, the computer effort of the Ministry of Transport is being directed to some 43 overall programs. In each area the computer support in intended to assist the performance of each individual Ministry of Transport branch in the attainment of its program objectives by providing quicker response and improved information flow such that both policy and operational management can react in a timely fashion.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS—DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT

Question No. 1,967—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Public Works have data processing equipment (automatic) and, if so, for how long?

2. What was the initial cost of the equipment?

3. What yearly costs are anticipated for data processing in the Department?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): 1. No.

2. Not applicable.

3. $215,000.

APPOINTMENT OF JUDGE HARRY WILLIAMS

Question No. 1,968—**Mr. Godin:**

1. What is the annual salary of the Hon. Judge Harry Williams?

2. When was he appointed to the bench?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): 1. and 2. There is no federally appointed judge known by the name of Hon. Judge Harry Williams.

NATIONAL PARKS—COIN OPERATED PERMIT DISPENSING MACHINES

Question No. 1,971—**Mr. Mazankowski:**

1. How many coin-operated permit dispensing machines have been placed in Canada's National Parks?

2. Where are these machines located?

3. What was the initial cost per unit?

4. What was the total purchase price of the machines?

5. Is it the intention of the government to put these machines into permanent use and, if not, for what reason?

6. When will a decision be made concerning the permanent use of the permit dispensing machines?

7. Who is the supplier and the manufacturer of the machines?

Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. Five.

2. Five campgrounds in Jasper National Park.

3. $900.

4. $4,500.

5. These machines have been installed on a trial basis. If proven satisfactory, they will become permanently installations.

6. Possibly in the fall of 1970.

7. The supplier is: Kodiak Parking Services Ltd., Winnipeg, Manitoba. The manufacturer is: Park-Ur-Self System, Inc., San Francisco, California, U.S.A.

CANADIAN NAVAL RESERVE—NEW UNIFORMS

Question No. 1,977—**Mr. MacLean:**

1. Are Canadian Naval Reserve unit personnel being issued with the new Canadian Forces uniform?

Questions

2. If the answer to Part (1) is negative, are Canadian Naval Reserve personnel being asked if they wish to purchase Canadian Forces uniforms and, if so (a) on what basis (b) what percentage of total strength expressed a desire to purchase new uniforms?

Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): 1. No, as indicated in *Hansard* of October 22, 1969, page 11689, the issue of the new uniform to Reserve personnel will not commence until after completion of the Regular Force issue program.

2. No, however all officers and men of the Reserve Forces are authorized to wear the new Canadian Forces' uniform under current regulations. Those wishing to outfit themselves ahead of the issue program may do so but will not be reimbursed. None have been canvassed to express an opinion in regard to the purchase of new uniforms.

ALBERTA—ASSISTANCE TO INDIAN PEOPLE IN STAGING CENTENNIAL CELEBRATIONS

Question No. 1,991—**Mr. Sulatycky:**

Is the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development contemplating a program of assistance to the Indian people of Southern Alberta in staging centennial celebrations marking the signing of Treaty No. 7?

Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): The Department has received a request for funds to enable a Committee of Indian people to hire Communication Workers whose purpose would be to organize Centennial Celebrations marking the signing of Treaty No. 7. The Chairman has been informed that the Department is not in a position to provide the funds they have requested for that specific purpose. The Department has however, provided Cultural Grants this year to three of the five Bands concerned. The total value of these Grants is $18,661 and they are for the purpose of promoting, for example, the annual "Indian Days" celebrations; the development of Indian dancing and language and providing native dress. In conversation with officials of the Department, members of the Committee have agreed to discuss their plans with Regional and District Officers to see how Departmental projects and expenditures planned for the next few years might be administered so that they would fit into their plans.

[Mr. MacLean.]

DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION—DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT

Question No. 1,992—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Regional Economic Expansion have data processing equipment (automatic) and, if so, for how long?

2. What was the initial cost of the equipment?

3. What yearly costs are anticipated for data processing in the Department?

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): 1. Yes, three years.

2. $405,000.

3. $750,000.

DEPARTMENT OF SOLICITOR GENERAL—USE OF COMPUTER

Question No. 1,997—**Mr. Robinson:**

1 Does the Department of the Solicitor General have the use of a computer in its operations and, if so, to what extent is it utilized?

2. Is the computer programmed 24 hours per day and, if not, for what reason?

3. What is the number of hours planned for utilization of the computer?

4. What has been the annual cost of computer services for each year 1960 to 1970 inclusive?

5. How many programmes are in preparation for the computer at the present time and how will each affect the efficiency of the Department?

Hon. John N. Turner (Acting Solicitor General): 1. The Department of the Solicitor General does not have the exclusive use of a computer in its operations; computer services being obtained as required from the Computer Services Bureau of the Department of Supply and Services.

2. Not applicable.

3. Not applicable.

4. 1960/61 to 1967/68, Nil; 1968/69, $8,496.78; 1969/70, $78,266.73.

5. Five programs are being used in the development and testing of techniques in financial and personnel accounting and records; and for inmate and police information records.

DEPARTMENT OF SOLICITOR GENERAL—DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT

Question No. 1,998—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of the Solicitor General have data processing equipment (automatic) and, if so, for how long?

2. What was the initial cost of the equipment?

3. What yearly costs are anticipated for data processing in the Department?

Hon. John N. Turner (Acting Solicitor General): 1. No.

2. Not applicable.

3. Anticipated future costs not yet worked out.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT BORROWINGS DURING SECOND WORLD WAR

Question No. 2,010—**Mr. Rondeau:**

1. What was the total amount of money borrowed by the federal government during the Second World War?

2. What was the amount of federal government bonds bought by (a) individuals (b) business firms (c) banks (d) the Bank of Canada?

3. What amounts have been repaid to date?

4. What amounts are still outstanding?

5. What amount is still owing to (a) individuals (b) business firms (c) banks (d) the Bank of Canada?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): 1. Increase in Government of Canada direct and guaranteed debt outstanding between December 31, 1939 and December 31, 1945 amounted to $12,889 million.

2. (a) $5,163 million (resident individuals); (b) $2,822 million; (c) $2,557 million; (d) $1,613 million. All non-resident and other governments net purchases amounted to $735 million.

3, 4 and 5. With the exception of a very small amount that is outstanding because they have not been redeemed by holders, all bonds issued during this period have matured and been repaid. Any refunding of maturing issues can have the effect of changing both the government obligation and the holders of those obligations. The Conversion loans currently outstanding in the amount of $3,060 million can be directly attributed to debt incurred during the war.

UNCOLLECTIBLE STUDENT LOANS

Question No. 2,013—**Mr. Hales:**

1. How many student loans have been returned to the federal government from chartered banks as uncollectable for each year from the inception of the Canada Student Loans Plan?

2. For what amounts are these loans?

3. For what reasons were they written off as uncollectable?

4. What amount was collected by professional collection agencies?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): 1 and 2. Number and value of claims submitted by chartered banks in respect of loans considered by them as uncollectable.

Loan Year	Number	Value
1964/65	1	$ 500
1965/66	43	27,441
1966/67	221	164,863
1967/68	534	303,920
1968/69	660	517,842
1969/70 to May 31st	1,300	1,577,966
Total	2,759	$ 2,592,532

3. Claims under the guarantee are submitted by the Chartered banks in the following circumstances: (a) Death of borrower, 15 per cent of claims; (b) Borrower cannot be located, 70 per cent of claims; (c) Borrower is in prison or medically unfit to work or unemployed, 10 per cent of claims; (d) Borrower refuses to cooperate with lender, 5 per cent of claims. Claims under (a) above are uncollectable. Claims under (b) and (d) above are now passed to a collection agency for collection action. Claims under (c) above are reviewed by the Guaranteed Loans Administration on a regular basis until the borrower is employed and able to commence repayment.

4. The services of a professional collection agency were engaged in July 1968 and to May 31, 1970, collections on accounts passed to them have amounted to $137,319.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

LOANS MADE BY CANADA TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES 1950-70

Question No. 1,066—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. How many loans and/or gifts has Canada made to foreign countries during each year 1950 to 1970?

2. What is the amount of each such loan?

3. How was each to be utilized?

4. What percentage of gross national product is the total per year?

Return tabled.

POLLUTION—FEDERAL EXPENDITURES 1959-60, 1969-70

Question No. 1,291—**Mr. Aiken:**

1. What expenditures have been made by the Federal Treasury in each fiscal year 1959-60 through 1969-70 for support of pollution abatement programs?

2. What were these programs?

3. In each of these fiscal years, what amount was expended on pollution research programs?

4. What departments of the federal government were involved?

5. In each of these fiscal years (a) what sums have been granted to the provinces and municipalities in aid of pollution abatement (b) which provinces received such aid (c) what were the names and locations of the projects?

Return tabled.

PUBLIC RELATIONS FIRMS HIRED BY GOVERNMENT TO PRODUCE INFORMATION ON GOVERNMENT POLICIES

Question No. 1,427—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. What public relations firms or economic or social research organizations have (a) been commissioned by government departments, agencies or Crown corporations (b) been hired or given contracts to produce pamphlets, brochures, economic surveys, etc., for educating or explaining government policies to the public?

2. By what government department or agency were they hired?

3. What specific task were they given to do?

4. How much money were they paid?

5. Was the choice of the firm concerned arrived at by asking for tenders and, if not, how was the choice made?

Return tabled.

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO SHARED-COST PROGRAMS WITH QUEBEC

Question No. 1,429—**Mr. Beaudoin:**

1. For each fiscal year since March 31, 1966, what was the total contribution of the Canadian Government to shared-cost programs with the Government of Quebec or any other party in the constituency of Richmond indicating the percentage and amount provided by each contributor?

2 For the same years, how much was applied to each of the following programs or projects in the constituency of Richmond (a) Old Age Security (b) Blind Persons Allowance (c) Disabled Persons Allowances (d) Unemployment Assistance (e) Health Grants (f) general contributions for hospital construction (g) Hospital Insurance (h) Occupational Training Agreement (i) post-secondary school education grants (j) rehabilitation of disabled persons (k) Civil Defence (l) Winter Works Program (m) health program (n) training for new Canadians (o) crop insurance (p) ARDA (q) Medical Research Fund (r) 4-H clubs (s) tourist information (t) youth travel programs (u) Mothers Allowances?

3. For each year referred to in Part 1, what was the federal government's contribution to those programs in which it was the sole contributor, indicating the exact purpose for which these funds were used?

Return tabled.

FINANCIAL DETAILS, POLYMER CORPORATION, 1967, 1968 AND 1969

Question No. 1,479—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. With respect to Polymer Corporation Limited in each year 1967, 1968 and 1969, what was (a) the ratio on working capital and is this ratio considered satisfactory (b) the ratio of liquidity and is this ratio considered satisfactory (c) the net tangible assets per $1000 (bonds) and is this situation considered satisfactory (d) the net tangible assets per share (e) the percentage of total capitalization contributed by bond-holders (f) the percentage of total capitalization owned by shareholders (g) the interest cover and is this cover considered satisfactory (h) the cash flow (i) the percentage of net profits distributed to shareholders (j) the efficiency or earnings ratio and is this ratio considered satisfactory (k) the return on capital invested and is this return considered satisfactory (l) the return on shareholders' investment and is this return considered satisfactory (m) the profit per ordinary share and is this profit considered satisfactory (n) the ratio of inventory turnover and is this ratio considered satisfactory?

2. What are Polymer's plans with respect to diversification of its activities?

3. Does Polymer intend to set up production units in Quebec and, if not, for what reason?

Return tabled.

UNSOLICITED MATERIAL RECEIVED BY NEWSPAPERS FROM GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS 1968 AND 1969

Question No. 1,485—**Mr. Whiting:**

1. How many newspapers across Canada, both weeklies and dailies, received unsolicited material such as newsletters, press releases, books and other documents, from various government departments during the years 1968 and 1969?

2. What were the actual mailing costs involved?

3. How much did it cost the respective departments to produce this material in the years 1968 and 1969?

4. How much of a saving could be realized by these departments, apart from mailing costs, if these unsolicited services to newspapers were cancelled?

Return tabled.

UNIVERSITY STUDENTS—SUMMER EMPLOYMENT

Question No. 1,541—**Mr. Yewchuk:**

1. How many applications has the federal government received from university students seeking summer employment, to date?

2. How many university students have been hired by the federal government for summer employment?

3. Has the federal government proceeded with any special programs which will provide university students in Canada with summer employment, aside from employment opportunities in the federal government?

Return tabled.

INCENTIVE GRANTS TO FAIREY COMPANY LIMITED

Question No. 1,601—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. For each year 1948 to 1969, what federal government subsidies, grants or incentives were awarded to the Fairey Company Limited of Halifax?

2. For each year 1948 to 1969, what federal government contracts were awarded to the Fairey Company Limited of Halifax?

3. For the same period, can the Government of Canada indicate the extent of provincial government financial assistance to the Fairey Company of Canada Limited?

Return tabled.

*RESEARCH INTO ALTERNATIVE USES OF WHEAT

Question No. 1,741—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

1. Is the Government of Canada carrying out any research into the alternative uses for wheat and, if so, what projects are underway and how much money is being expended on them?

2. Is any similar research being carried out by private agencies in Canada?

Return tabled.

OTTAWA, ONTARIO—REFURNISHING OF JACKSON BUILDING

Question No. 1,762—**Mr. Coates:**

1. When the Jackson Building was renovated, were new furnishings in the form of office equipment and carpeting provided?

2. If contracts were awarded for the refurnishing of this building, what was the amount of the contract or contracts awarded and the names of the firm or firms?

3. If the Jackson Building was refurnished (a) how was the furniture formerly used in the building disposed of (b) was any of this furniture destroyed and, if so, for what reason?

Return tabled.

INCENTIVE GRANTS

Question No. 1,767—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion under the Regional Development Incentives Act authorized or provided an incentive grant to the following firms and, if so, what is the amount of each grant (a) Bell Aerospace Canada for plants at Dartmouth and Halifax airport (b) Laiterie Laval Limitée, Quebec City (c) Technico Inc., Drummondville, Quebec (d) Auto-neige Toundra Inc., Duvernay, Quebec (e) Newell Vegetable Co-op Ltd., Brooks, Alberta (f) Fristamat Limited, Canning, N.S. (g) Minas Basin Pulp and Power Company Limited, Hantsport, N.S. (h) St. Lawrence Manufacturing Company Ltd., Giffard, Quebec (i) Karnes Kitchens Ltd., Woodstock, N.B. (j) Fishery Products Limited, St. John's Newfoundland (k) J. H. Normick Ltée, La Sarre, Quebec?

2. Who are the directors and executive officers of each firm and what is the address of each?

3. To what extent is each company non-resident or foreign-owned or controlled?

4. What is the name and country of the known non-resident ownership of each company?

Return tabled.

INCENTIVE GRANTS

Question No. 1,768—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion under the Regional Development Incentives Act authorized or provided an incentive grant to the following firms and, if so, what is the amount of each grant (a) Vauxhall Foods Limited, Vauxhall, Alberta (b) Leeds Candy Corporation, Granby, Quebec (c) Lakeland Dairies Limited, Selkirk, Manitoba (d) Grand Falls Industries Limited, Grand Falls, N.B. (e) Countryside Farms Ltd., Ste. Anne, Manitoba (f) La Compagnie Eagle Lumber Ltée, L'Annonciation, Quebec (g) Les Cercueils South Durham Ltée, Drummondville, Quebec?

2. Who are the directors and executive officers of each firm and what is the address of each?

3. To what extent is each company non-resident or foreign-owned or controlled?

4. What is the name and country of the known non-resident ownership of each company?

Return tabled.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION RESEARCH STUDIES

Question No. 1,820—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. What research studies have been carried out by, or on behalf of the Department of Communications during each year 1960 to 1969 inclusive?

2. What research studies are now being carried on and/or are contemplated during the next five years?

3. What was the cost of each of the research studies completed in each year 1960 to 1969 inclusive?

4. What is the estimated cost of each of the studies now in being or contemplated during the next five years?

Return tabled.

WHEAT SALES TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Question No. 1,909—**Mr. Rondeau:**

1. During the past five years, how many sales of wheat has Canada concluded with foreign countries?

2. In each case and, chronologically, who were the buyers?

3. What was the sale price on each transaction?

4. In each case, what is the name of the company that negotiated the transaction on behalf of Canada and how much did it receive in brokerage fees?

5. What is the aggregate amount of all such sales and the total sum paid in brokerage fees?

Return tabled.

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, with regard to question No. 244, I wonder whether the government intends to provide any information regarding outside consultant study costs for various departments.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): I will make a further inquiry in this regard. It may well be that additional information may be secured by Friday and this, among other questions, may be answered by special agreement of the House on Friday.

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): I wonder if the house leader would inform me as to when I might expect an answer to question No. 163. Eight months even for a Liberal government, seems a long time to answer a question. I was assured I would have the answer before the end of the session. Is that correct?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Perhaps I could take this occasion, the first since the hon. member has been declared a candidate for the leadership of his party, to welcome him in that capacity.

My information is that the list of firms is ready. However, statistical data on these firms has not yet been obtained from DBS. I hope that before much longer in his campaign we may have the answer for him.

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the house leader if the government intends to answer all the questions on the Order Paper for which statistical data are available, before the end of the session? I ask this in view of the fact that there are questions on the Order Paper under my name for which the information, I understand, is now available? Will these questions be answered before the end of the session?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I will have specific consultations with the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker. We will certainly make every effort to answer all the questions for which information has come to hand by next Friday.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

MOTIONS TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

BROADCASTING

ISSUANCE OF LICENCES TO TÉLÉMÉDIA

Mr. Pierre De Bané (Matane): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 26, I move the adjournment of the House to discuss a specific, important and urgent matter.

[Mr. Skoberg.]

This specific and urgent matter is the decision of the CRTC to issue a great number of radio and television broadcasting licences to Télémédia under circumstances and for considerations which, as admitted by the CRTC itself, are absolutely inconsistent, in addition to the concentration problems involved.

The urgency arises from the impending adjournment of this part of the session and from the 60-day delay allowed the governor in council to rescind that CRTC decision. Besides, my request is seconded by the chairman of the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Matane filed the notice provided for in Standing Order 26, which has given me the opportunity to take the request into consideration.

Hon. members will readily admit that the problem raised by the hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané) is one of real importance and general interest. It also has an aspect of urgency since the House will probably recess very shortly.

However, does this justify adjourning today's proceedings in order to study the matter brought up by the hon. member? It is questionable.

May I suggest to hon. members that the decisions taken by commissions while carrying out their normal functions should not constitute matters for urgent discussions. Even under the circumstances which seem to cause the hon. member some concern, it would seem to me difficult to justify the adjournment of our proceedings to allow interested members to express their views. I would point out to the House that if the CRTC decision was only made public recently, the problem itself has been discussed and commented, even in a controversial manner for several months, so that hon. members have had many occasions to express their views and present arguments for and against the project in question.

Under the circumstances, I must decide that the hon. member's motion cannot be put today.

[*English*]

DRUGS

RELEASE OF LE DAIN COMMISSION REPORT—NEED FOR CLARIFICATION OF GOVERNMENT POLICY

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave, seconded by the hon.

member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), to move the adjournment of the House under Standing Order 26 for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely, the release on Friday of the Le Dain Commission's interim report on the non-medical use of drugs, the apparent contradictions in statements by cabinet ministers, and the urgent need for clear and explicit government policy in order to avoid immediately a major crisis in Canadian courts and in every major city in Canada this summer.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has given me the required notice of his intention to request leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing the matter stated by him. In the interim, I have given very serious consideration to the several aspects of the question raised for debate.

It does seem to me that the matter raised by the hon. member is important and of wide and current interest, but I must concern myself with the question as to whether his proposal meets with the requirements of Standing Order 26. Essentially, I believe that the matter referred to by the hon. member can be resolved only by legislation. It might be that a debate at this time could do much to develop and clarify the thinking of hon. members in regard to a possible alteration of the criminal law of the country, but it seems to me that since the question is a matter of legislation rather than one which relates to the administration of government, it fails to qualify under the terms of Standing Order 26.

On the other hand if the hon. member's request is directed primarily to the apparent contradictions in statements by ministers of the Crown, I suggest that other means and methods may be used, which are available to hon. members, for the purpose of obtaining a clarification of such statements. For the reasons stated, I must say with regret that the hon. member's proposed motion should not be placed before the House at this time.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

DRUGS

MARIJUANA—REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION OF GOVERNMENT POSITION—DIRECTIONS TO CROWN PROSECUTORS

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Prime Minister a question arising out of what, it is now clear, was a non-statement by the Minister of National Health and Welfare in the House on Friday last. At that time the minister simply said that the government was giving consideration to acting upon one recommendation of the LeDain Commission, that is not to legalize the possession of marijuana but to lighten the penalty.

I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether we can expect an early decision with regard to this matter. I ask this in the hope that the enthusiasm of the minister outside the House may at least result in prophecy, although it was not strictly accurate on that occasion.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I take note that the Leader of the Opposition, in speaking for his party, says that the minister's enthusiasm should result in prophecy. As far as we are concerned, our position was stated in the House on Friday and it remains the same.

An hon. Member: There were two positions.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, there was nothing ambiguous about my position in speaking for the party on Friday and I hoped it would encourage the Prime Minister to make a statement. In view of the doubt that now exists with regard to what decision the government will reach, and the vast number of Canadians who are concerned and who will be affected by the eventual decision, I ask the Prime Minister whether he will give the House the assurance that he will make an early announcement.

I remind him, sir, that he kept this report within the circle of the government for several weeks so that he could deal with this sort of situation. I ask him if he will not give the House the assurance of a very early statement in order to remove the confusion and concern that is bound to exist in the country in the light of the non-statement made by the Minister of Health and Welfare in the House on Friday last.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, the indignation of the Leader of the Opposition moves me. I must say that making a statement would not change the law, and he must know this. Our statement was made on Friday and it remains the same. The minister explained, as he entered the House, that it remained the same. That was our position. The Leader of the Opposition knows very well that by making any kind of statement we could not change the law as it stands. The Minister of Justice

explained thoroughly in the House how this law has, in fact, been interpreted and applied for some time past. If the Leader of the Opposition is suggesting that through some kind of unanimous agreement of all members of the House we could change the law very quickly in some manner that he would suggest, I am sure the House, even our side, would consider it.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I think that is something which the Prime Minister might have explored instead of the farcical procedure which he has followed.

An hon. Member: Not a break in the cloud.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister. In view of the statement made by the President of the Association of Police Chiefs and the comment by an unnamed Supreme Court judge in at least one Toronto newspaper indicating a good deal of hostility to the recommendations of the LeDain Commission, would the government make clear to Crown prosecutors who are implementing government policy what the government's desires are with reference to people who will be arrested and prosecuted in the future?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of that statement, so I do not know if it refers to all the drugs considered by the LeDain Commission. If the statement relates to marijuana, I repeat that the Minister of Justice outlined in the House on Friday the way in which the law was interpreted by the courts, and in fact it appears that it has been interpreted by the courts in the way that the LeDain Commission says it should.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

PROPOSED SIX PER CENT WAGE GUIDELINE—ALLEGED REFUSAL OF ONTARIO TO APPLY TO PROVINCIAL CIVIL SERVANTS

Mr. David Lewis (York South): I have a question for the right hon. the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker. In view of the report of a telegram sent by the Provincial Treasurer of Ontario to the Civil Service Association of that province that the government of Ontario does not intend to apply the 6 per cent guideline to negotiations with provincial civil servants, I should like to ask the Prime Minister if it is still the government's intention to insist on such guidelines for the federal public service?

[Mr. Trudeau.]

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of that report. I will discuss it with the Minister of Finance. I understand that when the Minister of Finance met with the provincial treasurers and ministers of finance in Winnipeg some weeks ago, the provinces did agree to abide by the guidelines. If there is a contradiction here I will try to see which of the provincial ministers is stating government policy.

INFLATION—SUGGESTED MEETING OF PRIME MINISTER AND HEADS OF BANKS AND OTHER CORPORATIONS

Mr. David Lewis (York South): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Pursuing that for a moment, I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether he can inform the House if it is his intention to meet publicly with the heads of banks and of other corporations to urge them to reduce their charges and prices because, in the language he used to autoworkers in Talbotville, their high charges and prices have screwed certain sections of the Canadian people.

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

Mr. Lewis: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I suggest to the House and to you, sir, that the question is important and that the Prime Minister's behaviour is important. When a millionaire aristocrat goes to speak to autoworkers and talks down to them—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is hardly a point of order. The hon. member has asked his question. Certainly, it is not a point of order.

Mr. Lewis: A further point of order, Mr. Speaker. No one respects your position, Mr. Speaker, more than I, but I suggest to you that as a member I have a right to insist that I complete my point of order before you set me down. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that if the language the Prime Minister used in speaking to workers in a plant is good enough for them it is good enough, to be used in a question asked of the Prime Minister in this House.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has added three or four words, but they do not add anything procedurally to what he started to say. It is clearly not a point of order, and I have to rule along those lines.

INFLATION—SUGGESTED APPLICATION OF GUIDELINES POLICY TO PROPOSED AIR CANADA FARE INCREASE

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask that great defender of the consumer, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, whether he intends to apply the guidelines policy to Air Canada which, according to reports, is proposing to increase air fares by 10 per cent.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): There have been discussions between Air Canada and the Prices and Incomes Commission, Mr. Speaker. When action is taken there will undoutedly be a statement from the commission.

[*Translation*]

INFLATION—JOINT STUDY OF EFFECTIVE PRICE CONTROLS

Mr. Pierre De Bané (Matane): Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs tell the House whether he intends to propose, in co-operation with the Prices and Incomes Commission, some effective form of price control?

[*English*]

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I think the Prime Minister made it clear a number of times that in so far as that question is concerned, all options are open.

PROPOSED SIX PER CENT WAGE GUIDELINE—SUGGESTED CORRECTION OF HOURLY RATE FIGURES USED BY PRIME MINISTER

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether he would take an opportunity to check the figures which he used in speeches at the weekend, Mr. Speaker. The latest Dominion Bureau of Statistics figures for wages of industrial workers show them to be 30 cents an hour higher than the figure the Prime Minister quoted, whilst the figures for postal workers are in fact 30 cents lower. I wonder if the Prime Minister would check these figures.

POST OFFICE

POSSIBLE NATIONAL STRIKE—GOVERNMENT WAGE OFFER

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): I should like to direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister about negotiations with postal workers and the continuing rotating strikes. Can the Prime Minister advise if the Treasury Board spokesman representing the government in the negotiations is now prepared to go as far as Judge Lippé did in his recommendations on the matter of wages some time ago?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker. I am not conversant with the latest details of the negotiations, and I cannot say what exact offers have been made by both sides, but there has been no blanket authorization of that kind given to Treasury Board by the government.

SOCIAL SECURITY

TABLING OF WHITE PAPER—SUGGESTED INTERIM INCREASE IN OLD AGE PENSIONS

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In view of his statement to the House on Friday that the white paper on social security would be tabled before the end of the present session, is it still the minister's intention to introduce interim increases for old age pensioners before the tabling of the white paper?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Baldwin: Is the government considering it?

Mr. Marshall: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can we take it from the minister's answer that his recommendation to cabinet that interim increases be granted to old age pensioners has been turned down by his colleagues?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. McGrath: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I trust that the hon. member's supplementary question is supplementary to the first question asked, which was in order.

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister something he did not make clear in his answer. Will the white paper be tabled before the House adjourns?

Mr. Munro: Mr. Speaker, I indicated on Friday to the hon. member that I expected, in all probability, the white paper would be

tabled prior to the end of the present session, and I explained to him that did not necessarily mean prior to the recess.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the hon. member for Ottawa West in his capacity as chairman of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs. My question has to do with the report of the committee which he tabled a few minutes ago. Will the hon. member endeavour to ascertain through the usual channels whether hon. members of the House would be willing to concur in this report, without debate, if a motion for concurrence were moved tomorrow? I ask this question, believing he will find that to be the case.

Mr. Lloyd Francis (Ottawa West): Mr. Speaker, I have filed with the Clerk of the House the necessary notice for concurrence. I believe, according to the rules, that 48 hours are required which would mean that Thursday would be the earliest day on which concurrence would be possible. Whether it will be possible to do so on that day is a matter for the House.

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

INCENTIVES PROGRAM—ALLEGED DISCRIMINATION WITH REGARD TO PELLETIZING PLANTS

Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, my question arises out of a question that my colleague for St. John's East directed to the Minister of Economic Expansion on Thursday last. The hon. member asked a question about the Regional Development Incentives Act, which has now been in operation for one year, and referred to the failure of the act in the two provinces that need it most, Saskatchewan and Newfoundland. I should like to ask the minister why, since close to $25 million has been spent in the province of Quebec, close to $5 million in the province of New Brunswick and about half a million dollars in the province of Saskatchewan, there is discrimination with regard to pelletizing plants, or are we to understand—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Certainly the question as asked is not in order.

[Mr. Munro.]

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker, may I re-word my question?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am sure the House will allow the hon. member to rephrase his question. No doubt he realizes that, since it was asked in an argumentative form, it was not acceptable. Perhaps the hon. member might like to rephrase his question.

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister why grants have been given for pelletizing plants in the province of Quebec while applications for grants for such plants in the province of Saskatchewan were rejected?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I do not accept—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): I do not accept the statement that has been made, Mr. Speaker.

[*Later:*]

[*English*]

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker, my point of privilege is that I did not hear the minister's first reply. He spoke in French and I did not have my earphone on. Subsequently he leaned across and said, "That is mean." Regardless of what he said, if my statement is incorrect I wish the minister would get up and correct me. I understand that my information is correct, and I do not see how I could have been mean. I should like to hear the minister's reply.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member knows that he has every right to ask questions under our rules, but he cannot insist on a reply. My understanding of the minister's reply was that he did not accept the premise on which the question was based, and it then becomes a question of debate as to what the situation is.

Mr. McIntosh: I thoroughly understand this, Mr. Speaker, but did the minister say he did not accept my statement or the premise of my statement?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I certainly do not think we should become involved in debate. My understanding is that the minister said, as ministers will sometimes say, that he did not accept the premise for the question.

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious question so far as I am concerned. The minister is either doubting my word, or the information I have is correct. I should like the minister to clarify why he said I was mean.

Mr. Speaker: I suggest to the hon. member that this is strictly a question of debate between the minister and the hon. member. I do not think it is a legitimate question of privilege.

[*Later:*]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Regional Economic Expansion on a question of privilege.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): It is not that I do not want to answer the question, Mr. Speaker, but this is a rather complex case and I cannot answer with a yes or a no, nor can I give a brief reply.

So, should the hon. member like to receive some information, I shall be happy to supply it. However, in my opinion, his statement is not accurate.

[*English*]

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker, will the minister make a statement on motions in regard to this question so that the whole matter can be clarified?

TRADE

IMPORTATION OF MILK POWDER

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture which relates to a question I addressed to the minister about two weeks ago, and also to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, concerning the importation of milk powder into Canada from Ireland and New Zealand. At that time the minister indicated that he and his colleague would look into the question and reply at a later date. I was wondering if the Minister of Agriculture is now in a position to inform the House as to the extent of the importation of milk powder into Canada from foreign sources?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have had this investigated. I am not able to give the hon. member, at this stage in our proceedings, exact amounts as we know them. However, there is one thing I should like to clarify. I said I did not know whether any of the milk powder that had been exported from Canada was coming back into the country. I can now say categorically that no Canadian skim milk powder subsidized for export has been re-imported into Canada.

Mr. Nesbitt: A supplementary question—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I interrupt the hon. member for Oxford because I believe the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek is rising on a question of privilege.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Nesbitt: Mr. Speaker, my question is supplementary to my original question to the Minister of Agriculture concerning the importation of milk powder. Would the minister and his colleague, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, pursue their investigations into this matter of the importation of milk powder, because I have here, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Nesbitt: No, no.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member knows that a long standing practice prohibits him from bringing into the House or using in the House exhibits which may be used in courts of law. This practice has been ruled out of order in many instances, and the hon. member cannot pursue his question with the use of exhibits.

Mr. Nesbitt: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I was only trying to make sure that I was accurately reading what is on the label of the container. Perhaps Your Honour will permit me to paraphrase what it says. The label on the container shows that this is a product of the Borden Company. It is milk powder imported from Ireland, and is a fairly large quantity. In view of that, I was wondering if the minister would pursue and use—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Nesbitt: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I was just finishing my question. I was asking if the minister could pursue his studies, and if he would use the powers under the Export and Import Permits Act to stop the importation of milk powder into this country.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, I think I can clear this up. There are three principal classes of milk powder. There is dry skim milk powder, there is dry buttermilk powder and there is whole milk powder. Dry skim milk powder has been under import controls, as I recall it, since 1958. Whole milk powder has not been

under import restriction at all and, indeed, is not subsidized in Canada. However, if there is any skim milk powder coming in in large quantities, as might be suggested by the label of the product in the hon. member's hand, I will be prepared to look into the matter. I think he must remember, however, that there are three distinct categories of milk powder.

Mr. Baldwin: That sounds like a lot of bull.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

UNITED STATES DEPLOYMENT OF GLOBAL MISSILES—CANADIAN GOVERNMENT REACTION

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): My question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Has the United States government informed the Canadian government of the deployment of global missiles with multiple re-entry warheads in North Dakota, close to the Canadian border? If so, what was the reaction of the Canadian government?

Hon Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, there has been an official of the United States government in Canada within the last few days who has informed us about plans of the United States government but I do not think that this information goes further than ABM's. They have not asked for any reaction and we have not given any.

Mr. Brewin: In asking my supplementary question, I wish to advise the minister that I am referring to MIRV's, multiple independent re-entry vehicles. In view of the current discussion of a possible strategic arms limitation agreement, and the fact that the deployment of MIRV's constitutes a new and dangerous escalation of the arms race, does the government intend to make any representations to the United States government on this subject?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, we have supported very strongly the strategic arms limitation talks that are taking place between the United States and the Soviet Union. We urge both sides to avoid deploying these missiles.

PROPOSED UNDERGROUND NUCLEAR TESTS BY U.S.—FURTHER INFORMATION REGARDING RESULTS OF LAST TEST

Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West): A supplementary question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Has the government made any recent representations to the government of the United States concerning the proposed underground nuclear tests in the Aleutians? Is there anything to report to the House resulting from this possible dialogue?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, we are obtaining information regarding the results of the last test. We have been reviewing this information. It is my understanding that there is not likely to be a further underground test for approximately two years. We are considering first, whether, and second, when, we should make any further representations on this matter. I should clarify this point, Mr. Speaker. We are, of course, opposed to all forms of testing. The question that arises is whether there is any particular danger arising to Canada as a result of this particular kind of testing.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Rose: I have a supplementary to the previous exchange concerning the Aleutian nuclear tests. I ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs if Canada has initiated any independent investigation regarding the data or are we depending upon foreign or American information regarding the possible dangers of these tests?

Mr. Sharp: The hon. member may recall that when the first test was made we had our own experts examine the possibilities of damage to Canada arising out of peculiar circumstances. It was on the basis of those findings that we made our representations to the United States. We would do exactly the same again.

NATIONAL CAPITAL

CONSULTATION WITH APPROPRIATE AUTHORITIES RESPECTING NEW BRIDGE—PAYMENT OF COST OF APPROACHES

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): I wish to ask the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion whether he or the National Capital Commission have secured the approval of the appropriate civic authorities in Ottawa with regard to the proposed new bridge across the Ottawa River?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, there have been several discussions between the municipal authorities and those of Ontario. The final decision remains clearly with the federal government since it is assuming the total cost of building the bridge.

[*English*]

Mr. Stanfield: A supplementary question. Is it the intention of the minister and the government to proceed with the bridge, as announced, without the approval of the appropriate authorities in the city of Ottawa?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): The cabinet has approved the building of the bridge, Mr. Speaker, and as a member of the cabinet, I intend to carry out its decisions.

[*English*]

Mr. David Lewis (York South): A supplementary question. I understood the minister to say that because the federal government would pay for the construction of the bridge, it alone would make the determination. I ask the minister, who will pay for the approaches at both ends, of the bridge and whether the authorities that have to pay those costs should be consulted?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, I think I said a moment ago that there had been consultations with the authorities. Even though the consultation proceedings may not have been as extensive as they should have been, there were nevertheless consultations. The Ontario government was aware of the decision, as well as the municipality of Ottawa.

[*English*]

Mr. Stanfield: A supplementary. I ask the Prime Minister whether this is his concept of federalism?

Mr. Speaker: I believe the hon. member for Fraser Valley West has a supplementary to the previous question.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

IMPENDING DISASTER IN MANITOBA—REQUEST FOR RELIEF MEASURES

Mr. E. B. Osler (Winnipeg South Centre): My question is for the Prime Minister. Southeastern Manitoba has been subjected to almost continuous rainfall for many weeks. Farmers have been unable to work their land in any way. They are unable to seed or get their machinery out to cut hay in many cases. The result is that not only the farmers but the townspeople feel there is an impending disaster. I ask the Prime Minister if he can assure this House that measures will be taken to relieve this situation in the immediate future?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we do have a policy whereby the federal government assists provinces which meet with disasters of this kind. I thank the hon. member for bringing this to the attention of the government. I must add that because of our belief in federalism, we only act in cases like this when a request is received from the premier of the province. As far as I know, no such request has been received.

GRAIN

WHEAT—ACREAGE REDUCTION PROGRAM—ADDITIONAL MEASURES TO ACHIEVE GOVERNMENT OBJECTIVE

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Agriculture. In view of recent crop reports that, while wheat acreage has been reduced in western Canada, the acreage taken out of wheat has been transferred to rapeseed, flax, barley and other crops and the summer-fallow has increased by only 6 per cent, will the minister make a statement on motions before the summer recess indicating what additional measures will be taken—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have to interrupt the hon. member. I do not think that is a supplementary. At the same time, I recognize the importance of the matter. The question having been asked, for the purpose of saving time the minister might like to reply and indicate to the House whether a statement will be made.

Mr. Gleave: Unfortunately, it will be difficult for the minister to do that because I had not put my question. Can the minister inform the House what additional measures will be taken to achieve the government's earlier stated policy of providing $140 million in cash to the farmers under the Lift program?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, that was not the stated government policy. If the farmers participated to the full extent of 22 million acres, that would be the maximum amount. However, the program that we announced some weeks ago has been available to all farmers—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have to interrupt the minister. I understood the question to be whether a statement would be made. Again I say that is not a supplementary question.

Inquiries of the Ministry

FLOODS

NEW BRUNSWICK—GRANT TO ASSIST IN PAYMENT OF DAMAGE

Mr. J. Chester MacRae (York-Sunbury): I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. I have given notice of the question. Will the minister advise if a grant has been authorized and made by the federal government to the province of New Brunswick to assist those who suffered heavy financial losses due to floods in that province in February?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): I thank the hon. member for having given me notice, however I am not aware of it. I think the Treasury Board has jurisdiction over this. I can inquire and make a report or ask the Treasury Board to make a report to the hon. member.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

COUNTERFEIT PILLS—INQUIRY AS TO ORIGIN

Mr. J. W. Monteith (Perth): My question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. An article datelined Montreal appeared recently in the *Globe and Mail* concerning the arrest of two persons for selling counterfeit pills. Reference was made to the fact that over 900,000 of these pills came from Ontario. In view of the fact that this is the kind of operation that could have underworld backing, does the government know in which Ontario plant these alleged counterfeit pills were made?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): It is my understanding that this matter is presently before the courts, and I shall await the outcome before making any comment.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—SIX PER CENT WAGE INCREASE GUIDELINE—PROPOSED COMPULSORY LABOUR COURTS

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): My question is for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Have officials or members of the government been in communication with the government of Saskatchewan with regard to the suggested establishment of compulsory labour courts to enforce the 6 per cent guideline and, if so, has the government encouraged the idea?

[Mr. Speaker.]

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): I believe I answered that question on Thursday, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): The minister says he answered the question on Thursday. I do not believe he did so very clearly. May I address a supplementary question to the Prime Minister? In the light of recent statements by the government about Canadian unions, does the right hon. gentleman intend to protest the proposition of President Nixon that you cannot preserve the dollar by passing the buck?

GRAIN

WHEAT—ACREAGE REDUCTION PROGRAM—COMPENSATION FOR ELEVATOR AGENTS FOR TIME SPENT FILLING OUT FORMS

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker. Does the government intend to compensate elevator agents who spend much time completing the forms which farmers must fill out in their applications under the Lift program, bearing in mind that this work sometimes interferes with the loading and acceptance of grain?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): These people are the employees of the elevator companies. In many instances in the past, after programs have been announced by the government, such as the arrangement for cash advances on farm-stored grain, the companies have assisted farmers in preparing their forms.

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

INCENTIVE GRANTS—CHANGES TO CORRECT DISPARITY BETWEEN PROVINCES

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): My question is directed to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. Does the minister intend to bring in a measure to change the Industrial Incentives Act, bearing in mind the wide disparity between grants made in the various provinces of Canada, especially affecting some of the more depressed provinces?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, the difference is much smaller than the hon. member would seem to indicate, considering the population, and it is not our intention to

change anything. The firms themselves, and not the government, decide where they will settle. If the scheme does not work properly after a certain period of time, it might be in order to change it.

[*English*]

REQUESTED CHANGE IN DEFINITION OF INFRASTRUCTURE TO INCLUDE FISHING COMMUNITIES

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): May I ask the minister whether it is the intention of the government to redefine the definition of infrastructure in the special areas legislation so as to include viable fishing communities? Will a statement be made on a new program in the near future?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, if special areas are meant here, they are already included in the scheme and there is therefore no need to change it. We may do it provided the area is a special one. I cannot see what changes could be brought to the program at this time.

[*Later:*]

[*English*]

Mr. Lundrigan: My supplementary is directed to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. In view of the fact that the definition of infrastructure in the special areas legislation does not cover fishing communities, may I ask whether he is planning to bring in a new program of legislation to include viable fishing areas so that they can take advantage of the grants being made by his department?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Speaker, if a fishing community is designed in a "special area", we have the right to build all the infrastructures provided by the act. All we need to know is whether or not the community is within the "special area".

[*Later:*]

[*English*]

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): When answering a question asked by my hon. friend from St. John's East, the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion indicated that his department's incentives program was not based in any way on population. I would ask him whether this is not apparent from the fact that Quebec has already received over 50 per cent of the grants?

[*Later:*]

Mr. MacInnis: I rise to make an apology to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion who has indicated to me that I quoted him as saying exactly the opposite of what he did say. In making this apology, I would ask him to consider the fact that Quebec still received more than 50 per cent of the grants.

FAIREY AVIATION—STATUS OF NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): I hope, Mr. Speaker, that you will not take my question as contrary to the indication given in your comment of a few moments ago, but I wanted to ask the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion whether his department is presently negotiating with any firms for the rehabilitation or retaining of the maintenance and overhaul facilities at Dartmouth.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, the last time I received a report on this matter, negotiations were being conducted, but in order that the hon. member will not be misled, I shall inquire and find out where the negotiations stand and report to him very soon.

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

ABORTION—REQUEST FOR REMOVAL OF PROVISION FROM LAW

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): I have a question for the Minister of Justice, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the Canadian Psychiatric Association has declared that abortion should be removed from the Criminal Code and left, like any other medical matter, to the discretion of the patient and her doctor, and in view of the fact that nearly 200 doctors in Montreal have called publicly for the repeal of the present abortion legislation, will the minister take early steps to remove abortion from the provisions of the Criminal Code?

Mr. Speaker: It seems to me the hon. lady is repeating a question which has already been asked, and that—

Mrs. MacInnis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member will allow me to take a stand which was taken by some of her hon. friends earlier, and allow

me to finish my point of order. It seems to me that the question has already been asked. As to the argument which the hon. lady puts forward, I doubt whether it is in accordance with the practice of the House to put to the ministry the same question day after day. This having been said, rather than listen to a point of order or a question of privilege, the minister might like to reply.

Mrs. MacInnis: The minister does not seem to want to reply? Does he wish to reply?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): I have noted the contents of the question.

Mrs. MacInnis: May I raise a point of order? My point of order, with great deference, is that I have not been asking the same question based on the same material day after day.

Mr. Speaker: I have allowed the question, so no point of order can arise.

Mrs. MacInnis: This is my point of order. I waited for you to finish yours, Mr. Speaker. My point of order is that I have two brand new pieces of evidence here which have not been mentioned before.

Mr. Speaker: The Speaker has the last word, and I say that is not a point of order. I believe the hon. member for Gander-Twillingate wishes to ask a supplementary to a previous question.

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL HOLIDAYS

MONTREAL—PRESENCE OF PRIME MINISTER AT CELEBRATION OF ST. JEAN BAPTISTE DAY

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether he will attend the St. John the Baptist Day celebrations in Montreal next Wednesday.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, next Wednesday I hope to be in a locality of the province of Quebec which will remain unnamed.

[*English*]

MANPOWER

SUMMER EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM FOR STUDENTS—EFFECT OF SCHEME TO TEACH TWO OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. David Anderson (Esquimalt-Saanich): My question is for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. Some two weeks ago the hon. gentleman announced in this chamber a program to hire approximately 6,000 more students. I should like to know how many students have already been hired, and the target date by which all the students will have been engaged.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): The hirings are to be made by individual departments which have been authorized to do so. Finances for doing so have been made available. I will check and make a report as to the number hired so far.

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Can the minister indicate how the program announced by the Secretary of State under which students may receive summer instruction in one or other of the two official languages will alleviate the employment situation? Are these paid jobs?

Mr. MacEachen: The program administered by the Department of the Secretary of State will apply to 1,000 students who wish to study either French or English. Their accommodation and instruction will be paid for but they will not receive an educational allowance.

Mr. Baldwin: They will be able to make their applications for jobs next year in both English and French.

PUBLIC SERVICE

ESTABLISHMENT OF FRENCH-SPEAKING UNITS

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): My question is for the Prime Minister. On June 11, I asked whether the government had yet made a decision on the report of the B and B Commission. At that time, the right hon. gentleman said the cabinet had considered the matter but had not reached a decision upon it. I should like to know whether the Prime Minister will be in a position to make an announcement to the House concerning the cabinet's decision before, hopefully, we rise within a week for the recess.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): The position of the government will be made known within a very few days.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—EFFECT ON PENSIONERS AND UNORGANIZED WORKERS

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): I have a question for the Prime Minister.

Following his accurate observation that inflation will seriously affect those on fixed pensions, and unorganized workers, does the right hon. gentleman intend to do something about people in those two categories by introducing improvement in pensions legislation and by encouraging provincial premiers to pass labour legislation permitting more of our workers to become members of a trade union?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that, as usual, the hon. member has missed the point. The best way to solve this problem, I believe, is to solve the problem of inflation, and in this regard I should like more co-operation from the members of that party.

INFORMATION CANADA

DEPARTMENTAL POLICY IN PROVIDING PHOTOS OF PROMINENT CANADIANS

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister without Portfolio in charge of Information Canada, which has not been getting much attention these days. Is it the policy of his department, as evidenced in a recent communication, when requested for photos of prominent Canadian politicians to send pictures of himself and the Secretary of State only, leaving out the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition?

Hon. Robert Stanbury (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I had not realized that my department was so efficient and had such good judgment.

PRIVILEGE

MR. HOWARD (SKEENA)—REPLY TO QUESTION ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) rising on a question of privilege?

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Yes, Mr. Speaker. My question relates to an answer given today to a question of mine. I have just received a copy of the written answer. My question was asked on February 24 this year, and apart from the fact that it has taken almost four months to provide such a puny and insignificant answer, I find difficulty in understanding part of it.

My question of privilege relates to the answer itself. The question I asked reads as follows:

> During the time that the Honourable John Munro, Minister of National Health and Welfare, was in Prince Rupert, B.C. recently, what is the name of each group with whom he met—

The answer I received, which incidentally fails to explain why it took four months to answer the question is as follows:

> I find it difficult to answer the hon. member's question because I did not meet with any group which had a name—

Then, the answer goes on to cover other factors that are not pertinent to that first part of the answer.

My question of privilege is; surely during the time the minister was in Prince Rupert and met with the executive of the Liberal party he came to the conclusion that that group had a name.

Mr. Speaker: Order. This appears to me to be a form of argument, not a question of privilege. I would not think that the matter should be pursued.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CANADA ELECTIONS ACT

MEASURE TO CONSOLIDATE AND REVISE

The House resumed consideration in committee of Bill C-215, respecting the franchise of electors and the election of members to the House of Commons—Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale)—Mr. Faulkner in the Chair.

The Chairman: Order. House again in committee of the whole on Bill C-215. When the committee rose at one o'clock subclause (3) of clause 14, and a motion to amend proposed thereto by the hon. member for Matane, was under discussion.

On clause 14, subclause (3)—*Certain British subjects deemed electors.*

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Chairman, when we adjourned at one o'clock, I was regretting the absence from the chamber of the Minister without Portfolio from York-Scarborough. I am pleased to see him here now, smiling and in good health, and I wonder whether he might find it possible to advise the House and Canadians, before we take a vote on this question, of the current thinking of government with regard to citizenship requirements.

I will not attempt to bring the minister up to date on the debate that has taken place in the last hour or so, particularly the debate that took place the last time we were in committee on the bill, but it would be helpful if Canadians were able to understand the general direction of the thinking of the government in terms of future citizenship requirements, whether or not the present rules and regulations are going to be amended, or whether indeed any thought is being given to this question at all.

With regard to the amendment before the committee, I must say I am opposed to it, and I repeat the thoughts I started to express before lunch. If hon. members had taken the opportunity of reading the present Act, they might be able to comment on it a little more dispassionately. In this way, we might achieve a little more unity. I am sure that the very points that are giving rise to heat and to argument this afternoon were very much in the minds of the committee members when this legislation was before the committee.

The suggestion made by the hon. member for Ontario with respect to this particular provision has some merit, and the hon. member might wish to amend subclause (3) by substituting the words "All those persons" for the words "Every British subject".

The amendment before the committee seeks to achieve what perhaps most of us desire: it is the method of achieving that desire about which we seem to find some disagreement. Most hon. members are aware of the necessity to tidy up the approach taken by the standing committee to this particular problem, and the aspect of retroactivity leaves something to be desired as far as the phraseology is concerned.

The suggestion made by one of my friends to the left of me the other day has some merit, and if the members of the committee took cognizance of it we might be able quickly to dispose of the amendment now before the committee and to move on to a series of amendments that would allow the committee to put into legislative form many of the points that have been made in the debate this morning.

I contend that immigrants, particularly British subjects, should not simply be told once they have arrived in this country that we are sorry but the information they were given as to their right to vote is now incorrect, that we have decided to do something else. As members of the committee know, under the bill now before us a certain group

of individuals would be disenfranchised. Perhaps an amendment that would change the date of qualification from June 25, 1968 in subclause (3)(a) would correct the situation.

A number of suggestions have been made in respect of a time limit in this regard, and I have made my feelings known on this question. I should like to hear the views of the Minister without Portfolio. I urge the members of this committee not to support any amendment that would cause misunderstanding or hardship. It is quite evident, Mr. Chairman, that your committee was conscious of the necessity of putting this particular provision into some kind of order, particularly as far as those people who have chosen to come to Canada to live are concerned.

• (3:20 p.m.)

As I indicated, I must oppose the amendment we are considering now. I hope my remarks were not out of order and that hon. members will look at one amendment which I am certain is formally before us and another one which, if it is not formally before us, was certainly given to us for our consideration over the weekend. It does have the effect of preserving the right of those people who may come between now and the date of the next election to vote at subsequent elections. As a result of the advice we have given them, I suspect in many instances we have held out this right to them as an inducement to come and settle in Canada.

Mr. Stanbury: Mr. Chairman, I thank the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East for his interest in the Canadian Citizenship Act. I have mentioned that the Canadian Citizenship Act is under review. In recent weeks, I have been visiting every province in Canada consulting with leaders of citizens' organizations and others who are interested in citizenship law. I am not yet ready to make proposals to my colleagues as to what changes there should be in the law, but I hope to be able to do so shortly. I hope that my colleagues will agree there should be a bill on this subject before too long. The Act is outmoded, and I think it requires a great deal of improvement.

As hon. members may know, I have been interested in the subject now under discussion for some years. It has always been my contention that there should be equality of treatment in the Elections Act, as in all our laws, and that there should be no discrimination between people residing in Canada on the basis of their national origin. I think that is

the spirit in which the present bill is presented to this House, and it is the spirit in which a number of amendments have been proposed.

I should only like to say that I hope there will be no amendments which in fact accentuate or extend the ethnic elitism which has been present in the law. I refer particularly to the suggestion of the hon. member for Brandon-Souris, who is suggesting that we should indicate a superiority not only on the part of those who come from British countries but those who come from France. I reject that proposition completely on behalf of all those Canadians who have come here from other countries and who are equally as entitled to rights under our laws as those who come from countries of British or French connection.

Many members of this House will find, if they look back into their origins, that while their names may be Forrestall, Stanbury or Diefenbaker, their origins are very mixed. I doubt very much if a majority of the members of this House could claim to have some clear line of origin from France or Britain with no enrichment from other sources. I hope that the Elections Act will reflect this plurality of our population, and that it will be fair to all people who come to Canada and make their home here. I hope that will be the principle on which the new Canadian Citizenship Act will be based.

Mr. Perrault: Mr. Chairman, I think we are all grateful to the minister for the eloquent statement he has just made. This has been a very useful debate. A number of ideas have been advanced which reflect the concern of all parties in the House and their desire to make our system of elections as democratic and fair as it possibly can be. I must, however, oppose the amendment but not because I am unsympathetic to those who have spoken so eloquently in support of the view that the right to vote should be held exclusively by Canadian citizens. I know that in taking this position I will be in disagreement with some of my great and good friends on the government side, but I think we all hold our views sincerely.

It seems to me if the parliamentary system means anything at all, or if our system of law means anything at all, it means that we are very concerned about the rights of individuals. If the amendment before the committee is successful we would be depriving at least some people in Canada of the right to vote at the next general election in April of 1972. Let me explain that, and if I am wrong perhaps someone will wish to correct me.

If a British subject arrived in Canada on June 15, 1967 for example, and then proceeded to vote at the election in June of 1968, by April of 1972 that individual would not have qualified for Canadian citizenship because he would lack the five years of permanent residency which is necessary under the present legislation. Some members in the House are under the impression that British subjects are allowed to become Canadian citizens with only a 12-month waiting period. That is not correct. The requirement is five years permanent residency. The only person who may become a Canadian citizen on an accelerated schedule is a British subject who is the wife of a Canadian citizen.

One may well say that this affects only a small handful of people, but I think it is wrong in principle to say to a group of people who voted in the 1968 election that, even if they wish to obtain Canadian citizenship, they may not vote if an election is held before June of 1972. That principle is wrong. That is one of the small, technical reasons I simply cannot bring myself to support an amendment which would have that effect. Depending on the date of the next election, conceivably a great many people who voted in 1968 could be deprived of the right to vote. I am not prepared to support the amendment on that basis.

I can well understand those who want to achieve a middle position. Just as has been stated by the minister and others here, I cannot agree that we should preserve a cultural elite in this country and that people from British Commonwealth countries or from France should enjoy special status. That as well is wrong. That is why I lean toward an amendment which I hope will be considered favourably this afternoon. I do not intend to speak on it now but I have reference to the amendment advanced by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra. It seems to me this is the kind of compromise which may well improve the present situation, and may well enjoy widespread support in this House.

Mr. Prud'homme: May I ask a question? Do you not think that a period of two years is long enough for people who, at the moment, are not Canadian citizens to pick up their Canadian citizenship papers? Surely, that is long enough for them to make up their minds as to whether they are going to become

Canadian citizens. What is the great difference between two years and three years? They will still have to make up their minds.

Mr. Perrault: I appreciate the hon. member's comment but he still has not met the situation I outlined to the House. I think that an informed person can easily obtain his citizenship in two years. But we have to remember that we have the long tradition in Canada of people who have come here in the knowledge, or understanding at least, that as British subjects they have the right to vote in Canadian elections should they achieve one year's residence. I think the educational campaign alone requires more than two years. I ask myself what would happen if we had a by-election in the next few weeks.

• (3:30 p.m.)

Mr. Prud'homme: I covered the point.

Mr. Perrault: It may be, and I may have been out of the House at the time. But we must lean over backward to accommodate people if we take this action, and I think it will take longer than two years, as has been suggested by hon. members this afternoon.

I should like to come back to the point that as yet we have not met, the basic difficulty of a number of people who simply will not have the right to vote in 1972 if we act in the undue and unseemly haste which I think is reflected in this amendment.

Mr. Nowlan: I am glad to participate in the debate on the amendment to clause 14(3) of Bill C-215. I agree with my colleague, the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East, that, judging from the remarks made this morning by many hon. members, albeit with sincerity, they have contributed their thoughts without really appreciating the purport of the amendment that is before the committee or of the clause that is under study. I think it has been rather refreshing to hear the exchanges back and forth across the House. It is a healthy sign, and I believe the clause should be studied further by the Committee on Procedure. Although it may take more time, the atmosphere in the committee is more appropriate in spite of the physically exhausting meetings of that committee which we have been having.

I did not intend to participate at all in this debate until I heard different hon. members contributing their views, and I started to inquire just what was under debate. I read the clause and some of the speeches that have been made, and I share the view of other hon. members regarding the constructive nature of the debate. A little later I will comment on the contribution today by the hon. member for Saint-Denis. I find myself in the very refreshing position of agreeing with the remarks of the hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour. I share his enthusiasm and respect his energy, but sometimes I find I cannot agree with the decisions he makes or the way he votes. However, that is the prerogative of members of this House. I may go further than the hon. gentleman, but I am glad there are members on both sides of the House, including the hon. member for Ontario who spoke earlier, who are expressing different viewpoints on this very basic clause.

I should like to point out to the House Leader that if he wants to expedite the passage of Bill C-215, some members better get their heads together to find out where we stand on clause 14 (3) as well as the amendments proposed. Since this clause touches on a pretty basic and sensitive issue, as well as an emotional issue, as was apparent from some of the speeches we heard this morning, it may be the subject of a prolonged debate.

I have listened with interest this morning to many hon. members, as I did to the hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour a minute ago. He said that in Canada there are no special groups, that we are all Canadians. The hon. member for Fraser Valley East spoke with passion and conviction of his idea of Canada which I think would equal if not surpass some of the gratuitous remarks on nationalism made by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, be they made in Denver or before the Canadian Club. There is no one in this chamber who has a monopoly on being a good nationalist, a good Canadian, a good mother, a good father or a good member of Parliament. We all share these things. The difference is between prayer and practice. How do you define a good Canadian or a good nationalist?

I should like to speak particularly to the hon. member for Saint-Denis and to the hon. member for Winnipeg North—I will not mention him further if he is not here—as well as to the hon. member for Roberval, who spoke before noon and whom I informed of what I was going to say. I find it strange that we in this chamber can speak of no special group, no special status, when this Parliament, in trying 100 years ago to define a Canada enshrined a certain status and rights in some of the statutes of this Parliament. I only have to refer to the Official Languages Bill.

I say to the hon. member for Matane—who is sometimes in his seat and now I see him in the chamber—as well as any French speaking Canadian: Do not start to tamper retroactively with the rights that have come down through history. If you do you will shake the whole foundation, the whole platform of trust and confidence which it has been so difficult to build over the past 100 years. I am not referring to British subjects who come to this country today or who will come tomorrow or a year from now. I agree with the hon. member for Saint-Denis and the hon. member for Matane that these new Canadians, be they of Ukrainian, British, Italian or American origin, should all be treated the same. That should be the tenet of the just society. But I cannot be a member of a Parliament that refers to a just society and at the same time produces an amendment that unjustly and retroactively affects rights that were given to a certain class of Canadians long before we became Members of Parliament. This is what the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Matane seeks to do.

As I read clause 14 (3), it is a happy compromise and a good clause. It may not find agreement with all members of the House, but for any member who is not aware of what it says let me point out that it states clearly it would not apply to those British Canadians who came here before the last election. Perhaps if we had been members of the House back in 1867 there would have been a different law on citizenship and a different law regarding voting, but that is not the reality now. We are faced with a law that affects those British subjects who came to Canada and, rightly or wrongly, were given a certain privilege. This privilege should not be continued in the future, but certainly it should be preserved and not taken away retroactively today. What clause 14 (3) says is that British subjects who voted in the last election, and who are still resident in Canada, because of the conditions under which they came to Canada they shall keep the right to vote.

Since the act, as I understand it, is silent with regard to British subjects who came here after June 25, 1968, which was the date of the last election, those British subjects will face the same duties and responsibilities as the Italian, Spanish, German and other immigrants. If I misinterpreted this, I hope someone will correct me. In the future, from the day this clause is proclaimed, all new Canadians coming to this country will be treated equally. I think that is just. But I point out seriously to my French speaking friends, and especially to the hon. member for Roberval who spoke with such conviction about his own concept of Canada, and also to the hon. member for Papineau, who uttered some interesting sounds just before noon; stop, look and listen. If I understood correctly the contributions of hon. members this morning, I share with them the view that we should build a new constitution on the reality of today, looking forward to tomorrow, and perhaps forget about the reality of 100 years ago.

• (3:40 p.m.)

I say to the hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour that whether we like it or not we have a constitution, but because of the history of our country there is a difference in the interpretation of it. Was it a contract that was entered into in 1867? Coming closer to Mr. Pearson's day and perhaps the reality of the situation, was the objective to help build a land based on two founding nations?

This Parliament passed the Official Languages Act. It was because of the rights established in 1867, and it was because of the precedents and traditions that flowed from those rights that, in effect, we have two special groups in this country, English speaking and French speaking Canadians. Some hon. members may take exception to that statement, but I point out to some of my hon. friends who said, "Forget about history" that I share some of the views of the so-called third force. Are we to try to create a new constitution looking only at the retroactive rights acquired in 1867, at all of the good will and some ill will that flowed down to us during those 100 years? I say we should look at the reality of Canada today, and not only at the founding races in 1867. We should look at all of the races represented here today, and build our new constitution on that basis. One of the reasons we are so bogged down in the constitutional morass, and stuck in the swampland of constitutional debate, is that we have been looking backwards.

If the hon. member for Saint-Denis wants to project what I am saying into constitutional development, then I might go along with him, and with the hon. member for Matane on this bill, particularly if they want to forget the rights given by Parliament to certain people. The hon. member for Fraser Valley East mentioned that rights are changed every day, that we amend laws every day. I would ask him to stand up in this chamber this

afternoon, tonight, or indeed any time, and point out chapter and verse showing when Parliament has taken away rights retroactively. Of course we amend the laws, but we do so for the future.

I submit that the hon. member for Fraser Valley East was rather facile, and even facetious, when he said that we were here to pass laws. Of course we are, and that is what we are doing with Bill C-215. Clause 14(3) will affect people after it is proclaimed, but unlike the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Matane it will not take away rights those people have enjoyed for many years. I do not think it was intended that way, but I think there are some very iniquitous principles behind the amendment that could affect the fabric of the land.

The hon. member for Saint-Denis challenged the right hon. member for Prince Albert by saying that if unity would be diluted he would not support this amendment. He would not even support the amendment of the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra which would grant five years in which to effect the change. I point out that this bill, which was passed by the committee—it may not have been unanimous—in clause 14(3) takes care of the equities and balances the history of the past with the reality of the future.

French speaking members of the House who support this amendment should beware, not because the amendment by itself is going to stir up a lot of emotion, or cause an avalanche of backlash—I do not think that is necessarily the case—but because it could be a catalyst for that. The very fact that we have spent all morning and part of the afternoon debating this clause illustrates as clearly as anything that there is a problem involved, even though the hon. member for Saint-Denis says that in his heart he does not believe there is any problem caused by the clause or by the amendments proposed.

I can accept the bill in its present form because it will take care of the situation with respect to new Canadians in the future, from whatever country they come, but the amendment before the committee will retroactively take away a right that has been enjoyed by a certain body of Canadians. In this case it happens to be British subjects. It could have been Ukrainians, it could have been Canadians of Italian origin, it could have been French speaking Canadians. That is the important point we have to consider when we debate this clause.

[Mr. Nowlan.]

I look forward to creating a constitution on some of the principles enunciated by the hon. member for Saint-Denis, forgetting about the past and looking ahead to the future. But there is not a French speaking man, including the Prime Minister and French speaking members on both sides of the House, who wants to forget about the past when you talk about a constitution or about official languages. The Official Languages Act affirms some of the traditions, precedents and law handed down from the past. I suggest that what is good for the goose is good for the gander.

As the hon. member for Oxford said, adoption of the proposed amendment could act as a catalyst. He pointed out that a good many Canadians are starting to wonder what is going on, particularly with reference to this bill. When you start to build a country, in which one group was ignored for a long time, was held back for a long time—a lot of this the fault of that group itself—by strengthening that group through taking from another group which possesses rights given to it by parliament, then you are not proceeding in the right way to build a country. For that reason, I think all hon. members should pay attention to the implications of the amendments proposed. I think that clause 14(3) covers the situation fairly, balances the rights of the past, does not project any preference into the future, and does not retroactively take away rights.

Mr. Prud'homme: May I ask my hon. friend a question?

Mr. Nowlan: Yes.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Chairman, I am putting a question to the hon. member because he so often referred to the member for Saint-Denis.

I should like to ask him after listening very carefully to the speeches made this morning and this afternoon, whether this does not remind him of what was said during a debate on the new flag, that it would divide our country forever? At that time, I was in the House and I voted for that legislation because I was convinced that it was not a proposal which would divide our country, but would unite it. And there is no one in this House who can say that the new Canadian flag has divided our country, far from it. I have said that if they were convinced that this amendment would divide our country and if I were

myself convinced that this action was motivated by some anti-British feeling. I would vote against it. But I consider that this change comes within the natural development of our country towards what we call the total equality of all Canadians.

Does my hon. friend not believe that the feelings which motivated the flag debate are somewhat similar to those which motivate the debate now in progress?

[*English*]

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Chairman, I think the very fact that the hon. member for Saint-Denis poses that question shows the danger and/or confusion that will arise if we prolong debate on clause 14(3). I am not going to be diverted by any red herring about the flag. I was not in the chamber then, but if I had been no doubt I would have contributed my thoughts. We are not debating the flag. This section of the bill concerns rights given by previous Parliaments of Canada, citizenship rights and voting rights.

• (3:50 p.m.)

I suggest to my hon. friend that there is a big difference between this debate and a debate on what type of flag or national anthem the country is going to have. That is a sentimental subject, an emotional subject. Nothing was crystallized in a statute and that was why it was debated, so that we could have a national anthem and a flag. But that is another issue. The fact that my friend has tried to infer that my remarks are resurrecting the flag debate points out the danger we are in when discussing clause 14 (3).

I am saying sincerely that we are not dealing with emotion or blood, sweat and tears, as was the case in the flag debate, when the heart often ruled the head and speeches got emotional. Here, we are talking about rights under a statute, and I submit that the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Matane takes away those rights. It does not achieve what the hon. member for Fraser Valley East says he has in mind. Amending future rights is the purpose of Parliament but this amendment takes away rights. It is iniquitous indeed when the Parliament of any country, and especially our country composed of two founding races and many new Canadians, plays retroactively with the rights of citizens. As far as I am concerned, it is as simple and as basic as that.

Mr. St. Pierre: Mr. Speaker, I have listened to this debate with a great deal of interest, and it seems to me to have had a content which is lacking all too often in this chamber. Some of the remarks have been heavily charged with emotion, but that is not necessarily bad because it was an emotion that came out of sincerity and strong feeling for the country in an effort to do what was best for the country. In my remarks, however, I would hope to be entirely unemotional on this matter and to come down to the dry dust of the facts as I see them.

First of all, I should like to make a brief reference to the remarks concerning the status of the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek, because I feel a misunderstanding could result from this exchange. I suggest the hon. member was not asked to take out Canadian citizenship in order to get his passport but was in the position of a great number of Canadians during this past year and a half who have been asked and obliged to supply proof of citizenship. There is no doubt and no one disputes that the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek is a Canadian. I do not think that he or other hon. members should object to being asked for proof of Canadian citizenship. Neither do I think that I, or any native born Canadian or long naturalized Canadian citizen, should object. Let us remind ourselves of the situation when the issuance of Canadian passports was a scandal. Spies and other undesirables were making use of our lax laws in order to obtain false passports for improper purposes, so this country had a duty to itself and to the international community to tighten the regulations. This involves the presentation of proof of citizenship and, in my opinion is entirely proper.

Returning to the point at issue, after having listened to almost all of the debate it seems to me that there is a general disposition on all sides of the House to believe that citizenship is a privilege to be sought and that it should be a requirement for those who wish to vote in Canadian elections. There also seems to be a feeling that the special status enjoyed by some citizens of other countries should not be continued.

The hon. member for Brandon-Souris offered one exception to this. He felt that we should retain the present system for British people coming to this country and also that we should extend it to include French people. I find myself totally out of sympathy with this proposition and I have not heard hon. members from Quebec evince the slightest interest in offering special status to citizens of

France. I think most of us who have read history realize just how much love and interest France lavished on her people here. This was pointed out very dramatically by Mayor Jean Drapeau of Montreal who told how the French colonial governors scurried back to France, leaving their children tied to the kitchen and the barn. Quebec's code is "I remember", and I suggest that Quebec does remember.

The hon. member for Brandon-Souris was the only one who suggested extending these rights, however. The burden of the comments of other members has been that only Canadian citizens should vote. The dispute has settled on the question of whether British people who have had special voting privileges should retain them provided, as recommended in committee, that they voted in the election of June, 1968. Another amendment suggests a five-year waiting period. The amendment presently before us suggests a two-year waiting period and the movers of it feel that this is sufficient time to enable people to obtain their citizenship papers.

The speaker who preceded me suggested that taking away the special rights presently held by British subjects is retroactive legislation and therefore bad. I do not fully subscribe to this, Mr. Speaker. There are occasions in which retroactive law must be passed—in fact most budgets come in with retroactive provisions and this is necessary for the public good. In the case of the proposed sale of Denison Mines, and I was one who approved the government action there, hon. members will recall that the government said legislation would be brought in retroactively if necessary.

I do not believe that retroactivity is of itself wicked, but I suggest it should be brought in only when there is a clear demonstration of public interest. In this respect, I find myself powerfully moved by the speech of the hon. member for Ontario, who pointed out facts which all members should consider very seriously. There are people who have been in this country for 40 or 50 years, who have voted in every election and have served the country in war. Now, they are elderly and some are impoverished. How can we explain to them that, although they could vote in the election of 1968 and all preceding elections they cannot vote in 1972 unless they hold a citizenship certificate which will cost them $10. This is strange to them and they will resent it deeply.

• (4:00 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that if for 103 years British subjects resident in Canada have had special status it will not hurt to continue that status for a few more years. I am unable to find myself in sympathy with the amendment before us. However, I am in sympathy with its spirit. Practically speaking, it will be unfair to British subjects who have lived here, worked for this country and voted in our elections. Anticipating that subsequent amendments will be moved which will merely extend the period in which some people must apply for Canadian citizenship, may I say that they, too, will do the spirit of this country more harm than good. I intend to support the bill as recommended to the House by the committee, which sat long hours in study of this matter. It said that the British subject who was qualified as an elector on June 25, 1968 and who has since that time been ordinarily resident in Canada, should for his lifetime retain his special privilege which has been granted to him in the past. I think that the date of the passage of this bill is the proper date with respect to any new system of eligibility for voting in Canadian elections.

Mr. Walker: Will the hon. member permit a question? He emphasized heavily that the people of whom he was speaking, British subjects, have been here for 30, 40 or 50 years and that they have voted in many elections prior to the one in 1968. Is the reverse of this question also not correct, namely, that there are many who voted for the first time as British subjects in 1968 who do not come within the category of persons that the hon. member was speaking about generally?

Mr. St. Pierre: I do not know the answer to that, Mr. Chairman. I do not know how many British subjects voted for the first time in 1968. Nevertheless, I think that my suggestion with respect to a cut-off date is practical, and would be fairest for all concerned.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Matte: Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate that we fully and wholeheartedly support the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané), especially since when I first spoke on this matter, I pointed out this unacceptable gap in the Elections Act.

I also noted that the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise) had already introduced a bill dealing with the privileges the Elections Act gives to British subjects.

When one examines the present amendment, the following question comes to mind: How is it that in 1970 we find ourselves discussing the advisability of rejecting this amendment? I wonder why we are discussing this, since the question is of course beyond argument.

I wonder whether this is an illogical situation that some just want to perpetuate or unfortunate childishness on the part of many Canadians, because such provisions in the Elections Act are not justifiable on any grounds whatsoever.

And I mean it. For no reasons whatsoever. Indeed, if we were to inquire of 10 British subjects who are not Canadian citizens, who have been living in Canada for one or two years and have been through an election, we should no doubt find out that several of them did not avail themselves of that right to vote granted them by the act. I imagine that a proper British subject, arriving in Canada and finding that he has the right to vote after one year's residence, will refuse to exercise that right, for he cannot be aware of Canadian politics.

Besides, if he is already aware of Canadian customs, way of thinking and law, I suppose he will have seen fit to obtain a Canadian citizenship certificate. So I wonder why we are even discussing it.

This line of argument pursued theoretically could lead to the following conclusion. I say "theoretically" since in practice I cannot question anyone's intentions. Indeed, at some point, in some ridings on the island of Montreal, for instance, where English-speaking people make up 50 per cent of the population, scores of British subjects could be brought in and scattered in some strategic ridings to weigh down the scale of power. Theoretically speaking, this could be done if elections could be foreseen a year in advance.

It is unthinkable that such a thing can exist and we should all support an amendment aimed at amending the legislation by simply deleting subclause (3) of clause 14.

We claim to be adults and, consequently, we fail to see why Canadian citizenship should be given at a discount to anyone, be he British subject, French, Spanish, Portuguese, Russian, German or whatever. Discount sales are held in stores, but I do not see why the basic democratic right, the right to vote, should be given away to people who have just emigrated and who do not even have a certificate of Canadian citizenship.

To my mind, there is something sadly lacking there and, doubtless all my colleagues, especially those from Quebec, agree with the member for Matane in this regard and want that paragraph to be simply stricken out.

As for those who have already exercized their franchise as British subjects, and who are not Canadian citizens, they have of course had the advantage of a privilege. All they need do now is to make their participation to Canadian life formal by becoming full-fledged Canadian citizens. I do not see why a time limit should be set within which they can take out Canadian citizenship, and doubtless the authorities concerned will be pleased to grant it to them.

There is therefore no problem with regard to knowing how much longer that situation must be tolerated: it must no longer be tolerated. Indeed, it is intolerable, and because we have acted like children until now, by tolerating such exclusiveness in the law, is reason why it would be justifiable to maintain an absurd, idiotic and childish provision. We now have the opportunity to delete it; let us do so simply, and thus show that we are in an adult country, which is concerned about true democracy.

In closing my remarks, I wish to point out that subclause (3) is antidemocratic because the mere presence of a few hundreds of British subjects in a riding could tip the scales in an election one way or the other. Theoretically, that could happen. So, we see how liberty and democracy could be strained.

All of us hold democratic liberty dear; we now have the opportunity to prove it by deleting subclause (3) of clause 14 from this bill.

• (4:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Blair: Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak briefly in this debate. I wish to endorse the views expressed by some hon. members opposite, including the hon. member for Hillsborough and the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East. I also support the position taken a few moments ago by the hon. member for Coast Chilcotin and the position taken this morning by the hon. member for Ontario.

This is an important discussion. I make no criticism of the motives of the people who have moved this resolution which proposes striking out a proposed clause of the bill which denies those people who are British subjects and not Canadian citizens some of the rights which they now have. I think this

discussion has shown that the members of this House are trying to find a better way, if that is possible, in which the various people who make up our population can stand in some kind of approximate equality before our laws, particularly with regard to the important matter of voting in our elections.

I suggest that the search for absolute justice, which may give the appearance of treating everyone alike, can bring about unjust results. The point has been well made by several speakers that the people of this country have a differing status and differing rights which result from our history and the development of our laws over the years. I have no hesitation in saying that if this particular amendment is passed it will not accomplish a great national purpose of achieving equality between the various sections of our population, but rather it will have a punitive and discriminatory effect against a very large and important part of our population.

The hon. member for Saint-Denis has stated several times in the course of this discussion that if he could be persuaded that the adoption of this proposal will have a divisive effect, he will not lend his support to it. He appears not to have been convinced by the responses made by members opposite. Perhaps he will be more disposed to look more carefully at my opinion which is that this will have a divisive effect, and for that reason is to be deplored.

Many points have been made in this debate. It would be an imposition on hon. members who have sat through this discussion to repeat these points at this stage. One thing should be said by way of emphasizing what the Minister without Portfolio in charge of the Canadian Citizenship Act said earlier this afternoon. While this discussion has been going on I have been looking at the Canadian Citizenship Act and the various provisions contained in it relating to immigrants from the United Kingdom who are British subjects now resident in Canada. It occurred to me from this cursory survey of the statute, as the minister suggested, that it stands very clearly in need of study, revision and clarification.

I make the practical point that if the amendment of the hon. member for Matane is adopted, there will be a very confused situation at the time of any enumeration. Many people who have lived in this country for a long time would be uncertain as to their position. That appears to be a practical reason why we should not make any radical change of the type that has been proposed.

[Mr. Blair.]

I wish to reiterate a point which has been made many times by other speakers in this debate. There has to be a measure of justice, tolerance and respect between all sections of our population. We will not achieve this justice, tolerance and respect if we attempt to pass a law which is directed against a very substantial group in the population. There is no question in my mind that if this amendment is passed, it will have the effect of taking away rights which have been exercised by a large number of people in Canada for a very long time.

It will have the effect of depriving this important group of people of their franchise. I have been thinking about these people during the course of this discussion. They have contributed much to our country. Many of them have fought in our wars and many of their children have fought in our wars. I know of several widows whose husbands and sons were killed. We must be very careful before we say to these people that for technical reasons you are not Canadians like the rest of us, and you must go through some special procedure in order to vote as you have done in previous elections.

This is an unjust type of suggestion. It will strike many people as unfair because it has an element of injustice and unfairness about it. It is clearly predictable that the adoption of this resolution will have a divisive effect. It will be a reflection on this Parliament. It will be harmful to the country. For these reasons I hope this particular amendment will be defeated.

Mr. Prud'homme: May I ask a question? Does the hon. member believe that the fact that we want to Canadianize our institutions is divisive?

Mr. Blair: we are continually engaged in an attempt to make living in this country more acceptable to every part of the population. I suppose the word "Canadianize" applies to that. I can only reply by repeating my argument that no good purpose will be accomplished if in the process of making a change which one group thinks is important it alienates, infuriates and has a punitive effect against another section of the population.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Chairman, I regret that I have not been here for all of this debate. I

have been away for some time on parliamentary business. I have had the privilege of hearing part of the discussion this afternoon. I feel so strongly about what I have heard that I wish to express my personal opinion on the matter now under discussion. I have no hesitation in saying that I completely agree with the point of view so admirably put forward by the hon. member for Coast Chilcotin. The hon. member made reference to Canadian citizenship. This really hit me hard, because I have always felt that I am a Canadian citizen. Yet this Spring when my passport ran out—I have a green passport, a special passport, as issued to all Members of Parliament—I discovered that because of a strange system of bureaucracy and regulation requiring that certain things had to be done, it could not be renewed without delay.

I have been a resident of the city of Vancouver for 60 years.

Mr. Deachman: You are a Canadian.

Mr. Winch: You think so?

Mr. Deachman: Yes, you are.

Mr. Winch: I have been a resident of Vancouver for 60 years; I was a member of the British Columbia Legislature for 20 years, during which time I was leader of the opposition for 12 years. I served in the armed forces for three years and I have been a member of the House of Commons for 17 years. I have had a green special passport for 17 years. And when I applied for a renewal of my passport this spring, I was told I had to prove I was a Canadian citizen.

Mr. Deachman: So did I. So did everybody in this chamber.

Mr. Winch: Let me finish. Then, I had to wait for a month to get this card with my photograph on it before I could get a passport. Believe it or not, it hit me pretty hard that I had to prove, after all these years, with the record and career I have mentioned, that I was a Canadian citizen before my passport could be renewed.

Apply these circumstances to the change now proposed, the amendment put forward to the Elections Act. For 103 years, a British subject resident in Canada for one year was recognized as a Canadian citizen with all the rights of Canadian citizenship, including the right to vote, without having to produce a card with a picture on it to prove Canadian citizenship. Not thousands, not hundreds of thousands, but, I would say, millions of people in Canada not only believe themselves to be Canadian citizens but have been recognized as Canadian citizens with the right to vote, the right to become members of provincial legislatures and of Parliament. It would be a most retrograde step to say to these people, pioneers of Canada, that just because they are British subjects they no longer have any rights in Canada as far as voting is concerned unless they prove they are Canadian citizens by carrying a citizenship card. I sincerely hope that stupidity will not go so far as to lead us to tell these people that unless they hold an official card they cannot vote in the next election or in the elections which will follow.

[*Translation*]

Mr. De Bané: On a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman. I am the one who moved the motion to amend the bill. I believe every hon. member is discussing the amendment in good faith.

I will not tolerate that an amendment submitted by me should be termed stupid by an hon. member, whatever his worth and his record.

I respect the hon. member and I venture to believe that he also wants the debate to remain on a level worthy of all hon. members.

[*English*]

Mr. Winch: I wish the hon. member had thought of that when he introduced his motion, one which affects people who have been Canadian citizens upon all occasions and in respect of whom I think there should be no suggestion that they should lose their rights, or their understanding of being Canadian citizens by reason of a change in the Elections Act. I am sorry if I hurt the hon. member's feelings by saying I thought the amendment was stupid. If he does not like that word, I will put it this way: I regret that the suggestion we are considering should have been made by any Member of the House of Commons because it shows disrespect to millions of people in this country who have always felt they were Canadian citizens without requiring any card. I sincerely hope that in their wisdom, acumen and understanding the members of this House will take no action to alter the Elections Act so as to prevent these people from exercising their rights and privileges as Canadian citizens unless they carry a particular authentication. If, in the years ahead, it might be thought desirable to bring about a change in present policy, I hope it

will be done on the basis of a recognition that those who are Canadian citizens under our law are automatically accepted as being so.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Speaker, I am among those who think that this debate has lasted too long and, on the whole, that it has deviated from its purpose. It is important, I feel, to clarify certain things.

Some tried in their speeches to give the impression that there was a quarrel between French Canadians and English Canadians while there is nothing of the kind. We have proved, I think, that this is not so since we rejected the proposal of the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale) tending to grant French immigrants the same privilege as those from the Commonwealth.

I was surprised to find out that the most rabid separatists are not those from Quebec, as one would think, but rather those who persist in claiming special privileges while several New Canadians of all races, established in Canada for many decades, are as deserving as they are.

We want to decide, once and for all, whether Canada is self-governing country and whether all Canadians should be treated equally and enjoy the same rights so that nobody should have privileges.

I can understand that in the past privileges have been granted to some classes of citizens. It should not have been so perhaps and if it had not been the case, there would have probably been less misunderstanding and division in this country. I believe that we are now mature enough to decide that the status of Canadian citizen entails certain conditions that everybody will have to fill.

Some hon. members are shocked to be obliged to produce a proof of citizenship in order to go to vote but, after all, we are all required to do so. My ancestors came to this country in 1629 and this is much earlier than those of most of those who are protesting against regularizing a situation which has lasted too long already. And yet, we are obliged to prove that we are Canadian citizens in all sorts of circumstances where it is requested to produce our baptismal certificates in order to establish that we have the right to vote in such and such circumstance, which, besides, is the practice in every country in the world.

• (4:30 p.m.)

Those who since this morning have turned the debate into a racial conflict have done a disservice to the Canadian nation and to Parliament. The subject matter we are dealing with is injustice. Canada is a member of the Commonwealth, an organization that comprises 26 countries. Only eight of them give the franchise to Canadians and two do not give them the right to be candidates in any election. Why should we be asked to be more generous toward foreigners? In most cases, they are citizens of very small countries.

We are talking of injustice, Mr. Chairman. We are not disfranchising anyone. We simply say to foreigners: Go and register as Canadian citizens, then, you will vote in the next election. We do not want to deprive you of your privileges, because you have been just as good Canadians as the others, you served during the war, you paid taxes and contributed to the economic development of Canada about which we are so proud.

I do not think that hon. members from Quebec could be blamed for bringing racial considerations into the debate. On the contrary, we have proved since the beginning that we wanted to build a united and independent Canada. Indeed, I think that we have had some merit since all year round we fight against those of us who advocate separatism, who tear at the fabric of Confederation. I do not understand that some of our opponents, who wish to perpetuate this system of privileges, to which no other Canadian is entitled, do not realize that they are those who are responsible for the division from which we are suffering at this time in Canada, and which we are trying to minimize by all sorts of means.

Mr. Chairman, again I say that we are not taking anything away from anybody, that anyone wishing to vote could register. The formality is very simple, but if they do not deem the Canadian citizenship worth that small effort, they do not deserve to be considered as Canadians.

In opening my remarks, I said I thought that this debate had lasted too long. I shall not dwell on this, except to urge all my colleagues to talk with all possible objectivity, even if they are influenced by some particular considerations. Therefore, may I be permitted to ask my colleagues to put an end to this discussion and to proceed to the vote, so that this question might be settled once and for all.

[*English*]

The Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Amendment (Mr. De Bané) negatived: Yeas, 22; nays, 30.

The Chairman: I declare the amendment lost. Is the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre rising on a point of order?

Mr. Benjamin: No, Mr. Chairman, to speak in the debate.

The Chairman: The hon. member for York-Sunbury.

Mr. MacRae: Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I outlined very briefly the other day. I am not going to repeat what I said at this particular point; I will merely present my amendment to you and to the leaders of the parties. What the amendment does, in effect, is to retain the status quo. I move:

Resolved that clause 14(3) be deleted and the following substituted:

(3) Every British subject, other than a Canadian citizen who has been ordinarily resident in Canada for the twelve months immediately preceding polling day at such election, is qualified as an elector.

The point of this entire amendment has been very well expounded in this House by the hon. member for Cumberland and the right hon. member for Prince Albert. I will say no more but would ask you, Mr. Chairman, to put the amendment.

The Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Amendment (Mr. MacRae) negatived: Yeas, 7; nays, 46.

The Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Chairman, last Tuesday I and a number of other members, following the amendment moved by the hon. member for Matane, outlined the sense and the wording of amendments that we had in mind to this particular clause. Rather than repeat what I said last Tuesday, I refer hon. members to page 8208 of *Hansard*.

• (4:40 p.m.)

I wish to move an amendment to subclause 3 of clause 14. I may say at the beginning that it seems to me what is in question here is not whether or not people should have Canadian citizenship in order to retain the franchise in federal elections. That principle is being embodied in the bill. The objections which have been voiced have mainly related to the timing and how this is to be brought into being.

I have said before, and I repeat, that I approve in general what is in the bill, but it applies retroactively from June 25, 1968. In fact, it applies to British subjects who have arrived or will arrive from June 26, 1967 up to the coming into force of this Act, whenever that may be.

Hon. members may follow the wording of my amendment by referring to page 8208 of *Hansard* the second column about half way down. I wish to move:

That clause 14 be amended by deleting subclause 3 on page 24 and substituting therefor the following:

"(3) Every British subject, other than a Canadian citizen, who

(a) was qualified as an elector immediately prior to the coming into force of the provisions of this act referred to in subsection 2 of section 119, and

(b) has not, since that date, ceased to be ordinarily resident in Canada, is deemed to be qualified as an elector.'

The purpose of this amendment is to apply the principle in this bill, but to make it effective when this bill comes into force rather than on June 25, 1968. In other words, those British subjects who arrived in Canada after June 25, 1967 up until the date this bill comes into force will still be able to vote in a federal election as British subjects, but those people who arrive in Canada from the day after this Act comes into force will be required to obtain Canadian citizenship the same as anyone else who comes to Canada. The principle that is intended in the bill would take effect some three years later than is proposed in the bill.

I estimate this would affect somewhere between 60,000 and 80,000 British subjects who will have immigrated to Canada between June 25, 1967 and the day this act comes into force. I have had some communication with people who are in this category, and it is possible other members have also, and I cannot agree completely with the remarks of the hon. member for Coast Chilcotin regarding retroactivity. I still do not believe that the provision of the franchise or any changes affecting it should be made retroactive. Our electoral law should take effect from the day the law comes into force, not prior to it coming into force.

I submit, and I hope the members of the committee will agree, that this is not a major change in the bill. I submit it does provide

fair treatment for all those British subjects who arrive in Canada prior to the coming into force of this bill. Those who arrive after that will be treated the same as any other immigrant. They will know about this change when they arrive. They will not be told about if after they arrive, thinking they have the right to vote in a federal election, or after they have voted in a federal election.

I commend this amendment to the committee, and I hope it will prove acceptable to all members as an addition to what I think is the generally welcomed principle being established under this new election law.

Mr. Prud'homme: I will be very short, Mr. Chairman. Let me bring to the attention of the hon. member that if we agree to this amendment we will not only have two classes of Canadian electors, but within one of those two classes we are creating two classes of British citizen in Canada, those who were here before and those who came after. We will have more division created among British citizens because of these two classes of electors of British origin.

Mr. Benjamin: It seems to me that what is now in the bill does that. Our defeat of the previous amendment, in effect, confirms what is in the bill. All my amendment does is extend this principle for a further short period. It extends the present status of British subjects under our law. This bill creates two classes now. The committee has had ample evidence that hon. members do not agree with the amendment. They agreed generally with the principle in the bill. All my amendment does is extend that principle for a short period of time.

Mr. Macquarrie: I should like to commend the hon. member for Regina Lake Centre on his excellent amendment. I wish he had brought it before the committee. He would have improved our wisdom then and, heaven knows, we might have been away over to page 199 by now. In a sense, I think the hon. member has tidied up this whole matter in that he has brought the question right up to the proper time. I have reference to the time of the passage of this Act. With reference to my friend and fellow traveller, the hon. member for Saint-Denis, it is very difficult it seems to me to avoid this matter of having two types of British citizen because we have already voted down one amendment which would take away for the duration of this legislation those rights which people have had

[Mr. Benjamin.]

for a long time. We have now just voted down an amendment which would extend those rights.

What it seems to me we are doing, to use a non-legal term, is phasing-out rights which were granted to people in times past. I think the most logical way of approaching this is the way suggested by the hon. member; that is, up to the passage of this legislation those rights which were granted would be honoured. Surely, this is what we have been looking for all the way through. This is a very reasonable method of dealing with this whole matter. We have agreed wisely, as a committee, that we should neither extend these rights in the future nor cut off those rights that were legitimately extended in the past. It seems to me that the hon. member has bridged the gap. He is a very thoughtful member and I am sure he has also considered the change in the age group. There will not be this five-year gap with people being deprived of rights which were granted to them. This amendment will do away with that retroactive problem. This is a very commendable measure and I urge support for it.

Mr. Allmand: I have just a few words, Mr. Chairman. My principal objection to the amendment now before the House is that it perpetuates the right of a group of people who will, until they die, have the right to vote without becoming Canadian citizens. It even goes beyond what the government has in the bill. The government would perpetuate the rights of a group of people who had the right to vote up to June 25, 1968. They will continue to have that right until they die. This amendment would go beyond that group and include all those who arrive in Canada up until the date this Act is put into force.

I much prefer the amendment suggested by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra which would give these people five years to obtain their Canadian citizenship. He suggested an incentive in the law which would continue for the time being the right to vote but would place an obligation on these people to obtain their Canadian citizenship within five years. The amendment before the House does not bring any end to this privilege, and I call it a privilege. I am afraid I will have to vote against it. I hope the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra will introduce his amendment so I can vote for it.

• (4:50 p.m.)

Mr. St. Pierre: Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago I expressed myself in favour of

the legislation as submitted by the committee under clause 14 (3), namely, that the cut-off date should be June 25, 1968. I should like to say very briefly that I listened to the statement of the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre and it seems to me that his solution is a happier one than the committee's. Therefore, I would like to support his amendment.

Mr. Forrestall: I would just like to add to the words of my friend, the hon. member for Hillsborough, and compliment the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre on having indeed tidied up what seems to be an oversight. I should not like to anticipate an amendment which I am sure will come before the committee before the afternoon is over, but would like to reiterate my own position by saying that I cannot see how, having once given a right to a group of individuals, we can ever take it away.

I would like to go back to the position of the committee, the principle on which the clause is based and the clause that is currently in the bill which is being amended by what I say again is a reasonable amendment. I would like to indicate that once we have done something, surely it is not right morally, legally or in any other way to take away that right, particularly from people who come here between now and the date of the next election after the date of the coming into force of this act, as well as those who came after June 25, 1968. I do not see how we can disenfranchise 60,000 or 70,000 new Canadians in this category if over the next two or three years the trends in immigration to Canada continue as they have.

I think that while there is not much point in reiterating the arguments that have been put forward in the last few hours in the committee, I must make it clear that the tidying up amendment of the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre is far more preferable, to me, than any amendment which might be moved which would take away all the rights of British subjects. I think we have already dealt with that matter.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Matte: Mr. Chairman, I only wish to point out that we missed a while ago an exceptional opportunity to settle the entire problem. Indeed, the amendment under consideration does not really introduce anything new, except that it frankly recognizes that all those who wish to vote in Canada should be Canadian citizens. Now, the amendment proposed by the hon. member merely, as it were, gilds the pill.

I would like to take this opportunity to point out that I fail to understand why so many government members did not vote a while ago in favour of the amendment of their colleague from Matane (Mr. De Bané), especially the hon. members for Chambly and Missisquoi (Messrs. Pilon and Forest).

[*English*]

Mr. Coates: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member who is now speaking is referring to the vote which was taken on the amendment of the hon. member for Matane. I do not believe he has any right to make suggestions about how any hon. member voted in this regard.

Mr. Chairman: The committee has heard the amendment moved by the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre. Is the committee ready for the question?

Amendment (Mr. Benjamin) negatived: Yeas, 25; nays, 41.

The Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

Mr. Deachman: Mr. Chairman, many hon. members have expressed concern throughout the day for the position of those who came to this country from Great Britain, as British subjects, who under Canadian law were given equivalent rights of citizenship as every Canadian citizen and who, even after the Canadian Citizenship Act of 1947, were given the same rights under our electoral laws. They are to be considered in the amendments which we have before us because they are among those who, like the citizens of Canada who were born here or who came here and took out citizenship later, have been virtually citizens of Canada.

So when we think of this law and of how we are going to amend it, we must think with compassion of those brothers who have virtually held with us a status almost akin to citizenship. Therefore I have a small amendment which I think perhaps can find a middle ground between those who feel that an elector should be a Canadian citizen, on the one hand, and those who feel on the other hand that British citizenship should continue to be a qualification to taking part in a federal election. As a solution I propose simply that a space of time should be given for British subjects to acquire citizenship, and that after that period the qualification for a Canadian elector should be Canadian citizenship. I therefore move:

That Bill C-215 be amended by striking out line 10 on page 24 and substituting the following:

"—is, during the period commencing on the day upon which this act is assented to and terminating five years from that day, deemed to be qualified as an elector"—

• (5:00 p.m.)

This amendment simply means, Mr. Chairman, that all those British subjects who were qualified to vote in the June, 1968 election—not those who voted but those who were qualified, which includes those who voted—within five years after the coming into force of the act would have to acquire citizenship in order to vote again. If any election should take place within that five-year period and they had not acquired Canadian citizenship, they would of course be eligible to vote in a federal general election or by-election, but after that time they would have to acquire Canadian citizenship in order to vote in such elections. What are the advantages in having an amendment of this kind? First of all, in the amendment before us in the bill we have taken a step toward making citizenship a qualification for becoming an elector. The problem is that this is achieved simply by entrenching it in the bill.

The Chairman: Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member. I was not sure whether he was planning to speak to the hour, but I must point out that the House must now proceed to private members' business.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Chairman, if there is any disposition to carry on, we do not want to take advantage of the government's fumbling and bumbling on this matter and we would not object to an extra hour or so.

The Chairman: Perhaps the correct procedure would be for me to rise, report progress and then hear hon. members on this point.

Progress reported.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: When shall the committee have leave to sit again? Next sitting of the House?

Some hon. Members: Now.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, we are not opposed to the suggestion that has been made, that we carry on with the elections bill, but I think the House should give a hand to the hon. member for Surrey (Mr. Mather) who had an important speech he was prepared to make.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed that the House revert to committee of the whole for the purpose of considering Bill C-215?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Prior to reading the order I wish to inform the House of the business to be dealt with at the time of adjournment: The hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Harding)—Pollution—monitoring of waters receiving effluent discharges from plants using mercury; the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale)—Health and Welfare—inclusion of optometric services under medicare; the hon. member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Rose)—Industry—proposed closing of Canadian subsidiary by Skil Corporation of Chicago.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CANADA ELECTIONS ACT

MEASURE TO CONSOLIDATE AND REVISE

The House resumed consideration in committee of Bill C-215, respecting the franchise of electors and the election of members to the House of Commons—Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale)—Mr. Faulkner in the chair.

Mr. Deachman: Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to overcome the objection contained in the present clause of the bill which would entrench all British subjects qualified as electors in June, 1968, as electors until the time they cease to vote or until they die. It overcomes that objection by giving them adequate time in which to obtain Canadian citizenship. It is interesting to note who those electors would be. They would not be all those British subjects who acquired Canadian citizenship prior to December 31, 1941, and who by virtue of the Citizenship Act of 1947 automatically became Canadian citizens. It would include all of that class who came to Canada after December 31, 1941, and who after that time had not taken out Canadian citizenship.

We can only make a guess at how many people that group comprises. According to the 1961 census, the number of U.K.-born people

in Canada represented about 5.3 per cent of our population. This in turn represents about one million people or more living in Canada today who were born in the United Kingdom. About half of those would be on the electoral rolls. So we are looking at something in the neighbourhood of half a million people who were qualified as electors in 1968 by virtue of being British subjects. Who will have to take out Canadian citizenship in order to qualify after a five-year period? It will not be, as someone suggested, the older persons who came to Canada before December 31, 1941, because those people are automatically Canadian citizens under the Citizenship Act. Moreover, my amendment does not require that they go through any procedure with the citizenship court in order to demonstrate the fact of their citizenship. They are Canadian citizens, and they no more need produce a citizenship certificate than someone born in Canada is required to produce his birth certificate, unless he happens to be challenged at the polls on his qualification to vote. So proof of citizenship is not an immediate or first requirement in registering as an elector, although from our familiarity with the act we know that it may be if the matter is disputed.

At this stage I wonder if I may clear up a point that has troubled some hon. members. It has been expressed in several ways today but still does not appear to be quite clear. First of all, those who acquired citizenship by virtue of the Citizenship Act of 1947 are not required to take out citizenship today. They are required to give proof of their citizenship. They are required to get the little card to which the hon. member for Vancouver East referred. It is the equivalent of a birth certificate. When a Canadian citizen is asked to produce proof of citizenship, he produces his birth certificate for which he paid two dollars to the registration office in the province of his birth. A person not born in Canada can produce proof of his Canadian citizenship by sending $2 to the citizenship court and obtaining a citizenship certificate. It does not cost $10, as someone suggested this afternoon. It is not an amount that would be a burden even for an elderly citizen.

The bill is specific in saying that this is not an application for a grant of citizenship. Item 3 of the regulations says that where a Canadian citizen desires a certificate of citizenship, he shall file an application on the prescribed form with the registrar, which is a very simple procedure; it is quite different from going to the citizenship court, being examined and making application for a grant of citizenship. So some things that have been said here this afternoon about citizenship and the rights of citizens, and about British subjects, have not really been in context with the act that is before us.

• (5:10 p.m.)

The amendment that I have is quite a simple one, Mr. Chairman, and meets the middle ground that all members want to meet in respect of this question. It minimizes the burden on these people making the transition and wishing to have their citizenship in good time for future elections, at the same time giving them an opportunity to vote under their old status as British subjects should an election be called within the next few years.

Mr. Coates: Mr. Chairman, in moving this amendment the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra has indicated what I find to be the most objectionable aspect of it, that is, that people who thought themselves citizens of Canada will now have to prove their citizenship. Some members seem to think there is nothing wrong with this. They believe it is quite all right that someone who has lived in this country since 1947 and believes himself to be a Canadian citizen will find, if this amendment goes through, that he is not unless he can meet the bureaucratic demands of this government to prove it. The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra says this is not any different from an application for a birth certificate. I suggest that if he had talked to people who had the problem, he would not make that comparison.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Coates: There is a great deal of difference between getting a birth certificate and being told you have to prove you are a Canadian. I am sure that the hon. member for Vancouver East and the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek, with hundreds of thousands of Canadians who will find themselves in the same position, object very strongly to it. Having considered themselves to be Canadian citizens all their lives, suddenly they find that they must produce evidence of their citizenship. Apparently it makes no difference what service they gave to their country during that time.

Mr. Stewart (Cochrane): How do officials know that unless it is proved?

Mr. Coates: That is the trouble with this bureaucratic system; the officials have to be

told everything. The hon. member for Vancouver East has probably participated in politics for as long as he has lived.

An hon. Member: He is not that old.

Mr. Coates: Suddenly he is told by the bureaucrats in Ottawa that he must prove he is a Canadian. I am not alone in objecting to this. Some of my constituents find it very embarrassing and difficult to understand. As members of this House I do not think we should be causing any Canadian citizen to be embarrassed in any way, especially those who have participated in a very worth while way in building this country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Coates: What is the reason for all this embarrassment? It is very simple. At the time of the assassination of Martin Luther King, the Secretary of State for External Affairs had to draw up new regulations because the accused assassin had made a fool of his department. As a result, every Canadian who unfortunately happened to come from Great Britain many years ago now has to prove that he is a Canadian citizen. It is as ridiculous as this government is most of the time.

As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, this amendment is not as good as the proposal put forward in Bill C-215. At least under that bill people who thought themselves to be Canadians, who have lived in this country all their lives, will not suddenly discover that they have to pay the bureaucrats $2 to make the decision that they are Canadians. It is a head tax—$2 a head. As the member for Vancouver Quadra stated, there may be 500,000 such people in this country, so the government has found $1 million there. It is indirect taxation, a head tax. If you come from Great Britain, you now have to prove that you are a Canadian. It is a ridiculous situation and it will be made more ridiculous should this amendment pass.

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Coates: Certainly.

Mr. McIntosh: A moment ago the hon. member was asked a question by the hon. member for Cochrane. He wanted to know how the civil servants would know one was a citizen unless he made an application. Being in the same position, I should like to ask: How does the person or the department to whom I make application know that I am qualified as a citizen? The only difference is that they are getting $2 from me that other people do not have to pay.

Mr. Coates: Perhaps the hon. member should direct that question to the hon. member for Cochrane, who seems to know all the answers about how the bureaucratic—

Mr. Stewart (Cochrane): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Since I have been brought into the matter I should like to tell the hon. member that I paid a couple of dollars to have a citizenship certificate because I am proud to be a Canadian.

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Chairman, I do not know what the insinuation was when the hon. member for Cochrane said that he was proud to be a Canadian citizen. This morning I said in the House that I served six years in the armed services, and I certainly did not do that for the money. I was proud of serving what I thought was my country. If there was an insinuation in the remark I should also like to ask, through you, Mr. Chairman: How does the civil servant know, unless you put in an application for citizenship? I would suggest to you that—

• (5:20 p.m.)

The Deputy Chairman: Order, please. I would suggest that the hon. member address the Chair.

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Chairman, through you I say to the hon. member for Cochrane that a civil servant rules, when I put my application in, whether I am a citizen or not. So far as I am concerned, the $2 does not enter into the question. It is a matter of principle, of tradition and of right. The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra has suggested that if you were in this country before 1947, automatically you have become a citizen. If his statement is correct, why does not the country of my adoption issue me with a citizenship certificate, without my needing to apply for it and pay $2? Somebody is wrong, and I should like to know who it is.

An hon. Member: You are.

Mr. Pringle: Why don't they issue you a car licence every year?

Mr. McIntosh: For the same reason that they do not issue the hon. member a chicken licence.

Mr. Pringle: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, may I tell the hon. member that

every year the authorities issue me a chicken licence.

Mr. Forrestall: That makes the hon. member Canada's No. 1 chicken.

Mr. Pringle: I get it without making an application.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, when emotional matters such as one's concept of Canadian citizenship are being discussed we often get ludicrous situations which can become very tense. I do not think that they add anything to what the committee is trying to determine. What we are trying to do as reasonable men and one reasonable woman—

An hon. Member: She is always reasonable.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Yes, the woman in this House is always reasonable, as my colleague says. I wish the Minister of Justice had accepted some of her suggestions.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Howard (Skeena): But that is another matter. Here we are trying to deal with the rights of people in a democratic society to elect their government and their Members of Parliament. That, basically, is what we are concerned about. We are trying to define the restrictions that shall pertain to the right to vote. For example, in the past we have said that the right to vote should be restricted to those who are 21 years of age and over. We have now determined to lower the voting age to 18. My friend, the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre, made a proposition to the committee a while ago which was not accepted. In view of our history, we thought his suggestion was correct and that it would preserve rights which people had. But it was not accepted. That does not mean that we shall blandly reject everything else presented to the committee because an idea which we suggested in the first instance was not accepted.

As I said, I have been partial to the idea that those who have been resident here for one year with landed immigrant status should be allowed to vote. I chose one year because that period applies to British subjects other than Canadian citizens. I believe that the one year provision is also contained in the Citizenship Act. I am very partial to the idea that people who have lived in Canada for one year, have become permanent residents—to the extent that we can interpret what "permanent" means—have obeyed our laws, paid their taxes and assumed their other responsibilities should be given the right to vote. They are denied that right by the provisions of the Citizenship Act unless, after a residence period of five years, they become Canadian citizens. I am partial to the idea of allowing these people to vote after they have been here for one year, that is, between that period when they have been here for one year and when they may apply for their citizenship papers after residence of five years. But simply because I am partial to that concept and some colleagues of mine are partial to other concepts relating to people's rights does not mean that I would not endorse or accept suggestions by other hon. members about the fundamental and basic right to vote.

We are concerned about equality. I would much rather have our concepts of equality expanding than restricted. As a nation we are concerned about equality. I do not think any one of us in this House is any less proud of being a Canadian simply because we lack a piece of paper, with a picture on it, which says you are a Canadian. Although we may not all endorse the suggestion made by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra, you must remember that we are not concerned about partisan matters but about fundamental rights. As an hon. member said, we must approach this question, from the reasonable point of view. If we were unwilling to do so we would automatically reject the proposition of the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra on the ground that it not on all four fours with the concept that other members of the committee have about the fundamental right which we are discussing.

We think—I am speaking on behalf of myself and a number of my colleagues—that although the hon. member's suggestion is not as generous as other suggestions we endorsed and which were rejected, we ought to approach this matter as reasonable men. We ought not to take positions that will be unwieldy and will embrace all the points raised. As far as we are concerned, we support and will vote for the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra. We will do so because we think it has merit and because, as reasonable men, we are looking for something that is acceptable and is not clouded with emotion, as some of these questions are. The question of whether a piece of paper with a picture on it ought to confer a special privilege that somebody who is not a Canadian citizen ought not to have, is a question that is surrounded by emotion.

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, I will not be talking about licences or citizenship certificates. I can tell my hon. friend for Cochrane that I own a Canadian citizenship certificate. It is four times larger than the one he has, and I paid only half what he paid because I obtained it years ago. But I will not let anyone suggest that I am four times a better Canadian than he is, or that he is half as good a Canadian as I am.

I have had the feeling at times, as we have discussed this amendment, that perhaps we are seeking to do through the Elections Act what should more properly be done through the Citizenship Act. That has troubled me a little. I have been for a long time convinced that the Citizenship Act needs amending. Its provisions respecting the period of residence are most in need of amendment, as I think my hon. friend from Saint-Denis said this morning. Since we are trying to be as reasonable as the hon. member for Skeena sometimes is, I will not speak against this amendment merely because it is proposed by my hon. friend from Vancouver Quadra, but there are some things about it that trouble me.

I still feel this is an exercise which some people in this country could and would, I fear, regard as an act of bad faith. If I were talking about American constitutional law I would refer to the Bill of Rights and to the passing of *ex post facto* legislation. The amendment reaches back and strikes those people who came to this country some time ago. It now tells them of requirements which, at the time of their arrival here, they were told they did not need. To that extent it is *ex post facto* law, and to that extent it is reaching back retroactively and changing something. That is what I find repugnant about it. It is an act of bad faith. I fear it will create two classes in this country. There will be those who will go through the formula which this amendment imposes on them in order to get the vote—something which they had before—and there will be those who will not do it. It will not be a distinction between those with a state and the stateless; it will be a distinction between those with the vote and the voteless. At a given time they all came out here with the same rights, not with reference to citizenship—it is wrong for us to say that—but with reference to the election right and with reference to the right to vote.

• (5:30 p.m.)

Whether there are 100,000, 200,000, 500,000 or one million is not the question. The number is immaterial. The question is whether it is right or wrong, just or unjust. Incidentally, the number is quite large. I was impressed by a report of the Select Committee of the Ontario Legislature. It referred to the number of people who had come to that province in the years mentioned in this discussion. Because it has the impact of retroactivity, because it can be construed as withdrawing that which decent people were honourably given, and because it can conceivably set up distinctions among people who came here without distinctions one against the other, this is not the best way to approach it. As we move down the line, I think from what we have left the recommendation in the bill is to be preferred to this.

[Mr. Howard (Skeena).]

Mr. Cullen: Mr. Chairman, I wish to make just a few remarks on some comments that have been made. I feel the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra meets the situation, namely, that we are in a transitional period toward Canadianism. I take exception to the hon. member who said that British subjects contributed and fought as Canadians. They contributed and fought as British subjects. They were given this special right or privilege to vote. In essence, we are not taking that away from them. We are in a period of transition where it will be necessary for them to become Canadian citizens in order to have this right and privilege. I asked myself which is the greater act of bad faith, the kind of legislation now proposed or the act of bad faith by the British subject who comes to this country, earns his livelihood and does not pay us the respect of taking out Canadian citizenship.

I do not think we are looking at two classes of citizens. We are moving through a transitional period where Canadian citizens will have the right to vote. I am a little unhappy that the Canadian Citizenship Act was not amended in advance of this act. If it had been, we would have been able to vote a little more intelligently on this piece of legislation. I have my own point of view in so far as the Canadian Citizenship Act is concerned. I agree with the hon. member for Skeena that there are many instances of people who came to this country, paid their taxes and reared their families, and do not have the right to vote. Others have been given the special privilege of voting because they happened to be born in Australia, Great Britain or some other British Commonwealth country. For this reason I support the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Matte: Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment briefly on some of the arguments that have already been voiced.

As I said during the debate on the amendment introduced by the member for Matane (Mr. De Bané), I feel that we are discussing something which in itself is beyond argument: one should be a Canadian to be entitled to vote in Canada. In my opinion, this should not even be questioned, it should be accepted, period.

It is rather curious that the right to vote of certain Canadians is not acknowledged. For instance, we are still reluctant to grant the right to vote to the first inhabitants of the country, the Indians. This right is given to aliens before native people. If having to prove that one is a Canadian citizen before being allowed to vote seems extremely hard to those who are British subjects, it certainly amounts to belittling Canadian citizenship. Why not take it calmly and simply take out Canadian citizenship?

Why should a British subject hesitate to become a Canadian citizen?

This is a completely abnormal attitude. Therefore, I would be in favour of proposing a new amendment which would not make any exception and would grant that right to Canadians only.

It has been argued that some people were in the Canadian or British armed forces, that they fought for the country, for freedom. In that case, would all Canadians who served in Europe be entitled to vote in each of those countries? That is ridiculous. If the fact of having fought in a world war enabled someone to vote, then we could vote in all the countries of the world.

Let us make it a requirement that to be an elector in Canada, one must be a Canadian citizen. It is as simple as that.

The Deputy Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question?

[*English*]

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a few words about this amendment. As I said when speaking on the previous amendment, I am talking about the principle involved. Quite frankly, I do not see any difference between the principle of the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra and the principle of the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Matane. The only difference is that there is a time limit imposed. To those who spoke against the amendment of the hon. member for Matane, including the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton, I point out that I do not understand how in principle they can swallow the sugar, sweetness and superficial logic of the amendment of the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra.

I return to the basic question involved in this discussion, which has occupied quite a bit of time today. Perhaps that is a good thing. It has started to open avenues of thought. There has been an exchange of views. This exchange has been healthy, rather than smothering, because we do not always have the opportunity to express ourselves. One element that has not been mentioned in this debate regarding the British subject voting in Canada is reciprocity. Although many of us will not go to England, Australia or any of the other Commonwealth countries, there is that element to be considered. I will not waste much time on that aspect of the matter.

Mr. Ouellet: There are only six.

Mr. Nowlan: The member for Papineau again speaks from the repository of his brain when he sits in his seat. I ask him to repeat that verbal contribution.

Mr. Ouellet: I said that only six countries out of 26 have this reciprocity. Of this number only three are of major importance—Great Britain, Australia and New Zealand. The others are not of the same size as Canada in terms of population.

• (5:40 p.m.)

Mr. Nowlan: I am glad the hon. member for Papineau contributed those few remarks, and I hope he will elaborate on them later in connection with this or some other subject. I do not intend to come to that question for a while. I am not stressing the reciprocal element. I qualified my remarks on that.

I would just point out that this question is not quite as simple as everyone waving a Canadian flag and saying they are good Canadian federalists or nationalists, people who claim to be great Canadian nationalists from sea to sea, speaking both languages. There is the element of reciprocal recognition in six countries, as the hon. member pointed out. Three of these, he says, are important countries. The number involved here, as my hon. friend from Hillsborough says, is not important. The number is irrelevant to me. I do not care whether there are 500,000, one

million or 50,000. It is the principle involved. There is one principle at the reciprocal end of this recognition. I do not intend to develop this aspect of the matter any further.

I come back to what I said earlier with regard to the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Matane. There is an elementary principle involved here. Everyone should be cognizant of it and respect it. My hon. friend from Hillsborough talks about *ex post facto* legislation. I call it retroactive legislation. Generally, retroactive legislation is bad. There are some special circumstances, as the hon. member for Coast Chilcotin mentioned earlier, in which it might be necessary. I think of the proposals introduced on budget nights, proposals such as were made to deal with the situation involving Denison Mines. But in general, retroactive legislation is bad, and retroactive legislation affecting the rights of individuals is odious. A legislature should be wary of trespassing in areas where fundamental rights are involved.

There are many in this House, and I might be among their number, who question whether in times gone by a special class should have been acknowledged. But that is irrelevant to the discussion today because there is, in fact, a special situation existing. As the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra agrees, a special situation came into effect under the terms of the Citizenship Act of 1941. Are we going to find the hon. member for Matane, the hon. member for Saint-Denis or the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra bringing forward amendments to the Citizenship Act, in the next session of Parliament, seeking to get rid of this special class? If we extend some of the logic to which we have listened this afternoon, they might as well. I myself might think that it was not a bad idea. I qualify my words very quickly. If I could get hon. members opposite, the hon. member for Cochrane or the hon. member for Saint-Denis to agree to the logical extension of that principle, I would come right back to the fundamental rights which have sprung from the time French-speaking Canadians and English-speaking Canadians got together. That is the basic element involved in this clause.

I do not intend to wave the Union Jack. I respect it as part of our tradition, but I am glad we now have a flag of our own. I do not want to be sidetracked by a red herring. I never was against it. I think that debate overshot the mark by many, many days. But that debate is past. I am going back to the fundamental rights of English-speaking Canadians and French-speaking Canadians. I say to my French-speaking friends that if they extend some of their logic today about removing special classes, removing special rights, forgetting about the past completely, I say "Hooray"—we shall go on to a day of reality when we can sit down together, English-speaking Canadians, French-speaking Canadians, Ukrainian-speaking Canadians, Polish-speaking Canadians and Italian-speaking Canadians, in a constitutional conference room and draw up a constitution corresponding to the realities of today.

I would very much like the hon. member for Saint-Denis to make a speech on the constitution in this chamber at some stage in the life of this Parliament and say, "Let's get right back to square one". Why not use the reasoning he has propounded today in connection with this amendment to clause 14(3) when he declared there should not be special situations or special rights? He invited us in effect to forget about special classes and special rights and start on a brand new piece of paper with a revision of the constitution in which no account was taken of the special rights of English-speaking Canadians or French-speaking Canadians. Inherent in his reasoning was an appeal to take the Canadian context, the Canadian mosaic as it exists today, bearing in mind that there are today more new Canadians from other ethnic groups than either French-speaking or English-speaking Canadians.

If the hon. member really wants to accept that principle, I hope he will make the constitutional speech I have suggested, and I hope he is as active in propagating this point of view as was the hon. member for Papineau, who has evidently been travelling round Quebec describing how federalism works. The hon. member for Matane, when he was travelling around Quebec, described what federalism meant to a lot of CGEPs. That was a laudable effort. I do not know if it confused them. In light of the vote in the Quebec election there might be some discussion as to how much of the message was sold. But the hon. member may have done an interesting job.

Be that as it may, if he follows through his logic of today, forgetting about the pre-conditions to this whole institution, the conditions which made the two races come together, and the fact of Canadian life together with the three elements, English-speaking, French-speaking and new Canadians of other origins, we had better look at the whole constitution again, we had better look at the official lan-

guages act again and start out, as I said, with a brand new piece of paper. The reality of a country, the reality of a constitution and the realities of people who come together in a country such as Canada, which stretches from sea to sea, is that it is not possible to start out in a vacuum. We are bound to go back and see what our roots are; we are bound to go back and see where our people were, where our descendants were, where the graves are. It is necessary to go back to find out where you have populated, where you have prospected and where you have had some dreams. You do not start out in a vacuum. Yet today some hon. members appear to forget so much of our history. I have Irish blood in my veins, and I shall not necessarily wave the Union Jack because some people in Ireland, where my ancestors came from many centuries ago, do not think the Union Jack is all that great.

I am not proselytizing for the Union Jack; I am not proselytizing for the English tongue as compared with the French tongue. I am proselytizing, I am preaching, I am philosophizing about what makes a country tick—and you do not make a country tick when you have one-eyed vision. You do not make a country tick when you have a patch on one eye and then start to go blind in the other. I do not question the motives of any hon. member who has spoken today in this most interesting discussion. It has been a basic exchange. I say in all sincerity that you cannot take a constitution in a vacuum; you cannot start in Canada today and forget about everything in the past; you cannot concentrate on one element only, for example on British subjects, forgetting completely not only the English-speaking people who will one day come to Canada once we pass a law which affects them but the British subjects, the Commonwealth subjects who came to Canada under the law as it stood and as it stands today until we pass a new one.

This question involves fundamental rights, right or wrong; and I suppose there is considerable room for debate there among hon. members. Once we start taking away fundamental rights retroactively, whether they are language rights, voting rights or citizenship rights, we establish in this chamber a precedent which can come back like a boomerang and affect the rights of any minority anywhere in this land. It is for this reason I feel so strongly that many hon. members who are sincere, and who hold their convictions as strongly as I hold mine, are misguided. They are dealing here with a right. Some members opposite, and even some members on this side of the House, may feel it is not an important right; they may feel that the numbers involved are not important. Again I come back to what I said earlier: the numbers involved, the degree of importance of the right, do not interest me at all. It is the principle involved. I agree with what the hon. member for Sarnia said about the citizenship legislation. I agree that some confusion may have arisen in our minds in this area. I am not interested in the citizenship question. I direct my remarks to clause 14(3) which is under discussion.

• (5:50 p.m.)

If I can be a little political at this point, I find it passing strange that the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra, whom I understand is the co-ordinator of committees of this House, should be the member, among all others who feel strongly on this subject, to bring before this committee an amendment which destroys the unanimous recommendation of the Standing committee on privileges and elections. This it does as effectively as does the amendment moved by the hon. member for Matane, except that the amendment of the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra has a five-year reprieve. How the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra can reconcile his position as co-ordinator of committees in this House with his position as the member who will cut the guts out of clause 14(3) today—

Mr. Deachman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Nowlan: Certainly.

Mr. Deachman: Is the hon. member suggesting that my right to move amendments in this House ought to be abridged in some form?

Mr. Nowlan: If I had my way, your right to sit here would be abridged in a good many ways.

Mr. Deachman: Then you run against me in the next election and you might have that privilege.

Mr. Nowlan: There was nothing personal in that remark. It was just a statement of opinion made on the floor of the House. I would not say it in the corridors outside. As far as the question was concerned, I think it is passing strange, in view of all the fuss and talk

about participation in committees, about members involving themselves in committees and committees holding 14 meetings on Tuesdays and Thursdays, that once a committee has finally reviewed this bill the co-ordinator of committees in the House becomes the hatchetman to cut the guts out of this clause under discussion.

I appreciate that the hon. member has every right in this House, as I have, to make speeches and to move amendments. Nevertheless, of all members in the House who feel strongly about the bill, it is the hon. member who cuts out the guts of clause 14(3) by his sugar-coated amendment. The hon. member for Matane should feel very pleased that his point of view is being adopted by some members who felt otherwise in earlier votes. In effect, his amendment has been stolen or has been converted to the use of the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra, because the effect of both amendments is exactly the same. I see the hon. member for Matane shaking his head. He knows of which I speak. Certainly that is the basic intent of this amendment.

It is not on grounds of reciprocity nor of past history that I take my stand; it is because I seriously believe that retroactive legislation is bad. Retroactive legislation that affects the rights of people is even worse. Clause 14(3) will affect a certain body of people in the land. Whether or not they are citizens is another point. Many of these people have been voting in Canada for up to 50 years, and there may be 500,000 of them. If this bill is passed in its present form, the rights they now have had will be taken away. I say that instead of advancing the cause of unity in this country, this bill will disenfranchise those who have enjoyed the franchise up until now.

I do not want this issue to become confused with the position of newcomers to Canada. I agree that there should not be three or four classes of Canadians given certain privileges, if this can be avoided. There are several classes of Canadians today. For example, we have British subjects who came to Canada and are covered under the old law. English-speaking and French-speaking Canadians have certain rights under other laws. Then I admit there is that anomalous group of British subjects who are covered under the existing law. But until Parliament changes the law that applies to newcomers to Canada in the future, it would be a mistake to pass a bill that would disenfranchise and adversely affect the rights of so many Canadians who have enjoyed the franchise heretofore.

[Mr. Nowlan.]

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Chairman, I do not think this amendment should be voted on until someone on the government side satisfies me, at least, of its legality. In the next two or three minutes I should like to direct my remarks to the right of the committee to accept an amendment which, in effect, in a legal sense demands the amendment of other law. I am not learned in the law. As a matter of fact, I am not very learned in many matters. But it does seem to me that there is a serious point involved here and I am wondering why the minister who is piloting the legislation through the committee, or for that matter any other member of the government, has not bothered to address himself to it.

Before the question is put, preferably when we reconvene at eight o'clock this evening, it would serve the members of the committee well, as well as assist in the task ahead of us, if the minister during the supper hour would obtain a legal opinion on whether what the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra has proposed is indeed within our capacity to accept.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, could I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Forrestall: Yes.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): To what other law is the hon. member referring?

Mr. Forrestall: Do we not have a citizenship act?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): This amendment would not affect citizenship in any way. Is there some other law to which the hon. member is referring, apart from his apparent feeling that this amendment relates to the citizenship act?

Mr. Forrestall: I do not want to seem facetious, but this amendment is like "Mission Impossible". It it self-destructive in five years. I do not want to destroy the lives of 500,000 people who have protection under another act passed by this House. If they do not have protection, will the minister stand up and say so? Is the House Leader telling me that there is no other act in the country dealing with citizenship?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): There is a citizenship act, but the amendment does not affect that act. Indeed, the clause we are dealing with does not affect the right of any Canadian citizen at all. The rights of all Canadian citizens are those determined by the Canadian Citizenship Act. This amend-

ment neither adds to nor subtracts from the rights of a Canadian citizen.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Chairman, may I call it six o'clock?

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Chairman, when we rose for dinner at six o'clock I was wondering out loud about the effect of the amendment on the status of those people who came to our country prior to 1941. Apart from adding the further comment that I would find it a matter of personal regret if the members of the committee sought in any way to make life a little more difficult for those people who have been here for many years, I would bow to the wisdom of the committee. I do not believe it is a right step. As my colleague from Annapolis Valley and others indicated earlier, any motion which reaches into the past to deny rights that have been given must in some way constitute a breach of faith. With the assurance that this will in no way affect the status of those people who were dealt with in 1941 or who came to this country prior to that time, we are prepared to allow the amendment to come to a vote.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could just satisfy the hon. member in that regard. I advanced an opinion before the dinner hour regarding the extension of the qualification in respect of British subjects other than Canadian citizens, and I might explain that turn of phrase by pointing out that of course under our citizenship act all Canadian citizens are by definition British subjects. This amendment does not in any way affect that status. The fact that the right to vote is given or withheld under this act does not in any way change their basic status as Canadian citizens. They are required to look to the citizenship act and to their status under it as to whether or not they are Canadian citizens, British subjects or aliens. The giving or withholding of the right to vote does not affect that status in any way. By way of analogy I point out that our friend the Chief Electoral Officer is disqualified from voting in an election. The fact that Her Majesty's judges are not entitled to vote in an election does not make them any less Canadian citizens. In a certain number of limited cases there has been the removal of the qualification to vote, but that does not affect citizenship status.

There is one thing I think it might be worthwhile referring to because the question was inferentially raised by the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek this afternoon. That is whether or not there would be difficulty for someone who is in the situation where he was not born in Canada but is deemed to be a naturalized Canadian by reason of the Canadian Citizenship Act. The question is whether such a person would in any way require proof upon this rather difficult legal question of citizenship. Certainly the electoral act does not put this difficulty in this way. I draw the attention of the committee to clause 45 generally and subsections 4, and on, at page 112. This clause makes it perfectly clear that a person appearing at a poll and seeking the right to vote cannot be required to produce a birth certificate, naturalization papers or anything else. He can be required to swear an affidavit of qualification to vote, in form 43. He is not required to produce the kind of documents we were talking about earlier today.

In short, Canadian citizenship for the purpose of this act is as interpreted by the Canadian Citizenship Act and regulations. In some cases it may involve a difficult combination of law and fact as to whether a person is a Canadian citizen both for the purposes of getting a citizenship certificate and for voting in an election. That matter is not affected either favourably or unfavourably by this bill. It is not affected either way by the stipulations in the Canada Elections Act or in particular by the one we are debating now.

The Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Amendment (Mr. Deachman) agreed to: Yeas, 44; nays, 8.

The Chairman: I declare the amendment carried.

Mr. Dinsdale: Mr. Chairman, in the preliminary skirmish on this bill and this particular clause, which has consumed a considerable amount of the time of the committee, I indicated that I would propose an amendment. The reason I am disturbed by some of the amendments being proposed is that they are restrictive in their application of the right of the franchise, rather than expansive. Hitherto, in the progress of Canadian democ-

racy toward the universal franchise every change that has been made in the Canada Elections Act has been to broaden the base of the voting privilege rather than to narrow that base or to become restrictive in the application of that right.

• (8:10 p.m.)

The amendment I was thinking of at that time was in the following words, and it is found on page 8259 of *Hansard*. It is an amendment to subclause 3 of clause 14, and reads as follows:

(3) Every British subject, Commonwealth citizen and citizen of France who has landed immigrant status and who has lived continuously in Canada for a period of one year following the granting of landed immigrant status is deemed to be qualified as an elector.

The thinking at that stage of the debate was that an amendment of this kind would encourage arrivals into Canada to take out landed immigrant status with a view to eventually becoming citizens. Also, as I indicated when we were discussing this matter last Wednesday, I thought that an amendment of this kind would reinforce the values and the traditions which hold the Commonwealth together.

I have been interested to note the comments of the Prime Minister since his return from the Pacific rim tour. He gained a fresh appreciation of the importance and significance of the Commonwealth association. As it has emerged in our modern world, it is an association that has no formal constitutional basis and yet is one of the most meaningful international groupings to be found anywhere in our sadly divided planet. The forces that hold the Commonwealth together are traditions and values that have emerged largely out of the influences that have come from the mother of Parliament at Westminster.

As I listen to the discussions in the House it becomes obvious that the government wants to remove the traditional voting rights of British subjects who are living in Canada, which automatically means that it wants to downgrade the rights and privileges of people coming to Canada who have Commonwealth citizenship status. To my way of thinking this is a retrograde step and, as I have already indicated, it is restrictive rather than expansive.

Another comment that I would like to make is that by broadening the special privileges that have been granted to British subjects and Commonwealth citizens living in Canada, we were encouraging a greater degree of participation and involvement in the whole governmental and democratic process. Having listened to the debate, and particularly in light of the amendment which has just been passed by the government majority, I shall have to change my tack somewhat and I will move an amendment to the amended clause 14 by adding to that clause a subclause 4.

[Mr. Dinsdale.]

During the course of the debate there was some objection to the original form of the amendment that I proposed in that it marked out special classes of people. It seems to me that it is the general sentiment of the House that the time has perhaps come when we might apply the privilege of voting at an earlier stage, on the road to their becoming fully-fledged citizens of Canada, to all new arrivals with landed immigrant status. This is a consummation devoutly to be wished, and certainly it is in tune with the tendency in all previous amendments to the Canada Elections Act to extend the principle of voting universality and put it on a broader base. With this in mind I want to move the addition of the following subclause 4 to clause 14 which, in view of the even more stringent, restrictive amendment put forward by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra—which has just been passed—narrows the voting base almost along the same line as that proposed by the hon. member for Matane. The exception is that it gives it a five-year hoist when the same principle would apply. Therefore, I move the following amendment:

Every person who has landed immigrant status and who has lived continuously in Canada for a period of three years following the granting of landed immigrant status is deemed to be qualified as an elector.

In putting forward this amendment I am aware that the special privilege that was granted to residents of Canada who are British subjects qualified them to vote after one year. Perhaps that is an arbitrary figure, but in light of all the considerations involved in the matter I think at this stage, and in view of the fact that we are making this provision all-inclusive so as to apply to all landed immigrants, the three-year figure would be more appropriate.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, I think I originated the other evening, part of the concept herein contained, but for my own part I cannot possibly support the proposition just put forward by my friend the hon. member for Brandon-Souris, for a number of reasons, not the least of which is that it gives to people who are neither Canadian citizens

nor British subjects a preferred class status over and above Canadian citizens and British subjects. As a consequence of the amendment which we have just passed, if British subjects did not become Canadian citizens within five years of the coming into force of the act, they would cease to have the right to vote. The amendment before us simply and unalterably says that every person who has landed immigrant status—which, as I read it, means immigrants from whatever country—and who has lived in Canada for three years shall have forever the right to vote without taking any steps whatever to become a Canadian citizen.

• (8:20 p.m.)

It is on that ground that I must oppose the suggestion contained in the amendment. I am very partial to the idea that people of landed immigrant status during the period of time that is arbitrarily selected, whether it be one year or three years as is contemplated here, and the period of time defined under the Canadian Citizenship Act—which now requires that a person be here for five years before he can even apply to become a citizen—be qualified as electors, but they lose that qualification if they do not move as quickly as possible to become Canadian citizens and in fact become Canadian citizens. That is a proposition to which I am partial, and I had drafted an amendment to present to the committee. I did not proceed with it, partly because of the immediately preceding amendment that has passed and partly because of the reaction of the committee to the amendment of my hon. friend from Regina-Lake Centre relating to British subjects, which was preliminary to the idea that people other than British subjects should also come within the ambit of the law. But they would lose the right to vote if after a certain period of time, in one case determined by the Canada Elections Act and in the other by the provisions of the Canadian Citizenship Act, they did not come citizens. The treatment afforded the amendment of the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre led me to believe that the proposition I had been advancing would not be accepted. The committee had already rejected the concept with respect to British subjects.

If the committee had accepted the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre, I would have taken that as support for the idea that people, during the period they are prevented from becoming Canadian citizens, should have the opportunity to vote, but once that period of time had passed and they did not become citizens they should lose that privilege. For these reasons I did not move the amendment I had originally conceived.

The amendment now before the committee has no cognizance whatever of the concept of Canadian citizenship. It just says that anybody from any country may for the rest of his life continue to elect members to the House of Commons. The further presumption is that he will be eligible to run as a candidate and to be elected, which is stretching the point beyond all possible acceptance.

The Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Amendment (Mr. Dinsdale) negatived: Yeas, 12; nays, 50.

The Chairman: Shall subclause 3 as amended carry?

Mr. MacLean: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word on this principle, if I am still in order, so that the public will have knowledge of why a particular point of view is held and why some members of the committee voted as they did on various recommendations. For my part I feel, having listened to the speeches of a number of hon. members, that many hon. members started with the wrong premise. If that was the case, then of course it would be difficult to arrive at the correct conclusion.

Running through the speeches of many hon. members I saw a thread of supposition that the act, as it previously stood, represented a particular privilege so far as English people were concerned. If that were the case I would immediately vote for the elimination of that section from the Canada Elections Act. The concept of this clause is entirely different. I think it is an honourable one to which all fair-minded Canadians could quickly subscribe. The question is whether people who have lived under the same type of democracy that we enjoy, and who are familiar with our parliamentary system of government, should not have the right, on coming to Canada, of exercising the franchise a little sooner than emigrants from a country with an entirely different type of governmental system, even one with a dictatorship. That is the principle which the act tried to designate. In most cases it is a mutual right.

I do not think this right exists because of any international agreement in the Common-

wealth. It is one that Canadians enjoy in a number of Commonwealth countries. It is perhaps true that not too many Canadians emigrate to New Zealand, Australia or Great Britain; but a few do, and they would be recognized in those countries as special cases, as persons who had familiarity with the type of parliamentary democracy which is common to most Commonwealth countries. Many members of this House of Commons are members of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, which is a body of elected representatives from most of the Commonwealth countries, one of whose aims is to safeguard our common heritage, to try by discussion to solve our common problems and to develop a type of internationalism within the Commonwealth. I think that is an honourable and reasonable aim. But by the action we have taken we are again taking ourselves away from the international association known as the Commonwealth, and we are doing it for what I believe are the wrong reasons. In an age when we should work, wherever practical, toward international understanding we are returning to narrow nationalism.

• (8:30 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLean: For that reason I think this amendment, and even the amendment in the bill if it had been left that way, is a retrograde step. I think the amendment moved by the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre would have been a slight improvement to the bill, but a number of the other amendments would not.

I regret, Mr. Chairman, that for the wrong reasons we are doing what I believe is the wrong thing. For the reasons I have stated, I would have preferred to have Canadians of whatever background realize that they have this slight advantage, this token advantage of being members of the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth has a common heritage and it is still a force for good in a very confused and chaotic world. Some people would ask what the Commonwealth means. I stand subject to correction, but I do not recall any two Commonwealth countries going to war against each other. It is true that India and Pakistan almost did, but I believe the fact that they were members of a Commonwealth was a restraining influence. It is true that there have been civil wars within the Commonwealth, but I believe it is still a force for good, internationally. Membership should not only be of benefit to a nation in the international sense, but it should bring benefit to the individual citizens of the Commonwealth.

In the debate some members seemed to indicate that we were giving citizenship to a certain favoured class of people by allowing them to vote. That is not the case. There is no connection between the right to vote and the other privileges of citizenship. These were benefits which Canadians enjoyed and which other countries unilaterally will now take away from Canadians although they may apply in only a few cases. No doubt they will be taken away when we start this trend toward the narrow nationalism which the bill proposes.

The Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Chairman: Shall clause 14, subclause 3 carry?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): As amended.

Subclause 3 as amended agreed to.

On clause 14, subclause 4—*Disqualifications.*

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, I have only one copy of the amendment which I intend to move to subclause 4 because I handed out the copies I had prepared on Tuesday of last week when I wanted to give some prior indication of it to the committee. The sense of my amendment is shown at page 8201 of *Hansard* for June 16 and it relates to subclause 4 paragraph (e) which reads as follows:

> every person undergoing punishment as an inmate in any penal institution for the commission of any offence;

My amendment seeks to remove paragraph (e) from subclause 4. If it is carried, I assume the easy and automatic amendment would be made to the following paragraphs simply by relettering them. I did not put that in the amendment because it is consequential and should flow automatically. I do not anticipate any difficulty in that regard.

The purpose of the amendment is to give people in jail the right to vote in federal elections. Paragraph (g) of subclause 4 would exclude people guilty of corrupt or illegal practices relating to the electoral law. Clause 80 of the bill also covers this category, so that people who have committed an offence against the Elections Act would not have the

right to vote, whether or not they were serving time in a penal institution. But all other classes would qualify provided they met the qualifications of being 18 years of age, Canadian citizens or British subjects not disqualified by the five-year rule which the committee has just passed.

I am not sure of the history of the proscription against inmates of penal institutions voting in federal elections. It probably stems from the time when the inmate was totally removed from society and deprived of every vestige of right. There was no concept of parole, rehabilitation or anything of that sort—just the concept of incarceration for the term of his sentence. Once the sentence was served, his rights were reinstated, but during incarceration there was no privilege of correspondence, visiting with friends or anything of an educational or rehabilitative nature. Probably this prohibition in the Elections Act stems from that early approach to penology when inmates of jails were simply forgotten until it became time for their release.

Today we have a more enlightened and generous approach to people who offend against the law. We have the concept of parole, which is a stepping-stone to the complete rehabilitation of the individual. We have the concept of probation and the concept which has just passed this House, of expunging a criminal record after a certain period of time. Within the penitentiary the inmate has the right to correspond with his Member of Parliament and his immediate family and, subject to the approval of officials, to correspond with friends or with a lawyer on legal matters.

• (8:40 p.m.)

Inmates of penitentiaries can also see television programs brought to them from all over the western world. They learn about the current news and read newspapers and magazines. Inmates of penitentiaries are now given passes which allow them out for two or three days at a time. They may go to the downtown area or elsewhere to look for employment they wish to take up on leaving the penitentiary. There is parole and compassionate leave.

In addition, some inmates before they are released serve the remainder of their time, not on parole but in an institutional structure which in some parts of Canada is a house like many similar houses in the downtown area. An inmate may leave the house, go to work and return to it that night. He is allowed more extended freedom than in jail, and this prepares him for his release. A whole raft of new attitudes is showing up toward inmates of penitentiaries. People are more ready to admit them back into the social stream so that they may participate with the rest of the country in social activities in which the rest of society is engaged.

The purpose of the amendment I am putting forward is primarily rehabilitative. It is to involve the inmate, while he is in jail, in one of the processes of our democracy that deals with a social order of things from which the inmate has dropped out. Because he has become cynical about them and rejected them, he has got into difficulties and landed in jail. I think we ought to take this further step in giving the inmate an opportunity to participate in our electoral process and to choose a Member of Parliament who will have authority and jurisdiction over the penitentiary structure in which the inmate is housed.

I think, secondly, that the mere fact that here we have established a group electors will in itself tend to cause political parties to make a more meaningful determination of penological matters. Candidates would tend more readily to visit penitentiaries in their constituencies. If they did it for no reason except the garnering of votes, something would rub off on them and on the political party they support. Our concepts about penological matters would more truthfully reflect the actual situation in jails. At present we develop our political policies for penitentiary matters in an atmosphere that is far removed from that of the actual prison structure. We seem to develop these policies without really knowing what it is we are developing policies about. Giving inmates a vote would have a secondary effect.

May I draw a parallel. They used to say that the people who were excluded from the vote were people in mental hospitals, those in jail, and Indians. A few years ago we took the Indians off the proscribed list and everyone, including the hon. member for Kamloops-Cariboo, will agree that since then political parties and candidates have paid more attention to Indian people and Indian affairs, even where that has been done for political reasons—and I am not saying that it has been. Actually, I think there was a great deal of altruistic concern about Indians. The point is that candidates and parties began to be more interested in Indian affairs. I think something similar would happen with respect to inmates of penitentiaries.

I know that I ought to have raised this matter before the Standing Committee, but for some reason which escapes my mind at the moment I was not able to appear before the committee and raise it. However, I do not think that should diminish the force of what I am trying to say, and it should not diminish the consideration that the committee will give to this matter.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I move:

That clause 14 be amended by deleting paragraph (e) from subclause 4.

Mr. Alexander: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. member would permit a question. I have found his statements extremely interesting. Has he any statistics showing whether similar provisions are in force in other countries in the free world? I hope he will deal with this matter so that we will know whether we are pioneering this sort of thing, or following others.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, I can only say this to my hon. friend for Hamilton West. If we are pioneering in this field, good for us. I do not say that personally. If we are following the example of others, if other democratic nations have adopted this course and we are following suit, again I say, good for us. Frankly, I do not know what they are doing in other countries; I have not examined this matter. I have only looked at the situation in Canada. We are revising the Elections Act for the benefit of Canadians, and the Parliament of Canada must deal with the Elections Act. I hope it will also deal with the matter of penitentiaries.

I could find the answer to the hon. gentleman's question very quickly. Later this evening I might consult Mr. Hamel, the Chief Electoral Officer, who may have knowledge of this matter. That is the best way I can answer the hon. gentleman's question. I do not know what is happening in other jurisdictions. I am not too concerned about it because I believe we ought to develop law which is suitable for this country. If such provisions exist in other countries, I say good for them, whether we follow suit, as I hope we shall, or not.

I have discussed this question with Mr. Hamel and with Mr. MacLeod, who was at that time Commissioner of Penitentiaries. He spoke to me shortly before resigning as commissioner. I do not think that lessens the value of what he said to me. I wanted to discuss with these two gentlemen the procedural aspects of this matter as it fell within their respective jurisdictions. Mr. Hamel said—I hope I am not misrepresenting our conversation—that there would be no trouble so far as he could see with respect to the procedural aspects of enumeration, revision on election day, etc. As a matter of fact, it might be more easy to enumerate in a penitentiary than in many city communities; the penitentiary authorities would have a fairly accurate record of those qualified to vote.

[Mr. Howard (Skeena).]

An hon. Member: Unless some were out flooding the rink.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Quite; unless somebody was flooding the skating rink. I think the list of electors would be fairly easy to obtain, even if one or two might not be home, so to speak, at the time of enumeration.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): We could leave them to the posse!

Mr. Howard (Skeena): One question that Mr. Hamel raised, and which has crossed my mind, is this. The voters' list is a public document and some people in jail may not want their names to be included on any such public document. Of course, their names no doubt appeared in the newspapers when they were first sent to prison, but most of us hope that these matters are quickly forgotten. We want to preserve the integrity of the individual. Once a man has been incarcerated, his identity should not be disseminated throughout the community. I have spoken to a few people in penitentiaries about this matter, and that is their feeling. On the other hand, I received a favourable response from people about the idea I am trying to promote, which I think is very heartening. Some people have said that not everyone need be included on the published voters' list. It is the right of the individual to decide whether he wants to be registered along with other people in society. I realize that there are greater pressures on the person in jail, from the point of view of whether he shall be registered or not, then there are on the person outside jail. There is another matter that we ought to be concerned about. Subclause 4(f) points out that every person who is restrained of his liberty or movement or deprived of the management of his property by reason of mental disease is prohibited from voting. I understand this is the procedure followed by people in the psychiatric field with regard to people who are in mental hospitals and thereby restrained of liberty of movement. Some of these people are permitted to leave the mental hospital for

a few days or a week at a time but must return for examination. Individuals in that category, while being under the care of the mental hospital, are permitted to leave and are eligible to vote under the act. They are not restrained of their liberty of movement; they have liberty of movement. This is decided by the psychiatric people.

• (8:50 p.m.)

I understand that the procedure followed with respect to these people is to list them on a supplementary list at the court of revisions. Their position in society is not revealed. Amendments to voters' lists have much less distribution. This procedure might be used for inmates of penitentiaries who do not want to be placed on the voters' list. If the penitentiary is listed as a rural poll, the procedures available for swearing in voters as rural electors when their name is not on the list could be followed. This would preserve the identity of the individual.

I have a connected amendment to the urban voters situation which provides that a person whose name is not on an urban voters' list may be sworn in and vouched for by a select category of individuals such as lawyers, barristers, magistrates, school principals, notary publics or similar groups who are accepted by the passport office as able to vouch for people applying for passports, plus one or two enumerated categories of people able to take affidavits under the Canada Elections Act. I have such an amendment. If my companion amendment were carried, such a person would be further protected as far as identity is concerned and would be able to be sworn in. Mr. MacLeod, Commissioner of Penitentiaries did not conceive any great difficulty in this. He thought it could be worked out very well within the administrative structure of the penitentiaries.

One area where there may be a difficulty, although I do not think so, is with respect to the election campaign. Normally, in an election campaign the candidate has the right to go where he pleases, to visit people, meet them, go to their homes or place of business and explain his policies and seek their vote.

The Chairman: Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but the time allotted to him has expired, unless there is unanimous consent to allow him to continue.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): That is very kind of the committee and I express my appreciation. I have reached the last point I want to make. It is the opinion of Mr. MacLeod that candidates of political parties visiting inmates in a penitentiary to explain their point of view must be subject to the rules of the warden and the security and administrative requirements of the institution. The candidate would be under the authority of the warden as to what he could do and where he could go. The commissioner and the warden would have the final say as to what occurred in the institution. Any problem that may develop in that regard could be dealt with.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): As the hon. member has pointed out, Mr. Chairman, this matter was not canvassed among the members of the Standing Committee. It was brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member on second reading. At that time I called it to the attention of the House and, I hope, the public to see the reaction to this particularly novel proposal. I found that amongst those I talked to there was no consensus on this point. I talked in particular to my colleagues. Their opinion was divided on this question, basically along the lines of their opinion on corrections matters generally. Speaking on behalf of the government, I cannot say that there is a collective opinion in this regard. I believe there are opinions on both sides within this group. I am not inclined to take a government position on this question but would rather leave it to the judgment of the House. I think it will be found that there are opinions on both sides.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question to the hon. member?

[*English*]

The Chairman: Order, please. The hon. member for Skeena has resumed his seat. If there is the agreement of the committee, the hon. member may ask his question.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. member whether under the proposed amendment it would be possible for a prisoner to run as a candidate.

[*English*]

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Clause 20 of the bill sets out the qualifications of a candidate. As I recall it, it states that anyone who is qualified as an elector may be a candidate. According

to that, I would say yes, without any change in clause 20. We have not yet dealt with clause 20. The situation would be as stated by the hon. member if there is no change in that clause. An inmate in a penitentiary could be a candidate to run in an election. I did not deal with that question because I thought there might be other amendments that would need to flow from it. I was not sure of them, and therefore I left the question open. One does not presuppose the other.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Perhaps I could assist the committee. Clause 20 states that any person who is qualified as an elector or deemed to be qualified as an elector may be a candidate. If this disability was taken out of Clause 14, a prisoner would then be qualified to be a candidate. I could see certain interim difficulties in his taking his seat. Presumably, in the strict terms of the law he could be a candidate.

I neglected to deal with one point raised by the hon. member for Hamilton West. After consulting the Chief Electoral Officer I find that at the moment he does not have in his possession any comparative information on practices of other countries on this particular aspect of electoral law. I regret that I cannot answer the question.

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Chairman, I wish to support the proposal of the hon. member for Skeena. However, there are certain technical difficulties in the proposal. I wanted to ask the member some questions to see whether he could help me overcome these difficulties. I agree that the penitentiary system should be a reform and rehabilitation process; therefore, we could give the vote to those who are in penitentiaries. However, I see real objection to inmates of a penitentiary voting as a group in the constituency wherein the penitentiary is located. These people do not have any real interest in the particular constituency in which they find themselves. They have gone to that constituency for a period of time from other communities. Their homes are in these other communities, their real interest lies there and I do not think it would be fair for several thousand people, as might well be the case, to vote in a constituency in which they had only a temporary interest.

• (9:00 p.m.)

In Kingston, for example, there are three penitentiaries—Joyceville, Kingston, the women's penitentiary, and maybe even a fourth. I do not think it would be fair for the people who live in that constituency to have an election decided, perhaps, by individuals who come from other parts of the country. I can visualize the same problem in the St. Vincent de Paul area where there are four penitentiaries. I ask the President of the Privy Council and the hon. member for Skeena whether it might not be possible to consider setting up a system whereby the inmates could vote in their own constituencies under the proxy system, in the same way as members of the armed forces. We have not yet reached the proxy voting clause; it is clause 46 on page 117.

Another possibility would be to strike out subclause 4(f) and leave it up to the penitentiaries authorities to register the inmates through their families in their own constituencies and let them out on parole in order to vote, either on advance polling day or on polling day itself. I do not suggest this could apply to the whole of the prison population, but a certain number could be accommodated in this way. At the present time some inmates are allowed to go home for the weekend to see their families, and others may go home at Christmas and Easter. I am thinking aloud on these matters. If we could work out a system of proxy voting or temporary release to cover the situation, I would be willing to accept the proposal.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I suppose my hon. friend from Kingston would want to find out what the attitude of the inmates was to the white paper on taxation before endorsing an idea of that kind. No doubt it would be possible to adapt the special voting rules which cover others in the care of the federal government so as to extend the same privilege to inmates of institutions. It must be said, of course, that not all inmates are in federal institutions. Those whose sentence is less than two years are in provincial custody, and arrangements would have to be made in that regard. Some fairly substantial amendments would be required to the special voting rules if this proposal were to be accepted. Unless those amendments are made, this group of electors would have to be dealt with in the same way as any other group of institutional electors; the poll would be set up in an institution and their votes would be counted in the constituency in which they were resident, that is, where the institution was situated.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might comment for a few moments on what the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce and the minister have said.

The fact that the commission has on a couple of occasions rejected the concept of an absentee system of balloting prompted me to make my proposal in its present form. I have to deal with the law as it now stands. I, too, have thought about the armed forces voting regulations which give an individual the right to choose whether to register in the constituency in which he is located or in his home constituency wherever that might be. I did not attempt to draft all the consequential amendments to the armed forces rules, knowing there was a possibility of using that system if this proposal were carried.

The President of the Privy Council has indicated that it would be possible to adapt those rules for the purpose. He told us that substantial amendments would be required. But I think he meant a large number of amendments rather than intricate amendments or amendments difficult to draft. In any event, it is not impossible to amend the armed forces regulations in this respect. I would not be partial to the idea of leaving it to the head of the institution to determine which inmates should have the opportunity to go home in order to cast their ballots. However meritorious a case might be with regard to a particular inmate, there is always the possibility that he would not desire a three-day pass. Then again, an inmate might have been transferred from a British Columbia penitentiary to St. Vincent de Paul; his home might be in Vancouver. The difficulties involved there are such that we ought not to attempt to deal with them.

I can tell the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce that there are many instances in our society where large numbers of people have no particular connection with the constituency in which they are voting though they do, in fact, vote there and perhaps influence the outcome of the election. I have in mind the operations of mining camps, lumber camps, construction camps and the like in remote areas. In my own constituency a good many years ago there was a large-scale construction operation carried out for the Alumium Company of Canada which built a smelter near the community of Kitimat. At the powerhouse site, a whole chain of lakes and rivers was being dammed. The flow of the rivers was being reversed, a tunnel ten miles long was drilled through the mountain, and so on.

It was a massive project involving some 5,000 construction workers in the provincial constituency and, of course, in the federal constituency. They had the opportunity to exercise their right to vote under the provincial and federal law, yet they had no connection whatever with that constituency; they had just gone there to make their stake, after which they went back south or to wherever their homes were. This is the situation in a number of ridings, so I do not think it is a situation which ought to prevent us endorsing the concept I have put forward. I know that the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce would not do this. I hope that by using the armed forces rules or voting regulations and making them applicable to the situation such as I have in mind, the concern the hon. gentleman feels about the effects of a large group of voters casting their ballots in a constituency in which they have no particular interest will be alleviated. I would be far more partial to using the armed forces regulations than using the proxy system.

• (9:10 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. De Bané: Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to say that the only reason which could justify, in my opinion, the wording of subclause 4 (e) of clause 14 would be a technical or practical one.

And how can it be otherwise? Indeed, when we consider that this clause applies to persons imprisoned for minor offences sometimes, and that this can impose a penalty as heavy as the loss of the right to vote, I say that practical reasons alone can explain such a disproportion between the offence and the punishment!

If it is true that the loss of the right to vote is almost the equivalent of civil death, I really would like to know on what grounds someone who is imprisoned for 48 hours, let us say, should lose his right to vote simply because he was in prison at the time of the election.

Even if the reason is a practical one, it does not hold water if we consider that this clause concerns inmates. Let us take the case of someone who is imprisoned for a few years because he has not been able to obtain bail. How will we manage, on election day, to get him to the poll or to his residence? In view of the disproportion between the offence and the penalty, I suggest that the item be allowed to stand so that the legal advisers of the committee of the whole may draft a clause allowing those who are emprisoned to vote. Moreover, I agree with the previous speaker who stated that if the situation of prisoners is so miserable it is because they do not represent a group to be reckoned with during election campaigns.

I therefore propose, in view of the complexity of the practical reasons for the extreme streamlining of Clause 14 (4) (e) it be allowed to stand pending a much more thorough study.

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Chairman, I want to give my views on the amendment proposed by the member for Skeena (Mr. Howard). I would like also to indicate my admiration for his generosity toward those who deliberately have chosen to live on the fringe of society.

However, I cannot approve his attitude since all through his remarks I wondered whether we had not chosen the wrong place. The hon. member has given us such a list of all the advantages granted criminals over the last few years that we may wonder whether it is not more advantageous to live on the fringe of society.

We know how criminals are treated compared to law-abiding citizens. In Canada, thousands of families are living on social welfare. Thousands of workers must live on incomes obviously inadequate and deny themselves things essential to life which prisoners find in penal institutions.

It has been reported not so long ago that the construction of the penal institution at Sainte-Anne-des-Plaines, in the province of Quebec, had cost $32,000 per inmate. However, thousands of Canadian families have to live in slum dwellings which do not even belong to them and in distressing conditions, while $32,000 is available to accomodate individuals who did not want to comply with Canadian laws.

In my opinion, if we grant these people the right to choose members of Parliament, we are giving in to them a little too much.

Moreover, a comparison was established between members of the armed forces and prisoners. This is stupid. No comparison should be drawn between those who defend their country and those who destroy it. If we give prisoners the franchise, we must give it to saboteurs and traitors also.

On these grounds, I cannot support the amendment moved by the hon. member for Skeena. The hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané) who spoke before me is wondering what would happen in the case of a man sentenced to 48 hours in jail at the very time of an election. I would answer him that when somebody is sentenced to 48 hours in jail, the offence is not likely to be a crime but rather some petty larceny or some minor offence.

[Mr. De Bané.]

Moreover, I am sure that in such a case, a Canadian judge would have enough understanding to defer the sentence.

I do not think the present Elections Act aims at granting the right to vote to those who have deliberately chosen to be outcasts. If we make it easier for those people than for those who are law abiding citizens, I am afraid we shall have to change sides.

Such are the reasons why I cannot support the amendment of the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard).

Mr. Goyer: Mr. Chairman, the merits of the amendment moved by the member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) are not easy to ascertain and, consequently, must not be taken lightly.

I believe our society now accepts the concept whereby citizens who break the law of the land are not condemned to prison to suffer any other penalty than that of being deprived of their freedom. And so, citizens who are imprisoned do not suffer any corporal punishments which ar spurned by our laws. Citizens who now break the law and are imprisoned are not, generally speaking, deprived of access to information. In fact, they have access to literature and information.

Therefore, such citizens as are imprisoned are merely deprived of their freedom of movement. And even there, practise has it that more and more the prisoners are given the right to leave the institution for short spells at regular intervals. The citizen is therefore to be rehabilitated instead of being completely removed from the normal environment, so that he might readjust himself to society after serving his term.

• (9:20 p.m.)

I therefore ask myself two things with regard to the amendment proposed by the member for Skeena: First of all, whether the prisoners are well-informed; and secondly, whether they can have the will to improve society. Indeed, that is how, generally speaking, I understand franchise. Now, because in practice prisoners are given instead of denied access to information through radio programs, television, newspapers, they are in a position to follow the evolution of society like all other citizens, to see how the affairs of the state are managed, and so to pass judgment. Does the fact that he is excluded from normal life constitute a valid reason for denying him the right to vote?

Considering the information, I do not think so, for to admit that the fact of being cut off somewhat from the normal life of the political society to which we belong could result in being deprived of one's right to vote should lead us normally to the same way of thinking as regards servicemen stationed abroad. Servicemen, to whom we recognize the right to vote, do not live in their normal social environment, do not live within our frontiers. In order to get the necessary information and be able to have a sound opinion as to the administration of public affairs, they must rely on the mass media as a whole. This goes to say that their means of getting information are not better than those of an inmate within prison walls.

Moreover, can a prisoner feel a real desire to improve society, which would be the normal consequence of the exercise of his franchise?

I believe first of all that the prisoner, if he is married, surely wants his family to live in society as he sees it: the best possible for his children, for his wife, for his friends and for the community as a whole. Can the fact that he committed a crime or an offense prevent him from giving his opinion on the rights we constantly deal with during our sessions, the rights affecting the life of every citizen, whatever was his behaviour in society?

And I do not think so. If we really believe in the way we apply the rules in our penitentiaries, if we sincerely believe that a criminal should be rehabilitated, we should give him the right to give his opinion on the kind of society that will be established and the kind of people who will administer it on his behalf.

This is why I would have liked it better had the amendment moved by the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) mentioned one exception, namely life-term prisoners because they cannot hope to lead ever a normal life in society.

I think that a life-term prisoner should lose his franchise. It would be an exception.

I think that we should welcome the amendment moved by the hon. member for Skeena since, in general, it meets two concepts which are really the basis of the franchise: first, to properly inform the prisoner so that he may exercice his right to vote in an enlightened manner and on the other hand, his actual desire to improve society and to put it in the hands of responsible men.

[*English*]

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to give all my views on criminology or penology, but I think it would be wise if this suggestion were given a good deal more reflection, perhaps a good deal more than that suggested by the hon. member for Matane. Even though by my mathematical calculations, at the present rate of progress we are going to need nine more sitting days to finish this bill, I still think at the end of that time we might not be quite ready to take up this idea. I think there are many things we ought to reflect upon.

The suggestion which the hon. member tossed out was one which shook me rigid, to use the vernacular. The authorities of the institutions would make the decision as to which group would vote on advance polling and which would vote on election day. It seems to me this would call upon them to make a qualitative judgment which I would not ask them to make even if they were a college of archangels. The success of that venture would be very problematical.

I am a little concerned, too, about the ethical problems as distinct from some of the legal problems. The mover of the amendment would exclude from voting, shall we say, someone who gave a voter a bottle of rum on election day, but someone who gave half a dozen voters a Molotov cocktail would be all right for ever and a day under this proposal. There may be a lot of ethical judgments which we will have to reflect upon as we look into this interesting suggestion.

Going through my mind has been the question which always has been difficult in elections, namely, what is meant by "ordinary residence"? When I apply that concept to this amendment, I am equally concerned about what is ordinary residence. I have a feeling that the administrative problems as to the location of the institutions are pretty complex. I am still a little concerned about the posting of the names. All in all, I think it might be one of those matters to which we should all give our careful attention perhaps before the next session of Parliament.

• (9:30 p.m.)

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased that I came into the Chamber tonight. I have been sitting in the Finance Committee all day and have not had the opportunity to listen to this debate, but I have heard enough to realize that so far as I am concerned I am away behind in this so-called permissive

society. It seems to me that if we accept some of the suggestions put forward by the hon. member who proposed this amendment, we will make our society permissive to the point of extreme exaggeration.

With regard to the fact that there are people in jail for minor offences, may I respectfully point out that they would not be there if they had obeyed the law. However, in addition to that the hon. member is suggesting that rapists, murderers, arsonists and people who commit treason should have the right to vote. May I point out to you, Mr. Chairman, that people who disobey the laws of Canada and disobey the laws of Parliament should lose some of the rights which they had in our society.

I am not saying that I am against these people being allowed to see their families, because our law allows it. But I point out that they receive excellent board and lodging free of charge, paid for by the taxpayers of Canada. They are rehabilitated and reformed to the best of our ability. Yet here tonight there are hon. members who suggest that prisoners who have been in jail for a long time, and who perhaps will be there for a long time in the future because they have committed a crime, whether it be murder or rape of our wife or our daughter, should have the same rights as people who live in the rural communities, the towns, villages and cities of Canada.

I will not take any longer except to say that there is one way in which they can get the vote, and that is to obey the law. That fact should be stressed right across this country of ours. I appreciate that when these people are on parole, they should have the right to vote. That is fine, because society and the authorities concerned say they are safe to be out on the street and they are being rehabilitated to the best of our ability. But when they are in jail for having committed a hideous crime—and it has even been suggested tonight that they may have the right to run for Parliament and be elected—I say that is going too far. This amendment, so far as our being a permissive society is concerned, goes much too far for my taste.

Mr. Skoberg: Mr. Chairman, I am certain that the hon. gentleman who preceded me must be referring to permissive society in another context than the one I consider we now have. The way in which he has approached this subject would make our society a sick society—and this is exactly what we are facing today. Those who are supporting this amendment to give the right to vote to inmates of penitentiaries are not asking for charity. All we are asking for is the inmates' rehabilitation.

Whether or not the hon. member who preceded me has visited many penitentiaries and spoken to many of their inmates is, of course, for him to tell us. I suggest that if we are to have an enlightened society we must consider proposals such as the one that is before us. If we as politicians and legislators are concerned about creating an enlightened society, we must develop a social conscience and look at the whole situation.

I appreciate—many hon. members have suggested this tonight—that the provisions of this amendment may be difficult to enforce at times, but we as legislators should insert in the law the principle we believe should be in it; the mechanics of enforcing it can easily be applied later. I am sure that the people who drafted this legislation can look after that area. Some hon. members have said we should not give the right to vote to inmates of penitentiaries. I suggest that on speaking to these people one finds that they are much more enlightened than many people who have not served a prison sentence. I suggest that people who have served a prison term have paid their debt to society, so why should we ask them to pay a second debt? They were sentenced by a judge who decided they must pay a debt to society. It is time we decided not to impose a double penalty on them.

It is very easy for the hon. member who preceded me to use the tone of voice he did and to say that these people should be taken out of society. But it is not the idea of penal institutions to rehabilitate them? As one reads "The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich" one is reminded of the previous speaker when he spoke of rehabilitation. I suggest that if we as legislators have the will power to try to improve society, then we should improve our whole society by taking into consideration those people who are within the walls of penitentiaries. I am sure that ours does not have to be a permissive society, but rather a just society—and not in the terms used on many occasions by the Prime Minister. I refer to a society with a social conscience and a realization that people within penitentiary walls are paying a debt to society and should not have the right to vote taken away from them.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Chairman, I will only say a few words partly to support the hon. member

for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise) and to add that I do not approve the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard).

In the first place, it seems to me that paragraphe (e), subclause (4) of clause 14 is extremely broad. The paragraph reads as follows:

(e) every person undergoing punishment as an inmate in any penal institution for the commission of any offence;

There are two extremely vague terms which lead me to believe that we would not be fair if they were accepted.

• (9:40 p.m.)

The phrase "every person" includes hardened criminals who have been given a life sentence as well as individuals sentenced to a three month jail term for dangerous driving, for example, or because they could not obtain bail or for any other reason. Such an expression is unacceptable in a bill dealing with the basic democratic right: the right to vote.

In my opinion, there is another expression which is unacceptable, and I quote:

—for the commission of any offence—

There is an enormous difference between the person who is sentenced for a theft of $2, $10,000 and $100,000. I hope my colleagues realize that. The man who is guilty of rape, homicide, armed robbery or a $10,000 theft is in a much more serious situation than the man who stole less than $20.

Everybody cannot be put on the same footing nor can we say "every person" because one has been judged an outlaw and is branded.

As the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise), I am not willing to grant the right to vote to all criminals in all Canadian jails. The right to vote is not all; one should be able to use that right according to two principles.

First, one must realize what he is doing and, second, try to improve a given situation.

The convict, if he has committed ten offences, certainly rejects society, its leaders, its laws and its framework. Therefore, he is not prepared to take advantage of his franchise; even if he could use it, he could not do so conscienciously, honestly and properly.

On the other hand, anyone convicted following a minor offence such as dangerous driving, a $200 theft or inability to put up bail—justice in Canada being bound to money: if one is rich and a member of a particular political party, one is safe—cannot be considered as a dangerous criminal.

That is why I feel that paragraph (e) is unacceptable. However, one must not go to the other extreme and extend its approval to all inmates.

It would surely be wise for us, as members of Parliament, to reserve our judgment on paragraph (e), as well as on the amendment, in order to allow not only hon. members, but also legal counsels for the House, to find a third solution which would render justice not only to inmates able to exercise their right to vote, but also to the greatest number of people able to exercise it.

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Chairman, it is always useful to have our colleagues give us the benefit of their knowledge. I was surprised by the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) to the effect that paragraph (e) which reads as follows should be deleted:

(e) every person undergoing punishment as an inmate in any penal institution for the commission of any offence;—

The object of this amendment is to give inmates the right to vote. In my view, the amendment is in many ways illogical. First of all, its author has forgotten that paragraph (f) states that the right to vote shall be refused to, and I quote:

—every person who is restrained of his liberty of movement—

If the liberty of movement of a prisoner is restrained, the situation should be corrected. However, if we pushed this reasoning to the extreme, then under this paragraph, the disabled would also lose their franchise.

Something else amazes me too. I apologize for my scrappy remarks. Of course, they are in line with those I heard and on which I am trying to comment.

Some members of the N.D.P. sometimes suggest that we should not grant the franchise to senators. The bill stipulates that the franchise will not be granted—well, it might have been the Conservatives, but it is all the same, it comes from the opposition—to judges. Furthermore, the bill provides that the franchise is not to be granted to new Canadians who have not resided in Canada for five years because they are not Canadian citizens. All those things are understandable.

I feel that a senator has much more experience and deserves far more consideration than a criminal, and that the judge who is denied the franchise will vote much more sensibly and objectively than a criminal. It is

denied to him though, under the pretext that it is to prevent him from making mistakes or to be partial.

I feel that judges would not go to the poll even though they were allowed to do so. At least, few of them would exercise their right to vote. In my opinion, it is not logical to insist so much on granting the right to vote to offenders, traitors and other individuals of the same ilk, while the citizens I just mentioned are denied that right.

I heard the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Skoberg) accuse the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher) and advocate ideas which would point to a sick society. I am inclined to believe, even though I respect the opinions of others, that our society is much more sick that we think. Indeed, in this House, as members of Parliament, upholders of public order and advocates of law and order, we go out of our way to protect offenders, traitors, criminals more than the senators, the judges and the new Canadiens who have been living in Canada for two or three years, as well as all the others we want to disfranchise.

I am under the impression that our society is sick, and I wonder whether the present trend is not going too far. Is it not precisely part of the penalty being imposed on the law-breaker or the person guilty of an attempt against the life or the property of others, to deprive him of his civil rights? As I said, I find some inconsistencies in the amendment moved by the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard), and if he wanted to be logical, he would move an amendment to paragraph (f).

As far as I am concerned, I am against granting the right to vote to inmates.

I feel that paragraph should be left unchanged and that, to act in a liberal way, judges should be qualified to vote, as well as new Canadians after a year or two, once they have proved they have become good Canadians, and that facilities should be extended to enable disabled persons to vote.

Those who are mentally ill are disqualified. Are a criminal a traitor, a slanderer, a thief not also, in a way, mentally ill?

If such people were normal, they would be just as law-abiding as you and I, or at least would strive to be. I am not referring to people who have been jailed as a result of a mistrial, but of those who have been proved guilty.

I consider the whole debate to be tainted with inconsistencies. It is, in my opinion, an exaggeration to claim with such vehemence the right for inmates to exercise their civil rights.

I therefore intend to vote against this amendment.

[*English*]

Mr. Bigg: Mr. Chairman, I shall try to be brief. I am pleased that at last we are attacking the voting problems of the country with a forward-looking bill. I welcome many of the proposed changes and I hope that when the legislation is enacted, members of the armed forces will enjoy the secret ballot. I also hope that sick people and those absent from their own ridings on voting day will be able to exercise the franchise. However, I am worried about the suggestion that penitentiary inmates be allowed full voting rights.

I have always been in favour of efforts to rehabilitate penitentiary inmates. I have no desire to seek revenge on those who have no feeling for society, but I cannot quite see how we can give the vote to people who are guilty of treason, arson, aggravated assault, rape, armed robbery or murder. The greatest privilege that a Canadian can enjoy, next to that of life, is the right to vote in free elections. We should use it as a lever to encourage these people to get back into productive society.

• (9:50 p.m.)

The present law is very broad and would allow a man on parole to have full voting rights and all the other privileges of a citizen. It is up to those who are guilty of committing a crime—and I trust there are few languishing in our penitentiaries who are not guilty—to convince the authorities that they are fit for parole. Having worked with the Parole Board, I know that it is making every effort to return prisoners to productive society as soon as possible, bearing in mind the importance of protecting society. Next to wanting their liberty, self-respecting prisoners may want the right to vote. This very fact may be an encouragement to some of them to see the error of their ways. It may spur them into returning to society and having restored this privilege which they put in jeopardy by their behaviour.

It is bad enough to deprive a man of his liberty—I wish I knew of some way in which we could do away with jails and penitentiaries—but with our limited knowledge of the social sciences and psychology, perhaps even religion, at the present time apparently we have no alternative but to segregate people.

However, it is not necessary to be cruel. I have spoken against corporal punishment in this House and have left no doubt where I stand on that—I am absolutely against it. I am also against putting young men in jail except as a last resort. Where society, after careful thought and a fair trial, often with a jury, is convinced that there is no alternative to segregating prisoners, I think one part of that segregation should be that they be deprived of the right to vote. When they prove themselves worthy of parole, society is only too pleased to forgive them and restore to them the full voting rights that we as Canadian citizens are so proud to enjoy.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee would be correct in thinking me prejudiced when I say that the hon. member for Skeena presented his amendment and his case in the most reasoned manner we have heard in this chamber on any amendment to this bill. Whether one agrees or disagrees with his argument, I believe all of us were impressed by the fact that he keeps hitting certain areas. I wondered whether he had intended to do that and I believe other members of the committee were wondering the same. In the course of his argument he in fact covered many areas of problem and difficulty, whether they be administrative or economic.

I support the amendment of the hon. member for a number of reasons which I shall mention later. First, I ask this question of myself and of my colleagues in the committee: What are we afraid of? We know that in every election there are thousands of people who do not vote, but no matter how picayune their reasons we do not lose any sleep over it unless we think we have a chance of winning by appeal or recount. If we pass this amendment, probably 10,000 or 12,000 people across Canada will be eligible to cast a ballot in a federal election. It is probable that many of them will not choose to be enumerated and to vote, as do many civilians.

It is suggested that those who have broken the law should pay the full penalty, and upon return to civilian life should have the rights and privileges of ordinary citizenship returned to them. With due deference to hon. members, if that argument has any validity Mr. Chairman, I suggest it follows that those who break the law but are not in penitentiaries should be deprived of the right to cast a ballot. Those who get away with extorsion, with usury, phony bankruptcies, even closing-out sales or high rents, commit crimes just as hideous in civilian society—but they have the full right of the franchise.

I am sure we all agree that the purpose of our electoral law and this amendment is to maximize the opportunity of Canadians to cast their ballot. Given that principle, our objective should be to enlarge the opportunity of the maximum number of people in this country to cast their ballot. Of course there will be administrative difficulties. For a moment I hoped that the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce would support our amendment. He did not let me down: he told us how well he thought of it, and then gave us all the reasons why it cannot be done. Of course there will be administrative problems, but I have faith in the Chief Electoral Officer and the prison officials and I believe the problems can be solved.

What the committee needs to be concerned with is whether inmates of institutions should have the opportunity to cast a ballot. Some of them will be permanent residents and some will be there only a short time, but the day the enumeration starts they will be "ordinarily resident" because any prison term over two years is served in a penitentiary. These really are not problems: they may be excuses to avoid making the essential decision of whether inmates should be entitled to the franchise. Of course, there could be a block of this type of vote in some constituencies, and if they were to vote the same way they could elect their chosen candidate. But what else is new, Mr. Chairman? I suspect this could happen with civilian electors in a score of constituencies in Canada where a block of votes in one direction could swing the election. If we were to worry about the problem, we probably would have no electoral laws, because we all know that we make appeals to blocks of voters of various ethnic or social origins.

• (10:00 p.m.)

If we include the inmates of penitentiaries within our electoral system, we might develop better penal laws than we have at the moment. I think those who are worried have no valid worry. I suggest the first thing we ought to consider is that inmates are human beings, no matter how inhuman might have been their actions at some time; second, they are citizens of Canada; third—this point was mentioned earlier—it seems to me that we should begin a small process which would lead to the rehabilitation of many of those in

penal institutions. If we accomplish that, what have we lost? Surely that chance is worth taking, both for the sake of the inmates and for society as a whole.

Some hon. members are worried in case an inmate of a jail becomes a candidate. It has been known to happen that a person in jail has been elected to office. I am thinking of John Queen—I think that is his name—when serving a jail term was elected to the Manitoba legislature in 1920 or 1921. I do not know how he was let out of jail. I understand that he walked across the street from the jail to the legislature and took his seat. There is also Louis Riel who was under the shadow of a jail term when he was elected to this House. He served in this House for one day and then stole across the river in the dark to a neighbouring country and fled west. Doubtless we could find other examples if we were to study Canadian history.

In any event, I do not understand why anyone need worry because I would be very surprised if any of the political parties represented in this House nominated as a candidate any inmate of a penal institution. Second, if such a man were ever nominated I suspect ways and means could be found of permitting him to sit here, even if a guard had to sit beside him in the House. Third, and perhaps this is the most important part of my argument, if we permit inmates of penitentiaries to vote, when we come to the appropriate clause of the bill an hon. member could move an amendment which would prohibit inmates serving prison terms from being candidates at elections.

I emphasize that it is most important for us to maximize the franchise. We are not considering a large group of voters, perhaps only 10,000 or 12,000. That, I should think, is not really the point. I think the real point is—I shall not belabour it—that here we have an opportunity to take one more step in the right direction in our modern and, I hope, increasingly more civilized society. We need to make an effort on behalf of those who are in penitentiaries. It seems to me that if we obtain some response from them for our effort, we shall be rewarded. No matter whether our efforts works or not, we shall know that we have tried. I submit to hon. members that our trying cannot harm the electoral process, the Canadian society or democracy. It may not do any good, but I do not know that and neither does anyone else. I think we ought to try because no matter how small our reward is, it will be worth it.

[Mr. Benjamin.]

One could try to reply to the hon. member for Bruce and those who feel as he does, but one might lose his temper and not contribute much to the debate which so far has been rather bipartisan and multipartisan on this extremely important bill. If all the restrictions and penalties in the penal laws of Canada and of other nations—I say this with particular reference to those we have repealed—were so good, why did they not work? We accept that our amendment will not solve all the problems; neither will it turn inmates of penitentiaries automatically into fine, upright citizens, although some of them are at least as upright and upstanding as many who are loose in society. But I think it will help. I hope that without taking up much more time on the question the committee will say, "Yes, why not? Let us try it. Let us make our little contribution and try to return these people to society." I think if we do that, in a few years time we shall be glad we did.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Asselin: Mr. Chairman, our friends of the NDP, so as to seem progressive, are trying to defy all those who live on the fringe of society and who are against it.

I am in favour of the rehabilitation of inmates. But to give them the right to vote goes against a principle of society to the effect that criminals accept beforehand to be deprived of their civic rights.

When I see our friends of the NDP trying to "deify" all kind of people who run counter to the principles of society and the law, I wonder whether they are sincere or whether they are merely trying to play politics.

I have nothing against inmates, but they must show that they are capable of rehabilitation before they are liberated. That is why I maintain that the proposed amendment goes too far. That we should give the right to vote to a prisoner on parole, I have nothing against that. But an individual who has served a sentence of ten or fifteen years, who has never shown a desire to rehabilitate himself and who has appeared several times before a court of justice cannot lay claim to the same civic rights as those who obey the law.

My hon. friends of the New Democratic party are too anxious to deify those persons who, besides, have all my sympathy. If they have perpetrated indictable offences against society, they must bear the consequences of their actions and be deprived of their civil rights.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Trois-Rivières (Mr. Mongrain) said that we, in the

opposition, were perhaps in favour of depriving senators of their right to vote, but we never claimed such a thing. My colleague from Trois-Rivières should get the facts. He also said that one must bear—

Mr. Prud'homme: The hon. member for Trois-Rivières should not be taken to task.

Mr. Asselin: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Prud'homme: I said that the hon. member for Trois-Rivières should not be taken to task, because it was one of your own colleagues, the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie), who himself proposed that senators be deprived of the right to vote, and not the hon. member for Trois-Rivières.

Mr. Asselin: Anyway I shall discuss that with him and I shall report to the hon. member.

The member for Trois-Rivières asserts also that the right vote should be taken away from those who are restrained of their liberty or deprived of the management of their property because they are mentally ill. It is quite clear that the persons who are qualified to vote must be able to make a choice. Why go into all that?

That discussion is therefore a waste of time. I simply would like the question to be put so that the matter can be settled.

• (10:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Allmand: I will be very brief, Mr. Chairman. A few minutes ago in this debate I raised some questions. They were replied to by the President of the Privy Council and the hon. member for Skeena. At that time I stated I was in favour of the principle of giving the vote to those in prison but that I could see certain administrative difficulties. Listening to the debate following my questions, and having examined the Canada Elections Act, I see that those administrative difficulties can be overcome. I will vote for this amendment. If it is carried, later in the debate I will move an amendment to clause 17, subclause 15 to which I will add the following paragraph:

> An inmate in a penal institution shall for the purpose of this act be deemed to be resident with his family or, if he has no family, at his last listed address.

Later I will move an amendment to the part concerning proxy, clause 46.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Prud'homme: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The Deputy Chairman: The hon. member for Saint-Denis on a point of order.

Mr. Prud'homme: I think that we should in the first place, Mr. Chairman, dispose of the amendment now under consideration before stating that if the legislation is passed, we hope to propose another amendment. I think that it would be more logical.

The Deputy Chairman: Order please. We are now considering paragraph (4) and I think that we should not anticipate another clause which will be studied later. We should now dispose of—

[*English*]

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Chairman, some of the objections raised in regard to the amendment of the hon. member for Skeena were the administrative difficulties which might arise if we voted for it and allowed inmates of a penitentiary to vote. I wish to explain to the House that we can vote in favour of this proposal and still have a system whereby inmates will be allowed to vote in their own constituencies. I have already pointed out that under the section "residence", we can provide that an inmate can vote in the residence with his family or at his last listed address.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Allmand: When we come to the part on proxy voting, to complement what I have already said I will move an amendment to clause 46, subclause 1 in which I will add a paragraph (d) with the words "his detention in a penal institution". In addition to students being allowed to vote by proxy if they are resident at a university, inmates in a penal institution will be included. These inmates will be able to use the proxy voting procedure to vote in the electoral district of their family or, if they have no family, at their last listed address. As I said, I will vote in favour of this amendment for the reasons I have just put forward. I have listened to the speeches in this debate. Many members say we should not give the vote to those who have committed a crime and are in penitentiaries, because they deserve to lose that privilege. That is a vindictive and punitive approach to prison reform.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Allmand: The whole purpose of a penitentiary system should be that when people leave the penitentiary they are better-prepared citizens than they were when they entered. If the penitentiary system means that

when people leave penitentiary they are worse citizens than they were when they entered, and are to be further punished by society, we are not doing our job.

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): I will be very brief because I know it is the disposition of the committee to vote on this amendment. I do not want to delay the vote. I will only comment fleetlingly on what other members have said, including the hon. member for Charlevoix. I point out to him and other hon. members that regardless of what they may think—and I do not have to overemphasize this—this proposition was put forward by me as an individual. It was not put forward by the New Democratic Party, nor do the great bulk of the members of my party agree with this concept of rehabilitation. It was put forward in all sincerity. It did not call for the unkind remarks that were made.

I wish to refer briefly to the subject of rehabilitation. I hope it will have some effect on those hon. members who feel they should not support the proposition and should retain the punitive nature of the treatment of people in our prisons. We have tried all sorts of repressive measures such as heavy sentences, classing people as habitual criminals, removing their rights, and so on. None of these has worked in any measurable way. In our penitentiaries four out of five inmates have been in jail before. Only in recent years has our penitentiary system been altered. An alteration occurred as a result of the Parliament of Canada expressing the idea that we should be less rigid and confining and that we should concern ourselves with the fact that people in penitentiaries are human beings worthy of consideration, and not merely numbers.

Rehabilitation is not measurably affected by the conditions in a jail. It does not matter whether they are painted different colours, whether they have toilet facilities or what the situation may be. Rehabilitation is a state of mind on the part of an individual, a desire on his part to alter his attitude toward society and a desire to think truthfully and honestly about himself. If we can offer him one small fragment of an opportunity to face the truth about himself and his rehabilitation while he is in jail undergoing punishment, if we can let him participate in our democratic society while he is there, it will be for his good. He will have an opportunity to reflect on what he is doing and on what society is doing. It will be another step toward rehabilitating the individual to being a complete human being and a full citizen.

[Mr. Allmand.]

The Deputy Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Amendment (Mr. Howard) negatived: Yeas, 15; nays, 62.

The Deputy Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

• (10:20 p.m.)

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, on June 16 I deposited with the Chair and distributed to the spokesmen for the parties an amendment to subclause 4. If I took a tenth of the time taken by the hon. member for Skeena to move his motion, I would be up against the hour of 10.30. Therefore, I will do my best to telescope my point of view and hope that having done so there will be such overwhelming opinion in favour of it that we can adopt my amendment without a recorded vote. My motion is as follows:

That subclause 4 be amended by inserting the following as paragraph (h): "that the members of the Senate of Canada be listed among those disqualified."

This is not the outpouring of one who is against the Senate. On the contrary, I am one who lives in the hope that some day I may become a member of that illustrious body. As I tell the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, when I reach the age of 74½ I shall support his persistent motion to abolish the Senate, but until then I shall not.

There has always been the closest possible correlation between eligibility for candidacy and voting rights. Then again, people who are themselves members of a particular body do not vote to decide who are to become members of that body. In this sense I believe the Senate of Canada has not received the respect which it deserves. Its members are already represented in this Parliament as being members of the red chamber. It often happens that the word "Parliament" is used with reference only to those of us who are members of the green chamber. The Americans fall into the same error when they speak of congressmen; they are speaking, really, only of members of the House of Representatives. There is, of course, the British precedent that members of the House of Lords may not vote for candidates for the House of Commons—and I have recently come to think that the British know quite a bit about electioneering.

I believe we enhance respect for the Senate, to which body I hope to win my way some time, by recognizing that its members are in

fact represented already in the Parliament of Canada; that they are not eligible for membership of this chamber and that they do not require to be involved in the process whereby we are elected, as we in turn are not involved in that mysterious process whereby they are selected. So with respect, and following excellent precedent, I move the motion as read.

The Deputy Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Amendment (Mr. Macquarrie) negatived: Yeas, 16; nays, 59.

The Deputy Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

Subclauses 6 and 7 agreed to.

Clause 14 as amended agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Now we go back to clause 13, subclause (8).

On clause 13, subclause 8—*Deletions from registry*

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Chairman, I believe we had an amendment which was allowed to stand last week. It affected subclause 8 (b) (ii). I believe the amendment was proposed last week and allowed to stand.

The Deputy Chairman: The amendment reads:

That clause 13 be amended by deleting from subclause 8 paragraph (b) (ii) in line 26, the words "seventy-five" and substituting therefor the words "twenty-seven".

Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Amendment (Mr. Benjamin) negatived: Yeas, 8; nays, 59.

The Deputy Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

Mr. Deachman: Mr. Chairman, I move:

That clause 13 be amended by striking out line 26 on page 23 and substituting the following: "at least 50 of the electoral districts of Canada."

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on the proposed amendment. I do so in opposition to the amendment. It seems to me that the whole notion of restrictions on the number of people who may run for a certain party—

Some hon. Members: Half past ten.

• (10:30 p.m.)

The Deputy Chairman: Order. It being 10.30 p.m., it is my duty to rise, report progress and request leave to sit again at the next sitting of the House.

Progress reported.

YUKON ACT, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES ACT AND TERRITORIAL LANDS ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING MEMBERS OF COUNCILS, VOTERS, APPOINTMENT OF JUDGES, LAND MANAGEMENT ZONES, ETC.

The House resumed, from Friday, June 19, consideration of Bill C-212, to amend the Yukon Act, the Northwest Territories Act and the Territorial Lands Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Pursuant to special order made Friday, June 19, 1970, the House will now revert to the taking of deferred divisions on Bill C-212, to amend the Yukon Act, Northwest Territories Act and Territorial Lands Act.

• (10:40 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: The first question is on motion No. 2, moved by the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen), as follows:

That Bill C-212, an act to amend the Yukon Act, the Northwest Territories Act and the Territorial Lands Act be amended by deleting the words "but the Governor in Council may, after consultation with the council, at any time dissolve the council and cause a new council to be elected" in clause 2, lines 12, 13, 14 and 15, page 1 thereof, and replacing the comma after the word "longer" in line 12 with a period.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion? All those in favour of the said motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The House divided on motion No. 2 (Mr. Nielsen) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken	Benjamin
Alexander	Bigg
Asselin	Broadbent
Baldwin	Burton
Bell	Code

Division

Crouse
Danforth
Dinsdale
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Fairweather
Forrestall
Grills
Harding
Harkness
Howard (Skeena)
Howe
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Lambert (Edmonton West)
Lewis
MacDonald (Egmont)
MacEwan
MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond)
MacInnis (Mrs.)
MacLean
Macquarrie
McCleave
McGrath
McIntosh
McKinley
McQuaid
Mather
Mazankowski
Monteith
Nesbitt
Noble
Nowlan
Paproski
Ricard
Ritchie
Rose
Rowland
Saltsman
Scott
Skoberg
Southam
Stanfield
Stewart (Marquette)
Thomas (Moncton)
Thompson (Red Deer)—55.

NAYS

Messrs:

Allmand
Badanai
Basford
Beaudoin
Béchard
Blair
Blouin
Borrie
Boulanger
Breau
Buchanan
Caccia
Cadieux (Labelle)
Chappell
Chrétien
Clermont
Cobbe
Corbin
Côté (Richelieu)
Crossman
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Davis
Deachman
Deakon
De Bané
Dionne
Forest
Forget
Fortin
Foster
Francis
Gauthier
Gendron
Gillespie
Godin
Goyer
Gray
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Guilbault
Hogarth
Honey
Hopkins
Isabelle
Jamieson
Kaplan
Kierans
Lachance
Laflamme
Laing (Vancouver South)
Langlois
Laniel
Laprise
Latulippe
Leblanc (Laurier)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Lind
Loiselle
Macdonald (Rosedale)
McBride
Mahoney
Marceau
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Matte
Mongrain
Noël
O'Connell
Olson
Orange
Osler
Ouellet
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Perrault
Pilon
Pringle
Prud'homme
Reid
Richard
Roberts
Roy (Laval)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stafford
Stanbury
Stewart (Cochrane)
Sulatycky
Tétrault
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Turner (London East)
Wahn
Walker
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Whicher
Whiting—102.

[Mr. Speaker.]

• (10:50 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Mr. Lundrigan: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. May I say, for the record, that on the last vote the bell rang for only seven minutes.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 3, moved by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien), as follows:

That Bill C-212, an act to amend the Yukon Act, the Northwest Territories Act and the Territorial Lands Act, be amended by striking out lines 12 to 15 on page 1 and substituting the following:

"longer, but the Governor in Council may at any time, after consultation with the council where he deems such consultation to be practicable or, otherwise, after consultation with each of the members of the council with whom consultation can then be effected, dissolve the council and cause a new council to be elected".

All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Some hon. Members: On division.

Motion No. 3 (Mr. Chrétien) agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 6, moved by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien), as follows:

That Bill C-212, an act to amend the Yukon Act, the Northwest Territories Act and the Territorial Lands Act, be amended by striking out subclause 2 of clause 5 on page 3 thereof.

All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The House divided on motion No. 6 (Mr. Chrétien) which was agreed to on the following division:

Division

YEAS

Messrs:

Allmand
Badanai
Basford
Beaudoin
Béchard
Blair
Blouin
Borrie
Boulanger
Breau
Buchanan
Caccia
Cadieux (Labelle)
Chappell
Chrétien
Clermont
Cobbe
Corbin
Côté (Richelieu)
Crossman
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Davis
Deachman
Deakon
De Bané
Dionne
Forest
Forget
Fortin
Foster
Francis
Gauthier
Gendron
Gillespie
Godin
Goyer
Gray
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Guilbault
Hogarth
Honey
Hopkins
Isabelle
Jamieson
Kaplan
Kierans
Lachance
Laflamme
Laing (Vancouver South)
Langlois
Laniel
Laprise
Latulippe
Leblanc (Laurier)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Lind
Loiselle
Macdonald (Rosedale)
McBride
Mahoney
Marceau
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Matte
Mongrain
Noël
O'Connell
Olson
Osler
Ouellet
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Perrault
Pilon
Pringle
Prud'homme
Reid
Richard
Roberts
Roy (Laval)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stafford
Stanbury
Stewart (Cochrane)
Sulatycky
Tétrault
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Turner (London East)
Wahn
Walker
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Whicher
Whiting—101.

NAYS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alexander
Asselin
Baldwin
Bell
Benjamin
Bigg
Broadbent
Burton
Carter
Code
Crouse
Danforth
Dinsdale
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Fairweather
Forrestall
Grills
Harding
Harkness
Howard (Skeena)
Howe
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Lambert (Edmonton West)
Lewis
Lundrigan
MacDonald (Egmont)
MacEwan
MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond)
MacInnis (Mrs.)
MacLean
Macquarrie
McCleave
McGrath
McIntosh
McKinley
McQuaid
Marshall
Mather
Mazankowski
Monteith
Nesbitt
Noble
Nowlan
Paproski
Peddle
Ricard
Ritchie
Rose
Rowland
Saltsman
Scott
Skoberg
Southam
Stanfield
Stewart (Marquette)
Thomas (Moncton)
Thompson (Red Deer)—59.

• (11:00 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried. The next question is on Motion No. 11, moved by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien) as follows:

That Bill C-212, an act to amend the Yukon Act, the Northwest Territories Act and the Territorial Lands Act, be amended by striking out lines 23 to 27 on page 5 and substituting the following:

"but the Governor in Council may at any time, after consultation with the council where he deems such consultation to be practicable or, otherwise, after consultation with each of the members of the council with whom consultation can then be effected, dissolve the council and cause a new council to be elected and appointed."

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion? All those in favour of the said motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Some hon. Members: On division.

Division

Mr. Speaker: I declare the said motion carried on division.

Motion No. 11 (Mr. Chrétien) agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: We shall now proceed to Motion No. 12, moved by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien), as follows:

That Bill C-212, an act to amend the Yukon Act, the Northwest Territories Act and the Territorial Lands Act, be amended by striking out lines 1 to 5 on page 7 and substituting the following:

"(2) Subsections 4 and 5 of section 12 of the said act are repealed."

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion? All those in favour of the said motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Some hon. Members: On division.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried on division.

Motion No. 12 (Mr. Chrétien) agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on motion No. 13, moved by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien), as follows:

That Bill C-212, an act to amend the Yukon Act, the Northwest Territories Act and the Territorial Lands Act, be amended by striking out lines 5 to 19 on page 9 and substituting the following:

"3A. Where he deems it necessary for the protection of the ecological balance or physical characteristics of any area in the Yukon Territory or the Northwest Territories, the Governor in Council may, after consultation with the Council of the Yukon Territory or the Council of the Northwest Territories, as the case may be, where he deems such consultation to be practicable or, otherwise, after consultation with each of the members of the council with whom consultation can then be effected, set apart and appropriate any territorial lands in that area as a land management zone.

3B. The Governor in Council may, after consultation with the Council of the Yukon Territory or the Council of the Northwest Territories, as the case may be, where he deems such consultation to be practicable or, otherwise, after consultation with each of the members of the council with whom consultation can then be effected, make regulations respecting"

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion? All those in favour of the said motion will please say yea.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The House divided on motion No. 13 (Mr. Chrétien) which was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Allmand
Badanai
Basford
Beaudoin
Béchard
Blair
Blouin
Borrie
Boulanger
Breau
Buchanan
Caccia
Cadieux (Labelle)
Chappell
Chrétien
Clermont
Cobbe
Corbin
Côté (Richelieu)
Crossman
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Davis
Deachman
Deakon
De Bané
Dionne
Forest
Forget
Fortin
Foster
Francis
Gauthier
Gendron
Gillespie
Godin
Goyer
Gray
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Guilbault
Hogarth
Honey
Hopkins
Isabelle
Jamieson
Kaplan
Kierans
Lachance
Laflamme
Laing (Vancouver South)
Langlois
Laniel
Laprise
Latulippe
Leblanc (Laurier)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Lind
Loiselle
Macdonald (Rosedale)
McBride
Mahoney
Marceau
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Matte
Mongrain
Noël
O'Connell
Olson
Orange
Osler
Ouellet
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Perrault
Pilon
Pringle
Prud'homme
Reid
Richard
Roberts
Roy (Laval)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stafford
Stanbury
Stewart (Cochrane)
Sulatycky
Tétrault
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Turner (London East)
Wahn
Walker
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Whicher
Whiting—102.

NAYS

Messrs:

Aiken	MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond)
Alexander	MacInnis (Mrs.)
Asselin	MacLean
Baldwin	Macquarrie
Bell	McCleave
Benjamin	McGrath
Bigg	McIntosh
Broadbent	McKinley
Burton	McQuaid
Carter	Marshall
Code	Mather
Crouse	Mazankowski
Danforth	Monteith
Dinsdale	Nesbitt
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)	Noble
Fairweather	Nowlan
Forrestall	Paproski
Grills	Peddle
Harding	Ricard
Harkness	Ritchie
Howard (Skeena)	Rose
Howe	Rowland
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)	Saltsman
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)	Scott
Lambert (Edmonton West)	Skoberg
Lewis	Southam
Lundrigan	Stanfield
MacDonald (Egmont)	Stewart (Marquette)
MacEwan	Thomas (Moncton)
	Thompson (Red Deer)—59.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development) moved that Bill C-212, to amend the Yukon Act, the Northwest Territories Act and the Territorial Lands Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: When shall the bill be read the third time?

Mr. Baldwin: By leave, now.

Mr. Chrétien moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: On division.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

POLLUTION—MONITORING OF WATERS RECEIVING EFFLUENT DISCHARGES FROM PLANTS USING MERCURY

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, on June 10 I asked the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) the following question:

> Is the Fisheries Department monitoring all those waters in Canada which receive effluent discharges from industrial plants using mercury processes in their operations? If so, how many such monitoring operations are currently under way?

• (11:10 p.m.)

Mercury pollution has become a major threat to many of our lakes and rivers. It apparently has been with us for a long period of time, but was never detected because no adequate tests for it were carried out. We now find that it has reached into Hudson Bay, where rather severe mercury contamination has been found in beluga whalemeat. The contamination must have come from the Nelson-Saskatchewan River and it is thought that it originated from chemical plants in Saskatoon and in Dryden, Ontario. This means that hundreds of miles of a very large river and of a large lake in Manitoba must have been severely contaminated, because the fish and eventually the whales in Hudson Bay, have been affected. A similar story will probably unfold in other areas of Canada. Mercury poisoning is prevelant in Howe Sound in British Columbia, where it has forced closure of one of the finest sports fishing areas in the province. We have had the Saskatchewan River closed for months, at great cost to the Canadian taxpayers. Lake St. Clair has been closed to commercial fishing, and parts of the Ottawa River have also been closed.

Mercury is used in many major industries. Its use in fungicides is well known, and this use has been the source of some serious mercury pollution problems. Its compounds are useful in manufacturing and are used in some paints to prevent mildewing. The largest users of mercury are the electrical equipment industry and the manufacturers of chlorine and caustic soda. It is used as a catalyst in a

number of chemical manufacturing processes, particularly in the manufacture of vinyl chloride which is the base of many plastics. Mercury and its compounds can accumulate and be concentrated in living things. In this respect it is similar to radioactive pollution and to some pesticides such as DDT. Mercury in water is picked up and concentrated by fish. Birds and other species of sea life may further concentrate the mercury by eating contaminated fish. This is why any source of mercury pollution is dangerous.

I understand that some pulp factories used a mercury compound called phenyl mercury acetate—PMA—to prevent the growth of slime from fungi which clogs machines, and they discharge this PMA with their waste water. I do not know if any of our Canadian pulp plants use this mercury compound, but it should be checked out by the government. I have mentioned the chloralkali plants which produce chlorine and caustic soda by electrolytic process. The heaviest concentration of these plants is along the St. Lawrence River. Have all these plants been checked, along with the water, the river bottom and the fish in the vicinity of the plants? Has the department a list of all the industrial plants in Canada using mercury processes, and have these plants been checked to determine if a mercury pollution problem could exist in their operations? Does the department have sufficient research staff to carry out the monitoring required when a pollution problem is suspected?

These are important and urgent questions. I trust that the minister will be able to give us an assurance that the problem of mercury pollution is not only being looked into but that any offending industrial plant has been forced to take measures to rectify and prevent any further pollution from this source.

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Harding) has asked several questions. The first is: Does the fisheries department monitor all those waters in Canada which receive effluent discharged from industrial plants using mercury processes in their operation? The answer is yes. The major industries using mercury, which previously were discharging substantial amounts of mercury into the waters of Canada, are the chloralkali industries, the chemical processing industries making caustic soda and chlorine principally for the pulp and paper industry, and the pulp and paper industry itself. There are 12 such chloralkali plants in Canada.

[Mr. Harding.]

We have had meetings in Ottawa with all the plants involved. We have monitored all the waters downstream of those plants where we know there has been a degree of mercury contamination in those waters. Steps have been taken, either directly by the federal Department of Fisheries or in conjunction with the provincial departments administering the Fisheries Act, to close local fisheries where mercury levels were high, to compensate fishermen, to identify areas of the river bottom which were contaminated with mercury and to arrange for them to be dredged out. The answer to the difficulties in the chloralkali industry has been total recirculation of the mercury effluent within the plant systems. This has been arranged in all cases.

We have also had meetings in Ottawa with representatives of the pulp and paper industry. There are approximately 140 pulp and paper mills in this country. A majority of them in years gone by used fungicides containing mercury. Progressively they have stopped using these fungicides, mainly because their customers require products which could not possibly contain mercury of any kind. However, at the beginning of 1970 there were still six pulp and paper mills in this country using these fungicides. Their use has since been discontinued.

We have been monitoring the waters downstream of those and other mills which were known within the last decade to use fungicides containing mercury. We have been working with the provinces and industry in each case where appropriate dredging and other measures are planned. The problems downstream of the pulp and paper mills have not been as serious and acute as those—

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

HEALTH AND WELFARE—INCLUSION OF OPTOMETRIC SERVICES UNDER MEDICARE

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, the subject I want to discuss tonight has been under discussion off and on in this House for the past four years. I raised it again on June 17 when I directed a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro). It seemed that in reply the minister was opening the door and that at long last we were going to get a definitive response to the question of including paramedical services, particularly optometric

services, under the medicare act. It is not necessary, nor do I have the time, to review the chequered experience in pursuing this matter when the medicare bill was before the House. Members became concerned over the possible application of paramedical services. At that time an amendment was moved which indicated that upon the request of a province, paramedical services could be included. Again, because of the widespread interest in optometric services it was specifically mentioned.

The reason optometric services are a matter of great concern to many hon. members is that this is the only eye care service available to large numbers of people who live outside the larger urban centres. We are all aware that there is a shortage of ophthalmological services. This means that if Canadians in our rural communities are to receive even the basic refraction tests and are to be covered by the medicare program, which is supposed to be a universal program, they must depend upon the services of optometrists who serve in our smaller communities.

I asked the minister whether it was his intention, based on the fact that a consensus has been reached by the provinces participating in the program, that the government of Canada will now recognize the principle established in the amendment and cover optometric services under the medicare act.

• (11:20 p.m.)

The minister replied that there was to be a meeting during the summer, within the coming two months, with the provincial health ministers at which time the subject would be considered, and that the provincial government concerned would again be canvassed for a consensus. The uncertainty arises from this concept of consensus. It was not present at all in the original amendment. As a matter of fact, the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) specifically raised this point and got an answer from the then Minister of Health and Welfare that it would apply when a single province asked for this particular coverage for its citizens.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Hear, hear!

Mr. Dinsdale: Since that time the consensus concept has been introduced by the former minister and by the present minister. He has even gone so far as to suggest there will be no application of this principle until the territories have been included under the medicare legislation. However, as I said, I asked the minister whether he would consider consensus to be approval by all the provinces participating in medicare at this point, and his answer was, "Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is very largely true."

I trust that tonight the minister, or whoever is representing him, will clarify this point. I think it will be appreciated that there is discrimination involved as between citizens of Canada in various regions and I am sure all members will agree that the principle of universality, which was laid down so firmly by the federal government when it introduced the medicare program, should apply.

Mr. Rosaire Gendron (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the Medical Care Act requires that insured services be provided to all residents upon uniform terms and conditions on a basis, and I quote—

> that does not impede or preclude either directly or indirectly, whether by charges made to insured persons or otherwise, reasonable access to insured services by insured persons.

At the federal-provincial conference of ministers of health held late last year, the provinces indicated to the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro) their desire to include optometric services under medicare. The minister informed the provincial ministers of health at that time that when all the provinces had officially entered into medicare he would take up the matter of including optometric services with his colleagues. At this time, three provinces are not included under the federal medical care program. These are the province of Quebec, for which a precise date of entry is not yet known, New Brunswick, whose announced date of entry is January 1, 1971, and Prince Edward Island, whose announced date of entry is December 1 of this year.

The Minister of National Health and Welfare cannot at this time give the House an outright assurance that eye refraction care will be made available to all Canadians through the medicare program. The extension of medicare to cover these services is a matter which the government must weigh in relation to its total commitments. The minister, however, gives the assurance that it is his intention to discuss the inclusion of these services with his cabinet colleagues.

I would add, Mr. Speaker, for the information of the members of this House, that five provinces include optometric benefits among

the extra benefits of provincial medical care insurance. These benefits, however, are not sustained by federal grants.

INDUSTRY—PROPOSED CLOSING OF CANADIAN SUBSIDIARY BY SKIL CORPORATION OF CHICAGO

Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, I should like first of all to say that I am pleased the minister is here this evening to reply to my question. I trust that whatever sleep he loses tonight he will be able to catch up on tomorrow, either in his office or some other appropriate place.

The battle for Canadian control of our economy is coming to a boil, perhaps even to a brawl. It began to simmer even before the ill-fated budget of Walter Gordon and precipitated the decline of Mr. Gordon, a once powerful force in the Liberal cabinet, to his final isolation and resignation just before the last election. It seems that Mr. Grodon was no longer credible with his colleagues, in spite of the fact that the Watkins report on the subject of the tremendous foreign inroads—and by that I mean United States inroads—that had been made in our economy had been tabled in the meantime.

The Watkins report of 1964 cited, fearfully, large percentages of foreign ownership in some industries, notably gas, oil, mining and autos, and suggested that it might be too late for Canada ever again to regain control of her economy. "So what", many were heard to say, "Hasn't every developing country needed foreign investment at the start? Haven't Canadians the second highest standard of living in the world? What difference does it really make, anyway, who owns what as long as our resources are developed and employment is provided our citizens? And don't we need not less, but even more foreign capital?"

This view, of course, I believe has been the view accepted by most Canadians who have thought about the matter at all. Indeed it is the position that must have been taken by the Liberal government, because to my knowledge not one new piece of legislation was initiated to protect us from foreign takeovers as a result of Professor Watkins' 1964 study. Lately the people of Canada have been making slightly different sounds and there has been a resurgence of concern over such issues. "Sure, we enjoy a high standards of living," some are saying, "but is it really worth it if the price tag includes polluting our waters by pulp mills and decimating our wildlife ranges with open coal pits?"

[Mr. Gendron.]

The government has at last reacted. That is what governments always do—they seldom act; they only react. We are now seeing what amounts to a government flip-flop on the question of Canadian nationalism. The sale of our Mercantile Bank to the New York City Bank was forbidden, as was the proposed sale by Denison uranium mines to foreign interests more recently. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) introduced a bill to assert sovereignty over Canada's Arctic. The Minister of Energy (Mr. Greene) formerly regarded as a continentalist, reversed himself in Denver last month and became instead a sabre-rattling chauvinist, even going so far as to suggest jamming the air waves to protect us from United States' cultural imperialism.

All these things may be the result of government rethinking and enlightenment, and they are fine even though far off and remote from the concerns of the average Canadian worker. To get closer to my home and the subject that we are debating tonight, the importance of Canadian ownership is very real to 125 wage earners in the lower mainland of British Columbia. In 1968 a local firm, Power Machinery, was purchased by the multinational corporation Skil, the saw people of Chicago. My correspondents tell me that Skil now wants to close down its Vancouver operation on the ground of surplus production capacity in Chicago. What might happen—and I know of no present law to prevent its happening—is that the lower mainland of B.C. will be deprived of 125 jobs in order that Chicago can gain the same number. This small, local example has been replicated hundreds of times all over the country during recent years. Where are the former foods canneries of the Fraser Valley? What is to become of the 600 Dunlop workers recently laid off in Toronto?

This process of rationalization in order to maximize the advantages of the multinational corporation makes good economic sense to the corporation, but makes no sense at all to the men who are about to be unemployed. For that matter, what economic advantage can accrue to this country as the result of such policies? This is the nub of the problem of foreign ownership. It is not that Americans are sinister people who have taken advantage of us—quite the opposite; it is that Canadians, through their government, have encouraged this trend and thus vital decisions regarding Canada's future continue to be made beyond our borders.

• (11:30 p.m.)

Up to now, as far as I know there has been no legal way for us to stop the sell-out habit. I think from the context of what I have said the question I am enlarging upon tonight needs no repetition. The minister knows whereof I speak. I conclude by saying that I hope the reply of the minister will give these job holders some hope. I can understand if the Skil Corporation in their corporate wisdom decide to pull out of the B.C. operation. Perhaps the minister will tell us what his intentions are and what he may be able to do legally. Fine words are very tremendous and very comforting for a time. I do not think anyone would dispute the fact that Canada has no legal means of protecting the Canadian worker from this kind of pull-out. I am aware that the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce has been in touch with the company officials—probably with its usual kind of genial persuasiveness, if I know the minister. My intervention tonight is made in the hope that we can keep this issue alive. The minister might indicate some positive steps, and I look forward to hearing his reply.

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, my friend has painted with a very wide brush. Perhaps I could call him a political Borduas. The hon. member also paints mostly in black and white, as did Borduas. It is too late in the evening to go into the whole question he raises, and I have to go home to read my cabinet papers for tomorrow. I will answer specifically in respect of the case referred to by the member regarding the Skil Corporation.

As the hon. member indicated, we are concerned, and officers of the department in Ottawa and in the Canadian Consulate General in Chicago have discussed the situation with management of the Skil Corporation, trying to draw their attention to the concern which would be felt if the operations of this company's Vancouver plant were to be curtailed. The minister smiles. Some of his officials are usually quite convincing in their polite approach to this type of problem.

The company has been pressed to consider alternative solutions to their current corporate problems which would not require any cutbacks in Vancouver, and the company indicated that it would review the situation carefully. I understand that talks are now going on in Vancouver. As far as I am aware, Skil Corporation, the U.S. parent company, has not yet made any final decision regarding its Vancouver subsidiary. Officials of the department have offered and will continue to offer any assistance which we might be able to provide to resolve this problem in a satisfactory way.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

The House met at 2 p.m.

[*Translation*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN SPEAKER'S GALLERY OF MR. PHILIPPE YACÉ, PRESIDENT OF IVORY COAST NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. Speaker: Order. May I point out to the House the presence in the Speaker's Gallery of a very distinguished visitor, Mr. Philippe Yacé, President of the National Assembly of the Ivory Coast Republic.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: On behalf of the House and of all hon. members, I warmly welcome to Canada our very distinguished guest and those who accompany him.

[*English*]

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES CENTENNIAL

HUNDREDTH BIRTHDAY OF ESTABLISHMENT AS PART OF CANADA

Mr. R. J. Orange (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. At the time of Confederation, Canada included only Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and a very small portion of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. Between the tiny Canada of that day in the east and British Columbia in the west stretched the vast, undeveloped, largely unexplored and sparsely populated lands owned by the Hudson's Bay Company.

In 1868 the Rupert's Land Act by the British Imperial Parliament authorized the purchase by the Dominion of Canada of the immense tracts of land known as Rupert's Land and the Northwestern Territory. One hundred years ago today, on June 23, 1870, Queen Victoria signed the order which transferred these lands to the government of Canada and which granted to the Parliament of Canada authority to legislate for their future welfare and good government upon the terms and conditions therein stated.

Thus Canada grew from a small country huddled along the Great Lakes, the St. Lawrence River and the Atlantic seaboard to a mighty nation stretching north to the Arctic Ocean and west to the Pacific. The people of the Northwest Territories are Canadians first, proud of their contribution to our nation, its heritage and its culture.

The riches of the Canadian north, both of its people and of its resources, offer to Canada a unique opportunity to develop a truly Canadian identity from the Atlantic to the Arctic to the Pacific, from sea to sea to sea.

[*Translation*]

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

Twelfth report of Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, in French and in English—Mr. Lessard (LaSalle).

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Fourth report of Standing Committee on Public Accounts, in French and in English—Mr. Lefebvre.

[*Editor's Note: For text of above reports, see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

• (2:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

COMMUNICATIONS

TABLING OF STUDY, "A REVIEW OF THE PUBLIC MESSAGE TELEGRAPH SERVICE IN CANADA"

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 41 (2) I wish to table one copy in each of the two official languages of the report of the study undertaken by the Department of Communications entitled "A Review of the Public Message Telegraph Service in Canada".

Mr. Baldwin: Is that the new substitute for the Post Office?

Finance

FINANCE

ESTABLISHMENT OF CENTRAL DEPOSITORY FOR SECURITIES

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a statement to the House concerning the creation of a central depository for securities in Canada. For a few years now, some prominent Canadian financial and investment institutions have been considering the feasibility of establishing such a central depository. This led very recently to the incorporation under Part I of the Canada Corporations Act of the Canadian Depository for Securities Limited.

This corporation is a non-profit, service venture with no public financial involvement; most of the major financial and investment institutions are committed to its eventual operation.

The purpose of the depository is to facilitate the transfer of shares across Canada by computerized bookkeeping entries, thereby reducing the need for physical transfer of share certificates and the attendant administrative problems and costs.

Incorporation of this company under the Canada Corporations Act is an interim step. Before it can begin to operate as a depository it will require special powers now reserved for trust companies and not granted to companies incorporated under the Canada Corporations Act. It will also require government supervision in order to maintain full confidence in the system.

For these reasons, and in view of the fact that the creation of the depository will be an important forward step in the operation of the Canadian securities market, the government intends to present to Parliament in due course legislation which would give the depository the special powers needed for its effective operation.

For the further information of the House, I should like to table a letter I have written to the corporation's solicitor, outlining the government's position and intention in this matter.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, having had an opportunity to consider this matter as a result of the minister having sent me notice of his intention to make this statement, I should like to make a few comments. I think this is a step in the right direction, albeit there would have been much more progress if it had been wedded to a similar indication of progress on the establishment of a Canadian securities commission. The central depository for securities is a co-operative venture made possible through amendments to the Canada Corporations Act. It is important to determine where the location of this depository shall be. That is a matter that could be settled through co-operation with the provinces. The federal government and the provinces should agree upon the ultimate location of the securities commission and also agree upon the location of this depository because the two go hand in hand.

I agree with the minister that there will be a sensible reduction in the loss of time and in expense. The method of supervision has not been indicated but I hope it will come under the Superintendent of Insurance rather than under some other body.

Under these circumstances I think it is a welcome announcement. We look forward to this matter having high priority at the opening of the new session as far as legislative changes are concerned and we hope that it will not have to wait for the abolition of symbols in other places.

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, in this age of computers a central depository for securities is a necessity and we are therefore pleased to see that such an organization is to be established. Since the purpose is to ease the physical transfer of shares and other assets, I question why it is being brought in as a corporation involving the financial institutions. In view of the fact that the minister has stated it will require government supervision to maintain full confidence in the system, it would seem that the logical and uncomplicated thing to do would be to set it up as a Crown corporation somewhat similar to the Bank of Canada or a land registry office where a fee would be charged for the use of the service. There is no explanation why it was not done in that way.

We may find ourselves following the same path as we did with the Bank of Canada when an attempt was made to set it up as an instrument in which the financial institutions would play a role. It was discovered that it would not work this way and would have to act as an instrument of public policy. It seems to me, barring some explanation, that this is not the sensible way to set up this organization and that the minister should seriously consider the establishment of a Crown corporation. Desirable as the purpose is, I think it is frustrated by the manner in which he proposes to set up this body.

[*Translation*]

BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM

CONCLUSIONS OF GOVERNMENT WITH RESPECT TO VOLUME III OF COMMISSION'S REPORT

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the House I should like to make a statement about the conclusions which the government has reached with respect to the recommendations of Volume III of the report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. As hon. members will be aware, this volume deals with "The Work World", including the public service and armed forces as well as the private sector.

I am pleased to state that the government is able to accept in principle the broad objectives proposed for the public service by the Royal Commission. The general lines of these objectives are that the French language should increasingly become a language of work in the public service, that the atmosphere of the public service should represent the lingustic and cultural reality of Canadian society, and that Canadians whose mother tongue is French should be adequately represented in the public service—both in terms of numbers and in levels of responsibility.

The fifty-seven recommendations which Volume III of the report sets forth have been the subject of detailed study by a committee of senior officials and have been given careful consideration by ministers. The suggestions put forward by the Commission involve far-reaching changes in some instances, and they have been given the close attention which they deserve.

[*English*]

I wish to table, with the consent of the House, a detailed document which outlines the existing management objectives in this field and comments on the recommendations made by the commission. I have two copies in both official languages, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to have this document tabled?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed.

[*English*]

Mr. Trudeau: The fundamental consideration to which I am sure all Canadians fully subscribe is one of equality of opportunity in the words of the commission's report, "a real equality of opportunity, ensuring that the fact of speaking English or French would be neither a help nor a handicap to a person seeking entry into the institutions affecting our individual and collective life."

In the Federal Public Service, equal opportunity is closely related to the merit principle which cannot be said to be fully operative unless it extends to qualified francophones with little or no knowledge of English a recognition equal to that which it accords anglophones whose knowledge of French is similarly limited. I emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that we in no sense propose to limit the merit principle, but rather to fulfil it.

At this point I might put it to the House that, this general principle having been stated, if we want to get on faster I could table the rest of my statement which has been distributed to the leaders of the parties.

Some hon. Members: Read on.

Mr. Trudeau: If there is some desire to go through the whole reading of it, members know how well I enjoy reading and I know how much they enjoy listening to me.

Mr. Baldwin: You need the practice.

Mr. Trudeau: As the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) says, I need the practice. I am not quite sure if that practice could ever improve my performance. However, I am perfectly happy to take the time of the House to read on as suggested by the Conservative party.

[*Translation*]

The recommendations of the Commission can be considered under five main headings:

First, general principles. The first group of recommendations deals with the general principles of Public Service organization and management. It includes three recommendations (Nos. 1, 2 and 5) concerning the establishment of French-language units, and two more (Nos. 3 and 4) dealing with the appointment of francophones to the most senior positions in the public service.

There has, I think, been a great deal of misunderstanding about the notion of French-language units. I stated some time ago that we could not accept the creation of ghettos in which French-Canadian public servants would be divided off from their English-Canadian colleagues. Of course, this was not the Commissioners' intention.

Their comments make it clear that they had in mind units in which the main language of work would be French, but which could include both anglophone and francophone public servants. In our opinion, what the Royal Commission hoped to see accomplished was simply an extension of measures which it had already recommended to make the Public Service a bilingual institution. Viewed in that way, French-language units could have several advantages: for example, they would permit the recruitment and participation of unilingual francophones on a more equal footing with unilingual anglophones. By the same token, this procedure would open the way to a greater reliance on a manpower source that has not until now been adequately used, that is, those well-qualified francophone candidates whose knowledge of English is limited. It is a pool of talent from which the federal Public Service has been largely cut off. At the same time, the French language units would provide a milieu in which anglophone public servants who have invested great effort in acquiring second language skills would have the opportunity of becoming fluent in the French language, just as many of their francophone colleagues are now fluent in the English language. Such units would operate in favour of a greater degree of individual bilingualism at senior levels of the Public Service. They should also make it easier for French to take its place with English as a language of work in the federal administration.

• (2:20 p.m.)

[*English*]

The upshot of this, in the government's view, is that French language units should be considered as a means to an end, a useful tool in helping to advance toward a bilingual public service. Indeed, a number of francophone units, or units which come close to what the commissioners had in mind, are already in operation in the Federal Public Service in Quebec, in the Armed Forces and in some departments in Ottawa where they appear to work effectively and without difficulty.

It is clear that the consequence of establishing such units cannot be judged in the abstract. The government therefore believes that in an initial period they should be set up on an experimental basis which would permit a better informed decision to be taken at a later date as to whether the system can be viable in the long term. The application of the use of French would be established progressively in these French language units so that during a preliminary period, as an aid to anglophone participants in such units, the choice of language for written work would be optional.

On the understanding, then, that the units should not be considered an end in themselves, and that we should have an open and experimental attitude toward their potential advantages and disadvantages, we are prepared to go ahead over the next year or so with pilot projects in a number of departments designed to test this idea more fully.

We are also inclined to believe, Mr. Speaker, that there has been some misunderstanding concerning the Royal Commission's recommendations on the appointment of francophones to the Public Service and government task forces. I should make it clear that the government has no difficulty whatever in accepting recommendation No. 4 to the effect that federal planning and advisory bodies, task forces and similar groups should include "effectively balanced participation by Anglophones and Francophones". This is already government policy and has been for some time. Nor do we find it difficult to agree that such balanced participation should also be an important consideration in the appointment of senior officials. I must emphasize, however, that we do not accept that this in any way represents a modification of the merit principle. The first requirement will always be to search for the public servant who best merits the job. We see no inconsistency in ensuring the maintenance of this principle and at the same time respecting the need for full participation in the Federal Public Service by members of both the Anglophone and Francophone communities.

[*Translation*]

Second, the language policy. The next group of recommendations (Nos. 6 to 15 and No. 21) deals in some detail with language policy in the public service, in relation to recruitment, training and the work situation. In large measure these recommendations are straightforward in nature and can be accepted without difficulty; in fact a number of them have been reflected in government policy for some time. Although we recognize that a great deal remains to be done in this area, I am pleased to say that considerable progress has already been made toward realizing the objectives which are set by these recommendations.

Third, the public service organization. The next series of recommendations includes a number of suggestions regarding recruitment, promotion, and conditions of employment (recommendations 16 to 20), as well as suggestions with respect to organizational changes relating to the implementation of the recommendations put forward in Volume III, recommendations 22 to 24.

In general these recommendations are acceptable to the government, but I would like to draw the attention of the House to three in particular.

With regard to Recommendation 17, the government is of course prepared to recruit qualified persons abroad, whether in English-speaking countries or French-speaking countries, but only after it has been demonstrated that Canadian sources have been examined and that no qualified Canadians are available. This requirement is included in the Public Service Employment Act, and the government sees no reason to propose that it be altered.

The government has given careful consideration to the Commission's recommendation 22 that a new Public Service Authority be established. A number of developments have taken place in this field since the Commissioners carried out their study, and these have had a considerable bearing on our analysis of this proposal. In particular, a new service was established in the Secretary of State Department in 1969, whose responsibility it is to co-ordinate the implementation of the government's official languages policy. In order to avoid waste and duplication, we consider it more rational to maintain and reinforce this organization rather than to establish a new bureau with responsibilities in the same field. We are convinced that by proceeding in this way we will reduce administrative delays and speed up progress towards bilingualism in the public service.

[*English*]

Fourth, the armed forces. The next group of recommendations, numbers 25 to 41, relates to the Canadian Armed Forces. They have been the subject of detailed study in consultation with the military authorities, and I am happy to be able to say that, on the whole, the Armed Forces are already working in the directions indicated by these recommendations. Nevertheless, although they are acceptable to the government it would be misleading to suggest that the measures recommended in this field by the commissioners can be accomplished overnight or without difficulty. Changes of this magnitude require considerable effort and can only be introduced gradually if standards of efficiency and morale are to be maintained.

Fifth, the private sector. On the whole, the recommendations in this section are not addressed to the federal government. I might say, however, that we understand the reasons which led the commissioners to make a number of recommendations concerning the private sector, for a bilingual Canada cannot be achieved if efforts are restricted to governmental activities alone. We recognize, moreover, that the situation in the past has not been satisfactory and we believe Canadians will agree that changes are needed. Indeed, certain private firms and institutions have already shown what it is possible to accomplish with good will and a determined effort. Those responsible are to be commended, in my view, for having acted on their own initiative and I hope that increasing numbers of private institutions will see the need for further steps in this direction. For its part the government will be pleased to do whatever it can to encourage and assist them.

• (2:30 p.m.)

The proposals which the commissioners have put forward to establish task forces involving government, business, labour and universities seem to us to be reasonable. Although they are not addressed to the federal government as such, I can assure the provincial authorities that we will be pleased to play a part in this process if that is their wish. Moreover, in so far as recommendation 42 is addressed to the federal government, we are certainly prepared to ensure that the French language is used in our operations in all appropriate circumstances. We also have no hesitation in accepting two of the recommendations in this series, numbers 56 and 57, which are directly addressed to the federal government.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I say that we must recognize in all honesty that the effort to move toward a bilingual country is one to which Canadians have come very late in the day. As a result, we do not expect that the goal will be reached overnight; nor do we expect it will be easy to accomplish. We believe, however, and we think that this view is confirmed by discussions with provincial governments, groups and individuals across the country, that there is a new attitude toward bilingualism in Canada and a willingness to work towards its realization. We con-

sider that the recommendations contained in Book III should be seen in this light, as a part of an ongoing effort which cannot be imposed on a people, but which will grow out of a sense of co-operation, mutual respect and understanding. Mr. Speaker, it is my profound hope that all Canadians will wish to join in making these ideals a reality. That is all I have to read at this time, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I must begin by expressing admiration for the obvious reluctance of the Prime Minister, (Mr. Trudeau) to take very much of the time of the House to make this statement, particularly in view of the special significance of tomorrow. I do wish to thank him for sending me a copy of his statement with the attached papers this morning.

This is obviously a subject of great importance, a subject of great sensitivity and a subject in respect of which we would obviously wish to weigh our words carefully and also speak quite frankly. This is a very far-reaching statement by the Prime Minister with very far-reaching implications. I think I can summarize his statement by saying that generally speaking he is accepting the recommendations of the commission in the third volume, with one very important exception.

Let me refer to recommendation No. 22 which will be found on page 8 of the document tabled by the Prime Minister. The commissioners say:

> We recommend the creation of a Public Service Language Authority. This new body will be responsible for a) planning, implementing, and maintaining institutional bilingualism—

This recommendation was not accepted by the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister instead said the government had decided to amplify and develop a service that had been established in the Department of the Secretary of State. In other words, instead of establishing the formal authority recommended by the commission, presumably by Act of Parliament, the Prime Minister and the government have chosen to utilize a service within the Department of the Secretary of State.

This is of vital importance. What are the terms of reference of the Secretary of State's authority? What are his terms of reference in regard to exercising the control he will presumably exercise over every other department of government and the Armed Forces within, of course, the terms of reference? What are the terms of reference of his authority with regard to the private sector?

The government itself has great power to influence private institutions and private companies in this country. It is no exaggeration to say that the tentacles of the federal government are everywhere. Precisely what is the Secretary of State going to do to "encourage and assist private institutions" to take further steps toward bilingualism? We do not know.

I do not propose to commit myself or my party at this time to the establishment of a public service language authority, but at least such an authority would be set up by Act of Parliament and would give Parliament and the country an opportunity to discuss these matters. Certainly I have no hesitation in condemning as strongly as I can the tactic of the government to avoid this kind of discussion by giving this kind of authority to a service in the Secretary of State's department with undefined terms of reference.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: I suggest that this is a far-reaching matter. It is a matter that ought to be discussed in Parliament. It is a matter that ought to be discussed in Parliament in such a way that the public which wishes to express its views could do so to a committee of the House. This could have been done if the recommendation of the commission had been followed and a bill introduced, for example, to establish a public service language authority. Nobody in the House would disagree that this is of special importance. At least in this way it would bring the matter before the House in a manner presumably in line with the views of the commission. The Prime Minister is avoiding this.

What are the Secretary of State's terms of reference? We may be told they are contained in the recommendations included in the third volume of the B and B commission report. If these are the terms of reference they could be changed presumably any day by cabinet minute.

I think we have to recognize that relations between linguistic groups are always somewhat difficult. There is always a certain amount of fear and suspicion, whether or not it is justified. Therefore it is most important that we avoid this as much as possible. It is very important that we establish institutions and that we take steps in such a way so as to

reduce to a minimum the possibilities of fear and suspicion as to what may be going on.

The Prime Minister wants to use the Department of the Secretary of State as a vehicle "to speed up progress towards bilingualism in the Public Service". That is the Prime Minister's aim. In choosing this vehicle he may actually set it back. The old adage of more haste, less speed, may be appropriate here, because this is a very far-reaching step being taken, as I say, with no real public discussion. The measures are subject to no real public control or knowledge because they are being relegated, as I judge the Prime Minister's statement, to the secret recesses of the government.

I have in the past expressed concern about the concept of unilingual working units. I suggested that this is a backward step and to that extent an abandonment of the concept of bilingualism. I referred to the danger that we might develop some new solitudes. This is still my belief.

• (2:40 p.m.)

Are we to proceed without more discussion than we are having here this afternoon? Are we merely to have this brief exchange? The Prime Minister joked about the length of his statement. Are we to have this relatively brief discussion and then turn everything over to the Department of the Secretary of State to administer from now on?

The Prime Minister referred to the question of senior appointments and the merit system. He said that the merit system would not be modified in any way by an attempt to balance senior appointments in terms of language. There may be very good reason to balance senior appointments in terms of language, but it is nonsense to pretend that this would not be a modification of the merit system. We would be modifying the merit system if we were to adopt a system whereby so many senior appointments would come from each region. There might be reason for this, but it would be a modification of the merit system. So I do not think the Prime Minister should stand up in the House and say that this is not a modification of the merit system. It may very well be defensible, but it is a modification of the merit system.

I say again that it is wrong to proceed in this way. This is the same way Information Canada was set up. It was set up by government decree. This is a further concentration of power. I suggest it is an abuse of power and is an excessive resort to secrecy.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: I say again that the commission itself recommended a procedure that would be open and that would call for the government coming before the House and the country to present its measures and persuade the country to adopt those measures. But even had the commission not made that recommendation I would still believe that Parliament and the people of this country should have an opportunity to discuss these matters and make their views known before the policy is settled and shunted off once and for all to be administered by a department of government.

I wish to emphasize that I do not say this because the present Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) is a French-speaking Canadian. The situation might be more serious and a little more under suspicion if he were an English-speaking Canadian. The principle, however, is the same. We are faced not only with a *fait accompli* but with the administration of this policy in the future and with the development of this policy in the future being conducted within the secrecy of the cabinet and administered by departmental decisions.

I say in all seriousness that the government is creating an atmosphere which will encourage suspicion to flourish. I do not like that. I do not like it a bit, and I ask the government to reconsider more earnestly the manner in which it is proceeding and its intention apparently to deal with this simply as another departmental operation. I ask most sincerely, in fact I insist, that the government proceed in such a manner that this matter can come before the House and be discussed in such a way that interested Canadians will have an opportunity to make their views known.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: We are trying to build a united country. We are trying to make progress. I suggest we have been at it for quite a while and ought to take enough time to make certain that we proceed forward and that we do not take a step forward in such a manner that we find ourselves having slipped back a couple of steps in the process.

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I shall begin by congratulating the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) for reading the statement in a way that was more pleasant to listen to than he himself said was the situation on other occasions. I do wish to thank him very sincerely for having provided the

opposition parties with a copy of his statement very early this morning so that it could be given some consideration.

I remind the House that it was only as late as 1966, indeed on April 6, 1966, that the then Prime Minister, the Right Hon. Lester Pearson, made a statement with regard to bilingualism in the federal service. Indeed, Book III of the commission's report reproduces that statement as one of the appendices. At that time, speaking for my party, I said that it is a measure of the insensitivity by which we have treated our country and the language question that it was not until the 99th year of the existence of Confederation that the Prime Minister of Canada produced a co-ordinated statement about bilingual policy in the federal service. It is a measure also of the neglect of 100 years that it was not until the 103rd year of Confederation that the policy merely started by the right hon. Mr. Pearson in 1966 received fuller implementation in the statement we had today. As one Canadian I know the immense harm this failure to recognize the bilingual character of Canada inside the federal civil service has done to the unity of the country. I express with the Prime Minister and every other Canadian the sincere hope that these steps are not too late.

I am also very glad that the Prime Minister and the government have decided to deal with the French language units on an experimental basis. When I first read Book III of the commission's report I wondered whether the commissioners are not being a little too theoretical rather than practical in their propositions, because it is important that we not create language ghettos in the federal public service and not create a situation where one language unit competes with another language unit, whether of the same language or of the second official language, which is likely to be the case. Furthermore, it would seem to me that these things must not be artificially imposed. They ought to be developed functionally, to use a favourite word of the Prime Minister, as the situation makes it natural that the language unit be developed in a given department, Crown corporation or agency. Therefore, on behalf of my colleagues and myself I welcome the fact that the government intends to proceed step by step with these units as a pilot project in order to study the advantages and disadvantages before any large-scale work is done in this field.

I remind hon. members, and I think it is important to emphasize it, that when we speak of Anglophones in Canada we are not speaking about Canadians of British origin but are speaking of all Canadians whatever their origin whose working language in Canada is English. Also, when we speak of French-speaking Canadians in this country we are not speaking only of Canadians of French origin but of all Canadians whose working language is French and whose education has probably been in the French language. We ought to make clear to the people of Canada that this is not French versus English in the traditional sense of those words. It is recognizing that there are two language communities in Canada, whatever the origin of the members of those communities may be.

• (2:50 p.m.)

I want to emphasize another point which is merely mentioned in the Prime Minister's statement and which I have thought for many years is of very great importance. I suggest that one of the difficulties in the province of Quebec—only one; I am not saying it is the major one or that there are not very many others—in latter years has been the absence of identification by the French-speaking university population in Quebec with the federal system, with the federal capital and with the federal service. They have not felt that this is their service, this is their capital, this is where they can live their lives in useful contribution to their country, but have tended to regard the capital of their province as being their capital only, or their only capital, and to feel that no other capital in this country affected them. Therefore I think it is of the utmost importance that the government and the various agencies of government make a concerted and conscientious effort to bring a federal civil service career to the attention of the undergraduates in French-speaking universities in Canada, and to promote as much as possible their undertaking that career in the federal service.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lewis: These steps we are taking now, these steps which are proposed now, ought to make it possible to persuade Canadians of the French language attending French language universities to accept the proposition that the federal civil service is also a service in which they can live their lives in useful contribution and in fulfilment of their individual culture and language.

I suggest also, Mr. Speaker, that we must in implementing this kind of policy—I am saying something that is rather banal and I

apologize for it—avoid either timidity or rashness. We must avoid going too slowly, and we must also avoid imposing the suggestions of the commission in a way which will upset a lot of people. No matter what the policy may be, Mr. Speaker, whether it is laid down in a law or laid down in a statement by the Prime Minister, whether or not that policy will be advantageous will depend on the way in which it is implemented. A bad law is often good because of a good administration, and a good law is often butchered because of bad administration. No matter how good a policy may be, unless it is implemented with flexibility, with sensitivity, with understanding, implemented on the basis and with the knowledge that you cannot correct a mistake of 100 years in one year, unless that is carefully kept in mind a great deal of harm may easily be done.

I also want to say to the Prime Minister, although I am sure he does not need to hear it from me but I want to put it on the record, that it is not merely the question of retaining the merit principle that is involved, the merit principle in the technical sense in which it is defined in the relevant legislation. What is involved is the maintenance of a high quality of civil servants in the civil service, and the matter of language should be used as an instrument for improving that quality and never be allowed, because of pressures, to reduce the quality in our federal civil service in order to satisfy either one or other of the main language groups in this country. The quality of our federal public service is a most important thing.

I was going to say a word or two, and I will, on the public service authority recommendation of the commission, recommendation No. 22. I am not quite sure, Mr. Speaker, whether the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) was recommending that such an agency should be established or whether he was expressing dissatisfaction with what is proposed but opposing the establishment of such an agency.

I have not had a chance to discuss this with my colleagues, and I hope they will agree with me, but I want to make it clear that my study of the situation, which is not entirely inconsiderable, persuades me that such an authority would be undesirable, not only for the reasons the Prime Minister has given of duplication and so on but because it would set up another authority, an agency having to do only with language. It could become an agency unto its own end, as it were. Instead of recognizing the language problem as a means to an end that agency would be concerned only with the language and it would seek to interfere with the Public Service Commission, it would seek to interfere with government departments, it would seek to interfere with the merit principle, and it would seek to interfere with the quality of the civil service.

I therefore cannot agree with the implication—I say this in friendliness and kindness —in the statement of the Leader of the Opposition that any kind of separate language authority which would have authority over all departments is a practical way in which to deal with this problem. I do not think it is. I remind the House that we also have a commissioner under the Official Languages Act, whom some of us have met, and we are impressed with his flexible and intelligent approach to this problem, and he will undoubtedly do some of the ombudsman work that may arise.

Having said that, I express on behalf of my colleagues and myself entire agreement with the statement of the Leader of the Opposition in criticism of the government for putting this into the Department of the Secretary of State, without telling us exactly what it is that they are putting there. I suggest it is the Prime Minister's duty, as a part of governmental organization, to set up in the Secretary of State's Department a separate division having to do with language, for which there should be a separate vote in the estimates, for which there ought to be regular reports to Parliament on which the minister and his officials can be regularly questioned, and on which their work can receive the scrutiny and, if necessary, the criticism of Members of Parliament and of the public.

It is totally inadequate to say that his department is doing this. I want to know who is doing this. Who is the person, who are the people, what is the division, who is the head of it, what policies are they pursuing, what are they trying to accomplish, and what are their objectives? We should be told all of these things, and a separate division should therefore be set up for that purpose.

I should not take any longer, Mr. Speaker. I am glad that a further step in the right direction for unity in Canada is being undertaken. I emphasize again that you cannot repair the errors of a century in a year or two, and that I am therefore glad that the steps that are being taken are being taken on an experi-

mental basis so that we may be sure that what we build we build soundly for a stronger and more united Canada.

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, the general agreement which the government is in a position to give to the main objectives set forth by the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism in volume III of its report must not let us overlook the fact that the national problem is of such far-reaching consequences that a mere agreement in principle is far from satisfactory.

At a time when 650,000 Quebecers decide in favour of a provincial party advocating Quebec independence, it is rather strange to note to what extent the Prime Minister soft-pedals the essential recommendations of the Commission. What may appear as radical and drastic solutions to an English-speaking Canadian is merely basic justice to a French-speaking Canadian.

The Prime Minister states, and I quote:

> In the Federal Public Service, equal opportunity is closely related to the merit principle—
>
> —I emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that we in no sense propose to limit the merit principle, but rather to fulfill it.

Saying this, he seems to ignore an actual situation which makes the knowledge of English an essential requirement of the merit system he referred to. One only has to try to get in touch with senior officials in various federal departments to find out that it is still very difficult to obtain information or to carry on discussions in French with them.

Some progress has indeed been made. But much more will be needed in order to achieve the true equality we all hope for. I would like to emphasize a particular paragraph of the Prime Minister's statement which puzzles me. At page 3 of his statement, he says, and I quote:

> The application of the use of French would be established progressively in these French-language units so that during a preliminary period, as an aid to anglophone participants in such units, the choice of language for written work would be optional.

We do not object to helping anglophone participants to learn French, but if French units are designed for that purpose alone, nothing will change. The fire that burns brightly at night on St. Jean Baptiste Day will slowly go out. And the Prime Minister's good intentions, on the eve of French Canada's national day, will come to nothing in the English bureaucracy.

As I said, I welcome the Prime Minister's statement but I am afraid that it is not forceful enough.

While in Quebec we have put behind us forever the little "Baptiste" with his blond curls and even the tall "Baptiste", in Ottawa the sheep is shyly coming in.

• (3:00 p.m.)

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

SECOND REPORT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS COMMITTEE—AGREEMENT TO EXPEDITE CONCURRENCE

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, there has been some discussion about the motion on the notice paper today standing in the name of the hon. member for Ottawa West in his capacity as chairman of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs. It is a motion to concur in the second report of the committee, and I believe there would be general agreement to an order in the following terms: first, to permit the motion for concurrence to be brought forward today rather than Thursday which would be the normal course and, second, that the question be put on the motion without debate. I wonder if it could be ascertained whether there is agreement to this effect and, if so, perhaps it could be made a motion of the House and brought forward at this time.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are agreeable in the hope that the government will use this extra time to move immediately on all the recommendations in the report.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): We are very happy to agree to this motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members have heard the terms of the order suggested by the President of the Privy Council. Is it so agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

CENTENNIAL OF NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

CELEBRATION AT NATIONAL ARTS CENTRE—WELCOME TO COMMISSIONER AND COUNCIL MEMBERS

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr.

Speaker, 100 years ago today June 23, Queen Victoria, by decision of the Council transferred the vast territories known at the time as Rupert Territory, and Northwest Territories to the new confederation then set up by Canada.

Last night, we celebrated the Centennial of the Northwest Territories at the National Arts Centre. On this memorable occasion, we had the pleasure of welcoming there the Commissioner and the members of the Council of the Northwest Territories. Thanks to the courtesy of the people of the North, the event was a success. I would therefore like today to give them due credit and to thank them for their dedicated service in the far North.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, I should like to inform the House that we are privileged to have in the gallery today Commissioner Hodgson and Councillors Tetlachi, Stewart and Barber.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, may I say that we in this party join with the minister in his statement and are pleased to welcome these distinguished visitors. We hope their presence here will move the government to grant that degree of independence which the citizens of the territories so earnestly desire.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, the members of this party would like to add their welcome and say how glad we are to have them here on this auspicious occasion. We regret that the government last night managed to emasculate the recommendations of the committee which would have improved the lot of these people, but we are hopeful that by persistence we will be able to bring about a genuine type of democracy in the far north.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, we of the Ralliement créditiste would like to join with the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development in congratulating the Council of the Northwest Territories and wishing it well.

I would also like to point out that during the present session several pieces of legislation concerning the Northwest Territories have been considered and passed.

Thereby we hope that in the near future the Council of both territories, will be able to come here not as councils but as provincial representatives and take part in the federal-provincial conferences and work together with the federal government. (*Applause*)

[*English*]

VETERANS AFFAIRS

CONCURRENCE IN SECOND REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Lloyd Francis (Ottawa West) moved that the second report of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs, presented to the House on June 22, 1970, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

PENSIONS

OLD AGE SECURITY—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, this being a day on which it seems that many motions and statements are enjoying unanimous consent, I hope the pattern will continue. I rise to ask the consent of the House to move an important motion under Standing Order 43.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I wish some of my Liberal friends in what used to be the Little Chicago area would not say no until they hear what it is.

As hon. members, even my friends across the way, are aware, a motion under Standing Order 43 must have urgent and pressing necessity. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that if ever a motion had urgent and pressing necessity it is the one I wish to make. I hope that before government members just say no they will consider letting the House pass it without debate so that the government may give consideration to the request contained in my motion.

The urgency is that we are not to see in this part of the session the government's white paper on social security, and we have no undertaking that there will be legislation in the near future to assist our senior citizens. I believe that something should be done right away. Therefore I ask leave to move, seconded by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway:

That this House urgently appeals to the government to take the necessary steps to provide an immediate interim increase in the amount of the old age security pension.

Mr. Speaker: As the hon. member himself has mentioned, this motion under Standing

Order 43 requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Some hon. Members: No.

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

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Who said no?

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

INDIAN AFFAIRS

ABORIGINAL RIGHTS—DETERMINATION BY INDEPENDENT AUTHORITY

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. In view of the research results that have recently been published, does the government propose to change its views with regard to the aboriginal rights of the Indian peoples? Does it seek to have the extent of those rights determined by some authority independent of the government or is it still of the view that the rights are so vague and obscure as to be virtually non-existent?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, the government policy in this field is well known and we are proceeding with our consultations with the Indians. We submitted our proposals in June of last year, and the Indians' counter-proposals have started to pour in. When we have received them all, we will be glad to enter into negotiations with them, in order to devise a policy acceptable to both the Indians, the first citizens of our country, and the other Canadian citizens.

[*English*]

Mr. Stanfield: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Following the presentation of the red paper by the representatives of the Indian people, is the government accepting the recommendation contained in this paper to appoint a commissioner to inquire into the treaties who would be appointed on a different basis and with much more authority than recommended in the white paper, or is this just a matter of continuing talk as far as the minister is concerned?

[Mr. Speaker.]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I think it is important at this time to discuss with the Indians. We have no intention of imposing anything on them. Some suggestions have been submitted by the Indians of Alberta. I know that other Indian associations will make suggestions to us shortly. We will be happy to talk with them and try to develop a policy acceptable to them and which will not go against the well-known concepts of our society.

[*English*]

Mr. Stanfield: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. What kind of consultation does the minister consider it to be when his consultation seems to consist only of consultation within the framework that he and the government have laid down?

An hon. Member: You are wrong.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, it would be advisable to point out to the Leader of the Opposition that since last September, consultations have mostly been held among Indians only. Discussions took place in all provinces and we were present only when invited by the Indians.

[*English*]

NORTHERN QUEBEC—GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE IN SECURING RIGHTS

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since the discussions which took place in northern Quebec between the representatives of the government, the Indians and Eskimos of northern Quebec indicate, through the printed minutes of the meetings, that the native people of that area very keenly desire some government assistance in securing their rights to the ownership of the resources and the land, is the government going to take that into account in its actions?

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member should make a distinction because there are two groups of people concerned in northern Quebec. There are the Indians and there are the Eskimos. The Indians have formed a committee of Indian, of federal representatives and of provincial representa-

tives. I think they have had five meetings up until now. There were some discussions with the Eskimos, and the people are aware of the kind of discussions we have held and of the consultations. I said that we needed more consultations with the provincial government because of the change in administration. I hope to have the opportunity of meeting the new Minister of Natural Resources of Quebec soon.

NATURAL RESOURCES

NEGOTIATIONS WITH UNITED STATES

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister regarding the statement in Calgary by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources to the effect that the Canadian government would be most happy to begin exploratory discussions with the United States on energy matters. Since the government has until recently taken the position that it was not going to bargain on energy matters with a gun at its head or until the restrictions on Canadian imports of oil into the United States had been lifted, may I ask if the government has reversed its policy and is now prepared to negotiate on some of Canada's natural resources in order to secure the removal of the oil restrictions? If so, what are the energy items that are up for grabs?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Well, Mr. Speaker, this is a tactical matter which really is not one of government policy. The minister has been in contact with his United States counterparts for some months now. I presume, on the basis that the quotas on Canadian oil have been slightly eased recently, the minister probably feels now that this means they have unloaded the gun.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the Prime Minister now or the minister later tell the House what energy items are likely to be discussed in these negotiations which the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources says he will be happy to begin. Does this cover items such as uranium, natural gas, coal and water, or are any of these items exempt from the negotiations?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I expect that the statement of the minister is what is known in negotiation parlance as an overture. I am not sure at this stage if he would want to say more than he has. However, I can reassure the hon. member that I would be very surprised if this meant the sale of Canadian water.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since there are some apparent contradictions in the statements which have emanated from the treasury benches regarding negotiations with the United States on energy matters, may I ask whether the government will make a statement on motions or produce a white paper, so that we may know what its policy is with respect to energy?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the minister would be putting himself in a very poor negotiating position if he were to tell the House, the country and the people he is negotiating with in advance what his final position will be before he begins to negotiate.

OWNERSHIP OF RESOURCE INDUSTRIES—CANADA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the Prime Minister if the minister in question was enunciating government policy when he suggested that Canada intends to pursue its policy of increasing the national content of ownership of resource industries through the medium of a nationally-owned Canadian corporation which would include some government participation? Is legislation now in the course of preparation for a Canada Development Corporation or something similar?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, about a week or ten days ago, no doubt when the hon. member had his nose buried in his papers, I said that government policy was set on this act and, indeed, that a bill was ready but that we would not be able to pass it before the end of the present part of the session unless the House were to agree unanimously to discuss it and pass it in all stages in one day.

Mr. Baldwin: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the Prime Minister discuss with the Minister of Agriculture the question of vetting the members of the government from the top down for foot and mouth disease, having in mind that the government is now flying by the seat of its pants without knowing which way it is going and when it will get there?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Trudeau: So are lots of other people.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

An hon. Member: Why don't you boys hold your pants up?

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since the Prime Minister has repeated his offer that he is prepared to bring down the legislation if the Canada Development Corporation bill can be passed in one day, would the Prime Minister be prepared to make a copy of the legislation available to the leaders of the various parties so that we can ascertain whether it is the kind of legislation we would care to pass in one day?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, if the leaders of the other parties were to indicate their interest in this operation, I am sure that we could arrange a short briefing for them. If it arose that they were prepared to pass it in one day, I am sure we could find time to do it. I suggest that between five and six o'clock would be ideal.

Mr. Baldwin: The Prime Minister would be known as the one-day Prime Minister.

ROYAL VISIT

FROBISHER BAY—OPPORTUNITY FOR NORTHERN QUEBEC ESKIMOS TO MEET QUEEN

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, we have heard quite a bit today about the loyalty and devotion of the Eskimos. That is generally accepted. Since Her Majesty The Queen will be in Frobisher on July 5, meeting with the Eskimos in particular and turning the first sod for the establishment of a new Anglican Church cathedral there, and since the Eskimos in Quebec are desirous of having representatives of their council there, I ask whether the government would provide transportation for a number of representatives of the Eskimo Council of Northern Quebec. That would be very much appreciated and would indicate that we not only speak words of approval of the Eskimos but act to give them an opportunity of showing their fealty and loyalty to the Crown.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I take note of the suggestion made by the right hon. member for Prince Albert. In my opinion, it might be advisable that Eskimos from New Quebec be present. Eskimos from the Northwest Territories will certainly be present on that occasion and I wish to tell the right hon. member for Prince Albert that I will be there myself since I am a good Christian.

[*English*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: A supplementary question. As yet the hon. member has not shown that he represents the Indians or Eskimos, except in an official capacity. Will he arrange for transportation of representatives of the Eskimo council so that they may be present? Other Eskimos will be there. His presence will certainly not be regarded as representative of them.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has reiterated the question already asked.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Prud'homme (Saint-Denis): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister a supplementary question.

Does he intend to invite the right hon. member for Prince Albert?

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, all hon. members are invited, but unfortunately I do not know whether we will be able to accommodate everybody as far as transportation is concerned.

[*English*]

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

CONSULTANTS' REPORT—TOLL STRUCTURE—CONSIDERATION BY COMMITTEE

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): I have a question for the Minister of Transport. In view of the increasing discussion and grave concern over the future of the seaway in both Canada and the United States, will the minister indicate, before the session recesses, the position of the so-called consultants' report? Will he give every assurance to the House that no decision will be made on tolls before the committee has an opportunity to consider the matter?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): With regard to the report, Mr. Speaker, I am advised that it will be delivered later this week or early next week. In so far as the matter of any change in the toll structure is concerned, this must of course be a matter of negotiation between Canada and the United States. One or the other of the countries must indicate their anxiety regarding the question of tolls. Then, it would of

course be brought forward. I think it would need legislative approval. I am not certain on that point. I can assure the hon. member there will be full consultation.

EXAMINATION OF EXPENDITURES ON WELLAND CANAL SECTION

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): I have a supplementary question for the President of the Treasury Board in his overall capacity as watchdog over expenditures. Has the minister had a chance to re-examine some of the seaway expenditures in light of the new austerity program, in particular those in the Welland Canal section which many feel are reaching proportions similar to those on the *Bonaventure*?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Victoria-Haliburton.

Mr. Bell: With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, may I attempt to rephrase the question? I know that Your Honour has a particular interest in the seaway. I do also.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Bell: I would like to try again.

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

Mr. Bell: I ask the President of the Treasury Board, in all seriousness, whether in connection with his duties he has had an opportunity to reassess any of the continuing expenditures of the seaway, particularly those in the Welland Canal section?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): Yes, Mr. Speaker. We have had an opportunity to look at these figures. I may say that I do not share the judgment of the hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster.

OBJECTIONS BY SHIPPING COMPANIES TO INCREASING OF WELLAND CANAL TOLLS

Mr. W. C. Scott (Victoria-Haliburton): A supplementary question to the Minister of Transport. Can the minister say whether he has received any representations from shipping companies that use the Welland Canal system objecting to the proposed increases? If so, will the government give serious consideration to these objections?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): In view of the extraneous noise from a portion of the opposition benches, Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the first part of the question.

Mr. Scott: I will be happy to repeat it. Can the minister say whether he has received any representations from shipping companies that use the Welland Canal system objecting to the proposed increases? If so, will the government give serious consideration to these objections?

Mr. Jamieson: In so far as proposed increases are concerned, Mr. Speaker, there are none. I made it perfectly clear that we have not suggested any increases in tolls. One question is being held in abeyance, subject to discussion with the United States and presentation of the report to which I made earlier reference this afternoon.

As to having received representations from the shipping interests, the hon. member knows very well that they have been quite active in that regard in recent weeks.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): A supplementary question. The Minister of Transport indicated to the House that there had been no increase in the tolls on the Welland Canal. Is this because the prime purpose of the seaway was not that of a navigational link?

Mr. Jamieson: Perhaps I better clarify the situation. When speaking of tolls I was referring to those which come within the Canada-United States discussions regarding the whole St. Lawrence Seaway system. The Welland Canal is a different matter. Of course, there has been a plan in effect for a number of years which is being followed. There is no proposal to change that, either.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Chair will allow one further supplementary. I have, as all members have, a particular interest in the matter which is being discussed. However, we are running out of time.

Mr. MacInnis: A further supplementary to the Minister of Transport. Does the lack of action by the government result from the fact that the St. Lawrence Seaway was not built as a navigational link?

Mr. Jamieson: If it is not a navigational link, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what it is.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Abitibi.

Mr. MacInnis: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. In order to enlighten the minister as to the purpose of the St. Lawrence Seaway, I suggest he read the report of the—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Inquiries of the Ministry

NEGATIVE EFFECTS ON CORNWALL INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): My question is for the Minister of Transport. Is the minister having consultations with his colleague the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion to repair some of the deficiencies that have been reported in the unanimous report concerning the city of Cornwall resulting from the negative effects the seaway has had on that city and the development of industry?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): I have had representations from very official sources with regard to the situation at Cornwall. In so far as the seaway is concerned, these representations have been considered very sympathetically. We are also working on the same problem with the Department of Regional Economic Expansion.

[*Translation*]

REPAYMENT OF DEBT

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker I should also like to put a question to the Minister of Transport.

In view of the fact that since the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway, the Canadian government has not reimbursed any of the capital and that we even have a deficit of $60 million in interest on it, could the minister tell us whether the Canadian government is considering the steps it should take to succeed in reimbursing that debt which is rather a burden on the Canadian taxpayers?

[*English*]

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): As I indicated earlier, Mr. Speaker, a very comprehensive study is now being made. An interim report is due within a matter of days. One of the questions that is being considered in that report, and on which there will presumably be recommendations, is whether something should be done to the debt structure. This is one of the major matters being considered.

FISHERIES

MANITOBA GOVERNMENT OFFER OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO ESTABLISH PROCESSING PLANT IN SELKIRK

Mr. Doug Rowland (Selkirk): I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. Can the minister inform the House whether he has received an offer from the government of Manitoba indicating its willingness to provide the financial assistance necessary to retain the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation processing plant in Selkirk? If so, can the minister inform the House whether he is prepared to recommend acceptance of this offer and to proceed with the construction of the new fish marketing plant in Selkirk?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): I have not as yet received an offer of that kind, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Rowland: A supplementary. Can the minister indicate that upon receipt of the offer, which is on the way, he will give it urgent consideration?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

AIR TRANSPORT

REPLACEMENT OF CURTAINS ON AIRCRAFT TO BE USED FOR ROYAL VISIT

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): I have a question for the Minister of Transport. Will the minister inform the House as to whether the government has just spent $30,000 to replace new curtains and other like items in three aircraft that are to be used in the royal tour? Was this money spent to replace curtains which were recently installed?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): I have no knowledge of this, Mr. Speaker. I will be glad to take the question as notice.

TRADE

REQUEST FOR BAN ON MILK POWDER IMPORTS

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): I have a question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. This question was directed to the minister recently and yesterday to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the government's present dairy policy, will the minister exercise his power under the Export and Import Permits Act and place a ban on all milk powder being imported into Canada?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): This is under study, Mr. Speaker.

AGRICULTURE

MEASURES TO OFFSET EFFECT OF FREEING OF CANADIAN DOLLAR ON BEEF AND PORK PRODUCERS—REPEGGING OF EXCHANGE RATE

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): My question is for the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker. Having regard to the uncertainties which have developed in the beef and pork industry following the unpegging of the dollar, particularly in the field of exports, as a result of which exports of hogs from Alberta to the United States have declined to nil, may I ask whether the minister is investigating this matter and whether he intends to recommend to the government any effective measures to offset the uncertainty and the depressed prices which are adversely affecting the industry?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Yes, Mr. Speaker. We are entirely aware of the changes which have taken place as a result of the unpegging of the dollar.

Mr. Mazankowski: May I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Finance? Since the floating of the Canadian dollar is proving to be a major obstacle in maintaining a uniform degree of strength in many Canadian industries, particularly the primary industries, can the minister tell us what attitude the government is taking as far as the repegging of the dollar is concerned, or, indeed, whether it is still the intention of the government to repeg the dollar?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): I can add nothing to what I have previously said in this regard.

BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM

OPERATION OF EXPERIMENTAL LANGUAGE UNITS IN PUBLIC SERVICE

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): I have a question for the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker. In amplification of a statement he made earlier today, can the right hon. gentleman tell us how many experimental units there are to be, how long they will be in operation, and in which departments they will operate?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): As to the second question, I believe there was an indication given in my statement that they would operate for a year or more, presumably for between 12 and 18 months. I did mention some departments and some agencies in which they are already operative. I believe the hon. member also asked how many would be set up. I am afraid I cannot answer that question but I will draw it to the attention of the Secretary of State within whose responsibility this project, fortunately, will fall. Perhaps the hon. member will ask the question on Thursday.

Mr. Nowlan: I thank the Prime Minister for his answer as far as it goes. Hopefully, the Secretary of State will be able to indicate the departments on Thursday. I might point out that in the statement to which the Prime Minister referred a few minutes ago no departments were mentioned. My supplementary question is directed to the Prime Minister on a somewhat different tack. Did that statement—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nowlan: Well, when the man from Lanark, Mr. McBride—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Would the hon. member kindly ask his supplementary?

Mr. Nowlan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am surprised that the hon. member for Lanark and Renfrew should be so impatient. I can understand him being a bit embarrassed, but I am surprised that he should be impatient. My supplementary on this important subject is addressed to the Prime Minister. In order to avoid any conflict or confusion, does he intend to expand his statement either here or outside the House in order to reconcile the apparent conflict between a French only policy in Quebec and a bilingual policy in the rest of Canada?

Mr. Trudeau: I would very much like to hear a substantiation of the allegation that the federal government is applying a French only policy in Quebec. If that is the substance of the question, the hon. member should substantiate it.

Mr. Speaker: We are running short of time and I suggest to hon. members that if we spend all our time seeking answers on one subject many hon. members will be disappointed in their efforts to get the floor.

Mr. Nowlan: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your admonition, but we are dealing with a most important subject in the closing days of this session. The Prime Minister has invited me to amplify my remarks and I intend to do so, despite the hon. member for Lanark and Renfrew and other catcallers.

An hon. Member: Get on with it.

Mr. Nowlan: The basis of my question is the statement made by the Prime Minister that as far as the private sector is concerned the federal government will be pleased to play a part in the process of establishing task forces if that is the desire, and, specifically with regard to recommendation No. 42, that the federal government is certainly prepared to ensure that the French language is used in its operations in all appropriate circumstances. That may be the safeguard—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member says he is raising a point of order. I am sure he appreciates that what he is doing now is debating a point. If the Prime Minister disagrees with the hon. member and the hon. member disagrees with the Prime Minister, we could go on for a long time trying to ascertain who is right. If the hon. member has a supplementary question, let him put it without delay in fairness to other hon. members.

Mr. Nowlan: I was just about to conclude my point of order. In the time it took the Chair to admonish me I would have completed it. If hon. members would turn to page 13 of the document which has been tabled, they would find there recommendation No. 42 which says that French in Quebec should become the principal language of work at all levels.

An hon. Member: What else would you possibly expect?

Mr. Nowlan: If the Prime Minister intends to tell us only what he has said in this House, and what appears in this document—

Some hon. Members: Question!

Mr. Nowlan: Remember, this is going to be a rather interesting subject of conversation.

Mr. Speaker: I will not allow the Prime Minister, even if he wishes to do so, to expand on what he said earlier. He cannot do so during the question period. The hon. member has purported to raise a point of order but I suggest to him it is a point of argument, a matter for debate. According to my understanding of the rules, it is certainly not a point of order. However, he has made his point and I do not think the matter should be pursued.

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, you did allow me, as I was concluding my point of order, to put a further supplementary question. My question is: does the Prime Minister intend to amplify his statement either here or outside the House to deal with what I suggest amounts to a contradiction in his own statement?

Some hon. Members: Answer.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

POSSIBLE LIFTING BY BRITISH GOVERNMENT OF EMBARGO ON ARMS SHIPMENTS TO SOUTH AFRICA

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): My question is for the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker. There has been a suggestion that the British government is contemplating lifting its embargo on the shipment of arms to South Africa. In the light of the recommendation of the United Nations on this subject, and the danger that such action might lead to the break-up of the Commonwealth, will the Canadian government make its views known to the British government on this subject?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I will ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs to look into this question and be prepared to answer.

INQUIRY AS TO WHITE PAPER

Mr. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. Since the House might adjourn this week, would the Prime Minister state whether the government intends to table the white paper on foreign policy before the session adjourns?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker, and not only before the session is adjourned but before this part of the session ends. The minister has informed me that he wishes to table it in the House either tomorrow or the next day.

An hon. Member: We do not sit tomorrow.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

CLOSING CERTAIN STATIONS IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpeque): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport in connection with the proposal of the CNR to close down most of its existing railway stations in Prince Edward Island and dispense with the services of its agents. Is the

board of transport commissioners prepared to meet the unanimous request of the legislature of Prince Edward Island that the Commissioners direct the CNR to hold consultations with the provincial government, with the Prince Edward Island Produce Dealers Association, farm organizations, boards of trade and CNR unions before going on with this suggested program?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): I shall be seeing the Chairman of the Transport Commission later this afternoon, and I shall be glad to pass these representations along to him. As the hon. member knows, there is a procedure which allows for public representations to be made in all such cases and I am sure the wishes of the government of Prince Edward Island and other interested parties will be taken into account.

Mr. MacLean: May I ask the minister whether the CNR, through him, has been in contact with the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion to determine whether or not the proposal is consistent with or even part of the economic development plan for Prince Edward Island?

Mr. Jamieson: No, Mr. Speaker, there have been no three-way consultations of the kind to which the hon. member refers.

CLOSING OF CERTAIN STATIONS IN NEWFOUNDLAND

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister or the CTC reviewed the decision of Canadian National Railways to close down 24 stations in Newfoundland?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I made some inquiries about this when it was publicized, and the information I have is that the CNR has not yet made a positive decision. The public statement that they made was that this is a contemplated proposal, but they are waiting to get both public reaction and, as I understand it, business reaction before moving on the matter. That is the last word I had on the subject.

FINANCE

LOWERING OF INTEREST AND DEPOSIT RATES BY INSTITUTIONS OTHER THAN BANKS

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, may I direct my question to the Minister of Finance. In view of indications that the banks are prepared to reduce interest and deposit rates but may not be able to go much farther along this path unless their example is followed by other financial institutions, can the minister say whether it is his intention to discuss with other financial institutions the need to lower their interest and deposit rates as well?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, having only just seen the statement of the banks, I will have to consider it.

POLLUTION

OIL SLICK IN ST. CROIX RIVER

Hon. Hugh John Flemming (Carleton-Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. Has the federal government, in co-operation with the provincial government of New Brunswick, ascertained the cause of the oil slick found on June 15 in the St. Croix River in Charlotte county, New Brunswick, and its relative danger to fish, birds, etc.?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): No, Mr. Speaker, but we are right after it.

OIL SLICK OFF ARACHAT COAST

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the minister. In light of the findings of Dr. MacTaggart-Cowan that a slick 30 feet long, five feet wide and three inches thick discovered on May 27 off the Arachat coast could not have come from the *Arrow*, has the government ascertained the source of this dangerous slick, and can the minister assure the House that measures will be taken to make certain that a similar slick will not occur in the future?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): We will do our best, Mr. Speaker.

BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM

USE OF CERTAIN FUNDS TO ASSIST PRIVATE SECTOR

Mr. R. E. McKinley (Huron): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. In view of the Prime Minister's statement on motions today and his pledge of assistance to the private sector in regard to bilingualism, is it by the granting of regional development

funds to certain areas that the government intends to assist bilingualism in the private sector and institutions in Canada?

Mr. McGrath: At the expense of the rest of the country.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

REQUEST THAT BILL AMENDING CANADA GRAIN ACT BE PASSED BEFORE RECESS

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, may I direct my question to the Government House Leader. Is the Government House Leader prepared to ask the House to stay in session until Bill C-196, which provides for protein grading and for other necessary changes to the present Canada Grain Act, is passed, if it is not reported from the committee in time to deal with it prior to the proposed recess on June 26?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I am certainly prepared to discuss that question with representatives of the other parties to see whether we can make better progress on the bill than we have hitherto.

AIRPORTS

REVIEW OF USER CHARGES—CIRCULATION OF PLANS BEFORE ACTION

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. Could the minister indicate whether or not the departmental review of user charges and fees at airports throughout Canada has been completed? If it has, would the minister indicate whether or not it is the intention of the department to circulate the review among appropriate people in the industry for their comment before taking any further action?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, parts of the review have been completed, but it is an ongoing process. It is our intention in most cases, where there is a significant interest on the part of the users, to make our plans known before they are implemented.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

ARGENTIA, NFLD.—ACTION TO ALLEVIATE SERIOUS SITUATION

Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister or to the Minister of Transport. In view of the desperate situation facing 7,000 residents of the Argentia area as a result of the completion of the United States naval station phase-out in seven days, and in view of the meeting last week between the Prime Minister and his colleagues and Premier Smallwood, can the Minister of Transport or the Prime Minister inform the House what immediate action the government intends to take to alleviate the very serious situation in the Argentia area?

[Mr. McKinley.]

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, we have received the report from the task force which considered this matter and which included representatives from my department as well as others. This task force has submitted what is essentially a first report which contains a number of recommendations. These recommendations are now being considered in detail. I can say to the hon. member and to the House that it has been accepted in principle and we will take some steps virtually immediately. It is now a matter of trying to work out which of these recommendations can be put into effect most rapidly. I might add, as the hon. member of course knows, that we have already made significant improvements to the east coast ferry service as at least one move toward trying to solve the problem in Argentia.

TRANSPORT

NEWFOUNDLAND EAST COAST FERRY SERVICE

Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, I noted that the Minister of Transport made reference to improvements to the east coast ferry service. Is the minister aware that the east coast ferry *Ambrose Shea* has been withdrawn and replaced by a smaller boat?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, that is a misrepresentation of the facts. This was done in consultation with the task force and the residents of Argentia, including the head of the railroad union there, who understood the reason this step was taken. Whether this course will be adopted permanently remains to be seen. The new vessel is smaller to some extent, but the capacity of the vessel is still not being used to the full.

[*Later:*]

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question supplementary

to one directed earlier to the Minister of Transport by my colleague from St. John's West. Is it the intention of the department to put the *Ambrose Shea* back on the eastern ferry service when the minister has succeeded in finding a suitable replacement for the *Patrick Morris* since the *Ambrose Shea* was built especially for this service?

Mr. Jamieson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that principle is still the one we wish to follow. I advised the House the other day of our negotiations in regard to other ships. As the hon. member may know, we managed to get a vessel on a three-month short charter from the U.K., the *Cerdic Ferry*. She will be going on the gulf service and I hope that this will enable us to put the *Ambrose Shea* on the Argentia run. However, I think with the problem that has been created by the loss of the *Patrick Morris* there may have to be a certain amount of shuffling over the summer months in order to ensure what I know would be the hon. member's objective, that is to get as many visitors into and out of Newfoundland as possible.

MANPOWER

PROVISION OF SUMMER EMPLOYMENT FOR FEMALE STUDENTS

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. In view of the preponderance of assistance for male students announced by the minister in his statement on motions a week and a half ago with regard to additional summer jobs with national defence, would the minister say what compensating plans he has in mind for women students who are already earning less?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the general program was non-discriminatory from that point of view and is available both to male and to female students. Hopefully there will be opportunities for female students in other aspects of the program rather than that sponsored by the Department of National Defence.

WOMEN

INQUIRY AS TO ROYAL COMMISSION REPORT

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. In light of the fact that the Minister of Labour would like to introduce amending legislation in the fall dealing with fair employment practices, particularly as they affect women, but is apparently hampered because the report of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women is not yet available, would the Prime Minister advise the House whether he has had any indication when the report will become available?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker, I have not. I will gladly inquire again, but the last time I was asked this question in the House I was told that it would be many months before the report would come in, and that was some months ago.

POST OFFICE

POSSIBLE NATIONAL STRIKE—PRESENT POSITION OF NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the President of the Treasury Board which is prompted by today's announcement of an intensification of the work stoppages by postal employees because it is alleged that Treasury Board representatives have refused to change their position one iota. Can the minister advise whether the government is now prepared to make any move toward the formula suggested by Judge Lippé?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I should point out that in respect to the recommendations of Judge Lippé there is only one issue, namely pay, separating the position of the government from that of Judge Lippé. On the other hand, the Council of Postal Unions has been and continues to be at variance with Judge Lippé's recommendations in respect of hours of work, overtime, shift premiums, statutory holidays, vacations, severance pay, medical and hospital insurance, and the duration of the contract. It is in respect of these issues that the Council of Postal Unions has not been able to move at all toward the recommendations of Judge Lippé, and it is to this that we are directing our current efforts.

Mr. Macquarrie: A supplementary question. Considering that the minister might become a better conductor than watchdog, would he think of making, to use an expression of the Prime Minister, an overture on this fairly important issue of pay in the hope of getting a counter response on the other issues?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, no one would welcome more than I any indication from the Council of Postal Unions that they would be prepared to settle for Judge Lippé's recommendations.

PRIME MINISTER

VISIT TO NORTHERN BRITISH COLUMBIA

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister. Let me say as a preliminary, while he is returning to his seat, that an affirmative and definitive answer would be very welcome. Inasmuch as the Prime Minister has had a very eventful trip round the world and another one round southern Ontario, could he give some indication that an early date might be chosen so he can wing and/or swing his way through northern British Columbia?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I expect to go to that general area to visit some constituencies during the summer.

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

PROVINCIAL MINISTERS' CONFERENCE—STUDY OF PROBLEMS OF QUEBEC EGG MARKETING BOARD

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

Since the 21st conference of agriculture ministers is scheduled for June 29 and since the Quebec egg marketing board is faced with problems, would he tell us whether he intends to discuss them with the Quebec egg marketing board?

[*English*]

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the conference that will be held with the provincial ministers is arranged by the association of the provincial ministers. I go at their invitation. What they have on the agenda is, of course, arranged among the provincial Ministers of Agriculture.

[*Translation*]

Mr. La Salle: I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Given the interest raised by the problems of the Quebec egg marketing board, may I ask the minister to make a suggestion about it to his provincial counterparts?

[Mr. Macquarrie.]

[*English*]

Mr. Olson: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MEETING OF HOUSE LEADERS TO DISCUSS PLANS FOR BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order may I raise a matter having to do with the business of the House. In view of the general understanding that adjournment of this part of the session on Friday is our goal, I wonder whether arrangements can be made for a meeting of the House Leaders to discuss the plans for Thursday and Friday of this week? I ask this question or raise this matter particularly because of a reference made a few minutes ago to Bill C-196, and also because of the Prime Minister's reference to things like the Canada Development Corporation and legislation relating to the LeDain report that might be dealt with if there is general agreement. I wonder, therefore, whether the Government House Leader would consider calling a meeting of House Leaders. I know he is tied up with the Elections Act but could he call such a meeting to see where we are and what matters we can deal with during the balance of the week?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Yes, Mr. Speaker. The only difficulty is that there are discussions under way which would have the House sitting continuously until 11 o'clock at night. I envisage a little difficulty in getting away during that time but I will do my best within the time constraint.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether I might seek the consent of the House to revert to motions for the purpose of appointing the members of the committee to study election expenses.

Mr. Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

And the House having reverted to Motions:

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

ELECTION EXPENSES

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Rosedale) moved:

That the members of the Special Committee on Election Expenses be Messrs. Breau, Brewin, Deach-

man, Forest, Jerome, Laprise, McKinley, Macquarrie, Nesbitt, Ouellet, Sulatycky and Walker.

Motion agreed to.

• (4:00 p.m.)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CANADA ELECTIONS ACT

MEASURE TO CONSOLIDATE AND REVISE

The House resumed consideration in committee of Bill C-215, respecting the franchise of electors and the election of members to the House of Commons—Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale)—Mr. Faulkner in the chair.

The Chairman: When the House rose on Monday, June 22, clause 13 was under consideration with an amendment by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra which reads as follows:

That clause 13 be amended by striking out line 26 on page 23 and substituting the following: "at least 50 of the electoral districts of Canada."

On Clause 13, subclause 8—*Deletions from Registry.*

Mr. Deachman: Mr. Chairman, when I moved this amendment at the previous sitting an amendment has been moved earlier that this number be set at 25. This is a case of finding something that is agreeable to the members and which will fit. One could say that a party of 75 would be too large, particularly when one thinks of the maritime provinces or the Prairies as a whole. One might think that this number is too small when one thinks in terms of a federal party within this House. We must compromise in order to arrive at the right figure. It is not really so much a matter of argument as a matter of taste. It is like Goldilocks seeking the right bowl of porridge, one will be too hot and another too cold. Some figure will perhaps be just right, and I suggested 50 in my amendment.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Chairman, before I refer specifically to the amendment, let me say I had a discussion a few minutes ago with the House Leader in reference to subsection (b) part 1 of the original Act where the word "and" appears. It seems to me that with the interpretation that has been put on this section that "and" should be "or".

As I read the Act now, the fact that a party or a purported party had no representation in the House of Commons would mean it would be excluded from having a party label on the ballot. From the discussions that have gone on within our caucus and, as I understand it among government members as well, this was clearly not the intent of that section. I hope this matter will be clarified very early this afternoon.

Referring specifically to the amendment, the hon. member who preceded me suggested that his proposal to alter the number of candidates to be nominated in order that a party label be attached to a person's name on the ballot, being reduced from 75 to 50, represents some kind of compromise which should be accepted. This seems to be not the type of item in respect of which we should have a compromise. There is a basic democratic right at issue here.

In any legislative matter it is sensible, and indeed desirable, in any meaningful sense of politics to bring about compromises. One may argue at a given time that a minimum wage of $2 is appropriate. This depends on the economic and political conditions. It may make sense to effect a compromise in reaching a final decision. When we are considering the proposal to recognize the right of political parties to appear by name on ballots, it seems to me we are not dealing with a type of item that should be considered in terms of compromise.

It has been recognized for a long time in our political system, since early in the last century, that wherever there is a democratic system in a modern industrial age at least there are bound to be political parties. One of the anachronisms in our society in Canada, and elsewhere, is that political parties have obtained almost no official recognition in terms of the law. One distinct advantage in terms of democracy in respect of this bill we have before us is that it does intend to give legal recognition to the existence of political parties. I believe there would be an important weakness in this bill if it did not recognize the right of any man or small group of individuals to start a new political party and present a program to the electorate, whether in one municipality, in one province or on the basis of a national appeal. The real issue is that party politics is an integral part of our democratic system. Therefore, I do not think we should weigh the electoral system against the emergence of new political and social changes in this country, no matter how insignificantly these might be regarded by the rest of us at the outset.

One thing we should all have learned by now, as a result of the history of the last 100 years, is that new political parties and new movements constantly occur in society. Therefore, I object to the principle of compromise on this issue and would like to see the whole of subsection 2 struck out. I do not propose any specific wording at this point. We will get around to that later. It would seem to me that the principle we should recognize in respect of this legislation is the right of one man or two men to begin a political party, obtain nomination through the correct procedure and, following that, have their name and their party listed on the ballot.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): While there is a difference of opinion between the hon. member and myself on this question, I think he will recognize that there is also a difference of opinion between himself and his colleague the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre on this point. As I understood the amendment of the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre he wished to reduce the threshold to 27 candidates. The bill states 75 candidates and the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra proposes what is close to the arithmetical mean of 50 candidates. In my view of the matter 50 candidates would still achieve the objective the government had in mind without being so restrictive as the requirement of 75 candidates 28 days before polling day. Therefore, I would be inclined to accept the amendment of the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra.

In respect of the other point, I would accept the view that subclause 8 of clause 13 does require a careful reading, but my opinion, confirmed by talking to the draftsman, is that this would not have the effect, as the hon. member would seem to fear, of excluding his group from being able to become registered. In effect these are cumulative criteria which will be operative after the twenty-eighth day.

We are talking about a group not previously recognized in this House which did not have 75, 50 or any number of candidates in the field. In essence, there are two criteria in respect of a description of a group. There might be some argument that if it was changed to "or" the hon. member's group might be excluded, but I do not quite see that particular argument. The way I read it, I think a fair interpretation of the matter, is that here we are talking about a political grouping which in the first place is not represented in the House of Commons and which in the second place did not nominate 50 candidates in the field on the 28th day before election. Therefore, I think it is properly "and" rather than the disjunctive "or" in the circumstances. In the circumstances, I believe the clause is quite correct as it stands.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Chairman, I am beginning to feel that the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby had a point. Do I understand that a political party which had no members in this House only need have the number of candidates specified in clause (b)(ii)? Is that the intent?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Yes. The chief Electoral Officer has no authority to delete any such grouping unless these two criteria are not met.

Mr. Macquarrie: I am impressed, Mr. Chairman, at the rather breezy and easy way in which we are playing the numbers game. Surely, there is something more serious to this than striking an arithmetical means. The government decided not to accept the recommendation of the committee that the number should be 26. The government chose 75. Surely, some thought must have been given to that. The suggestion that the number 50 is the mean point is interesting mathematically, but surely there must have been some more thought given to this than merely picking the number out of one's head.

I would have thought that the minister whose government saw fit to change the committee's recommendations might have defended the change by giving us some reason for it, so that we would be prone to listen carefully and weigh it. If this becomes law, we are introducing the suggestion that we would not countenance a group of people being independent of, or splinters of, the various parties. It would seem to me that if we are talking about a national party there should be some reason for hitting upon a number which would reflect a potential natural expression through the political process. I should like to know the special virtue of the number 50. The fact that it lies between 26 and 75 does not impress me.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, there is nothing more fundamental behind the choice of 50 than the committee's choice of 26 or 27. Really, what is involved is a difference of opinion concerning what a substantial political grouping should be in order to achieve recognition under our electoral law. I did take the point made by several of my colleagues on this side of the House that 75 is

obviously very much tougher to achieve on the 28th day before election than 50. There is no magic in the figure, any more than there is in respect of the voting age. I am prepared to accept it as a suggestion.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the House Leader would deal with the point I tried to make that this is not the type of issue in respect of which we should try to effect a compromise, and that, in the fundamental interests of a parliamentary democracy, our electoral laws should recognize a man or a few men as constituting a political party. I cannot see any practical objection to linking the name of the party with the candidate's name. The principal argument suggests the contrary. Would the House Leader address himself to that?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I should perhaps say that the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre seems to have been persuaded by the same argument I was. We may both be wrong, but I make the point that we are talking about national political parties and would want some expression of a very substantial political position by having the candidates nominated and put into the field.

• (4:10 p.m.)

I acknowledge that 75 was too tough. I would be prepared to lower the threshold. On the other hand, I think 27 is too low. That was the basic proposition to which the committee agreed, and apparently the hon. member does not agree with that.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, I think we should correct one misunderstanding on the part of the President of the Privy Council, perhaps not a misunderstanding but an attempt to be divisive. There is no basic difference between the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre, myself and others in the NDP, and the position taken by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby. All the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre was doing was trying to indicate that the Standing Committee had made the determination of 10 per cent. That was a unanimous decision of the Standing Committee.

Obviously, the President of the Privy Council and the government were not content to accept the unanimous view of the committee, agreed to by the Liberal members on that committee, and so came in with the counter proposal of 75, which is far above 10 per cent of the number of members in this House. The hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre chose the number 27 as the next highest whole number over 10 per cent of the membership of the House. In fact, 10 per cent would be 26.4 members. I will admit that there are a number of members on the opposite side of the chamber who would qualify to be placed in the .4 position. However, we wanted the next whole number, and that is why 27 was chosen, to represent the unanimous view of the committee.

Within the Standing Committee, we argued that it should not be the prerogative of one political group to make any determination about what should constitute another political group. We put forward that argument a number of years ago when a decision was pending as to where the Raillement de Creditiste, or Social Credit party as it then was, would sit in the House, and whether a party should have 12 members in the House before its leader could receive the additional remuneration set aside for party leaders. We have constantly advanced the argument that basically it is wrong for political groups to impose restrictions on other political groups, some of which may not have yet come into existence. Apparently the President of the Privy Council is not content to accept the sage advice of the Liberal members of the Standing Committee.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I wonder who is being partisan now. I would point out that I just turned the logic of the hon. member for Skeena against his colleague, the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby. The latter does not accept the fact that the threshold has to be set. He does not accept the argument of the hon. member for Skeena and asserts that one, three or five individuals running as candidates should be able to claim all the privileges of a political party. That is all I am pointing out to the hon. member for Skeena and to the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre who, in pressing the amendment last night providing for the number 27, accepted the principle that a threshold has to be set somewhere in order to determine what will be a national political party. I doubt very much that I can satisfy the hon. member for Skeena, but I think this amendment is acceptable to a large number of hon. members, including members of the Standing Committee.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Beaudoin: Mr. Chairman, we should always look for a middle course. The motion proposed by the hon. member for Vancouver

Quadra (Mr. Deachman) is acceptable because it provides that to get official recognition in an election, a party must have at least 50 candidates.

It is essential to determine a reasonable figure, neither too high nor too low, because it would not be fair to require of a new party to have 264 candidates in an election in order to be considered officially.

However, since only national parties are recognized, 50 is an acceptable figure and we support the motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Chairman, at meetings of the Standing Committee, hon. members expressed preferences varying from zero to something over 100, with respect to the number of candidates who should run in order for a group to be qualified as a political party. My own personal opinion is that the reality of the situation demands that we have a party system in Canada. I guess I can be called a party person in more ways than one, and while people have a perfect right to form a political party and run candidates, I have always resented the frivolity that we have seen the odd time in Canadian history. On one occasion a group called the Rhinoceros Party ran candidates, in either a provincial or federal election. I think that was nothing more than an attempt to demean our electoral process. If people disagree with the kind of process we have, I say they had better be damned serious about opposing it. They should be serious about political parties. This is why I, personally, felt the figure of 10 per cent of the membership of the House would be fair.

I feel that the threshold, as the President of the Privy Council calls it, should be as low as possible. I can still see nothing good about the amendment that is before us. It is perhaps better than the government proposal, but it is not as good as the one I moved. As the hon. member for Skeena said, I moved my amendment merely to make an honest women out of the government, by calling on it to implement the committee's recommendation. The Standing Committee attempted to come up with an unanimous recommendation. After hearing all the arguments we agreed on 10 per cent of the membership of the House. That did not mean all of us liked that, but we agreed to it. If the President of the Privy Council could come down a little lower than the number 50, he would make some hon. members on both sides of the chamber much happier.

[Mr. Beaudoin.]

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, in this party we don't play politics.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Macquarrie: I just want to say I am always sorry when a carefully thought out recommendation of a committee is callously and casually brushed aside by the government.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Then, why did you move an amendment yesterday?

Mr. Macquarrie: I am not impressed with the non-argument of the mover of this amendment. I do insist, however, despite the logic of the presentation of the hon. members to my left, that there is a point in pragmatic judgment where the state, if it is going to recognize parties, can surely say that a group with one candidate is not a national party. So, there is some basis for making a numerical decision, and because 50 is better than 75 I am going to support the amendment moved by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra. I hope that this will carry so that we can move on, because I have no desire to spend the first half of the month of July on this legislation.

The Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Chairman: Is it the pleasure of the committee to accept the motion? All those in favour will please rise.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Is this the amendment of the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra?

• (4:20 p.m.)

The Chairman: I am sorry, apparently some members of the committee may not be sure. The amendment is moved by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra, and reads:

that Bill C-215 be amended by striking out line 26 on page 27 and substituting therefor "at least 50 of the electoral districts".

Is the committee ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Amendment (Mr. Deachman) agreed to: yeas, 32; nays, 2.

The Chairman: I declare the amendment carried.

Subclause 8 agreed to.

Clause 13 as amended agreed to.

Clause 15 agreed to.

The Chairman: The committee will now consider clause 16, subclause 1.

On clause 16, subclause 1—*Persons entitled to vote.*

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): By way of explanation, Mr. Chairman, I should make it clear that what has been done here has been to shift the date for residence from the date of issue of the writ to the enumeration date, thereby moving slightly closer to the election day the date upon which the voters' list is made up.

Subclause 1 agreed to.

Subclause 2 agreed to.

Clause 16, as amended, agreed to.

The Chairman: The committee will now consider clause 17, subclauses 1 to 8 inclusive.

Subclauses 1 to 8 inclusive agreed to.

On clause 17, subclause 9—*Clergymen, teachers and persons in fishing industry.*

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Subject to what the hon. member for Coast Chilcotin may say, I was going to suggest that we postpone consideration of subclauses 9, 10, 12 and 13 until the House arrives at the consideration of the question of proxy voting as contained in clause 46, so that we might have all in the one place those provisions relating to absentee voters within Canada.

Subclauses 9, 10, 12 and 13 stand.

Subclause 11 agreed to.

Subclause 14 agreed to.

Subclauses 15 and 16 agreed to.

Subclause 17 agreed to.

The Chairman: The question on clause 17 will stand until the subclauses are disposed of that it has been agreed will stand.

The committee will now consider clause 18, subclauses 1 to 3 inclusive.

Subclauses 1 to 28 inclusive agreed to.

Mr. Rowland: Mr. Chairman, on rule 39 of schedule A to clause 18 at page 51—

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): He is not there yet. Unless this clause relates back to one of the clauses from 1 to 28—we have not reached the schedule yet.

Subclause 29 and 30 agreed to.

The Chairman: The committee will now consider rules 1 to 3 inclusive in schedule A to clause 18, page 41.

Rules 1 to 38 inclusive agreed to.

On clause 18, schedule A, rule 39.

Mr. Rowland: Mr. Chairman, I would ask that this particular rule be allowed to stand as I have a consequential amendment to make to this should an amendment that I have to propose to clause 92 be carried at a later point in the discussion which has to do with advance polling days.

Rule 39 stands.

Rules 40 and 41 agreed to.

On clause 18, schedule A, rule 42.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if rule 42 could be allowed to stand as consequential on rule 39.

Rule 42 stands.

Rules 43 to 57 inclusive agreed to.

• (4:30 p.m.)

On clause 18, schedule A, Rule 58.

Mr. Rowland: Mr. Chairman, I would ask that rule 58 be allowed to stand, for the same reason as mentioned before. I wish to move a consequential amendment which would follow from consideration of clause 92. At that stage of our examination of the bill, I intend to present the amendment to the committee.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Rule 58 stands.

Rules 59 to 80 inclusive agreed to.

The Chairman: We shall now take up schedule B to clause 18,

Rules 1 to 15 inclusive agreed to.

On clause 18, schedule B, Rule 16.

The Chairman: Is it agreed that rule 16 stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Rule 16 stands.

Rules 17 to 27 inclusive agreed to.

The Chairman: I will not at this time put the question on the whole of clause 18.

Clause 18 stands.

Clauses 19 to 22 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 23, subclause (1) agreed to.

On clause 23, subclause (2)—*Manner of nomination.*

Mr. Rowland: Mr. Chairman, I should like to propose an amendment to subclause (2) of clause 23. I should like to propose:

That clause 23 be amended by striking paragraph (j) of sub-clause (2).

Could I give a few words of explanation about this amendment. Its purpose is to

eliminate the requirement that a deposit of $200 be posted by a candidate in a general election. I am proposing my amendment because I believe it to be wrong that a person or political party should be exposed to potential financial loss as a result of participation in our democratic process. This happens when a person has not secured sufficient support from the electorate to achieve 50 per cent of the total vote of the winning candidate.

Probably the basis of the requirement of a deposit, if we were to look at its historical genesis, is that people wanted to prevent the proliferation of political parties. I think that there are sufficient guarantees against that kind of proliferation of political parties in Canada. The first guarantee which militates against the establishment of a large number of parties and the fragmentation of the representation in parliament is the existence of single member constituencies. The second factor which militates against the fragmentation of the party system in the country is the solidity of the existing parties, the entrenched loyalty towards existing parties and the well established voting patterns in this country. These two factors militate against the undesirable proliferation of political parties in Canada, and the requirement for the deposit of $200 in no way furthers that desirable objective.

As matters now stand, the deposit of $200 is large enough to deter those in straitened financial circumstances but too small to deter those who are determined to disturb the electoral process. It acts against the poor and does not deter anyone of normal financial means from deliberately meddling in the political process and perverting its purposes. We have seen that happening. The $200 deposit requirement will become a total farce if, as I suspect, at some future date this Parliament considers legislation which will provide financial aid from the public purse to bona fide political parties. So, I would simply recommend the elimination of the $200 deposit. It is useless in that it does not achieve its purpose, and it will eventually be rendered farcical when political parties are supported by the public purse.

• (4:40 p.m.)

Mr. Francis: I listened with interest to the arguments of the hon. member. I cannot support them. I believe there is a tendency for frivolous candidates to offer themselves in an election. I respect the desire to give the maximum opportunity to those who genuinely represent a serious point of view to participate in the democratic process. The simple truth is that in municipal elections, where there is no deposit required, it is almost routine procedure for candidates who are not serious to offer themselves for office, sometimes even those who are a little mentally disturbed. There has to be some kind of restriction on this type of candidacy.

There is another situation which gives me concern. I feel that the deposit and the return of the deposit should be tied in with meeting the requirements of the Act, including a statement of election expenses. I may possibly offer an amendment in that respect at a later stage. First, I think we have to defeat any proposal to eliminate the deposit. In my opinion it would be a retrograde step. It is a fairly nominal sum. It has not been changed for a substantial period of time. I do not think it has discouraged people with a genuine party or other interest from presenting themselves as a choice to the electorate. For these reasons, I oppose the argument of the hon. member.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I wish to add a few comments to the point of view which has been expressed. My information is that the figure of $200 has been in the Canada Elections Act since the year 1882, when it was raised from $50. I do not quite agree with the hon. member in his rationale. I agree with the hon. member for Ottawa West who has pointed out it is not so much in relation to the party system as in relation to frivolous candidacies, such as a group calling themselves the Rhinoceros party or individuals who are self-advertisers.

It might well be that the figure of $200 is not a sufficient deterrent or threshold. The provisions in Manitoba and Quebec are the same as at the federal level. In Ontario there is no deposit required, but on the other hand the signatures of 100 electors are required. In the province of British Columbia, the signatures of 50 electors are required. I think most members will agree the purpose is a deterrent against frivolous candidacies. I disagree with the hon. member that it will become meaningless when in time we deal with the question of election expenses.

I think my memory is correct when I say that one of the comments of the Barbeau Committee was the possibility of the deposit being raised and part of it being returned to the candidate after he has filed the election return required of him under the election expense regime. As I already said, the com-

mittee will be considering that in due course. It seems that the basic reasons for including it in the first place continue. Indeed, the committee may not only decide to leave it at the present level, but to raise it or change the circumstances under which it is required.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): The President of the Privy Council has somewhat accurately described the situation in British Columbia with respect to provincial election laws. It is true that no deposit is required. The requirement of 50 signatures applies if there are 10,000 or more registered voters in a constituency. If there are less than 10,000 registered voters, 25 signatures are required for nomination. The President of the Privy Council did not mention that aspect.

I have had personal experience and involvement in campaigns in the province of British Columbia dating back to 1952. This involved quite a number of provincial elections. Although there may have been one or two instances, I cannot recall so-called frivolous candidates entering the race in British Columbia in any elections or by-elections that have been held since 1952. It may well be that someone could say that all of the candidates of all parties are frivolous candidates. However, that is an argumentative point. It has equal validity to anyone who puts forward that argument. My basic point is that I cannot recall any frivolous candidates running in these elections. All of the candidates with whom I have had experience ran under the label of a political party, and we have quite a number of them in British Columbia, or as independent serious-minded candidates with a large background and support.

The experience we have had in British Columbia is that the lack of a deposit requirement has not attracted the frivolous kind of candidate who enters the race to gain publicity or to embark on a bit of hobbycraft or a game of that sort. I do not know what the experience has been in the province of Ontario. Some members from Ontario may wish to comment on that. The argument that a deposit of any amount deters the entry of so-called frivolous candidates has a false base. The experience in British Columbia proves that it is false. There is no such monetary deterrent to candidates running in an election. As a consequence since 1952, and I am sure many years prior to that, the so-called frivolous candidates have not entered provincial elections.

Mr. St. Pierre: I wish to take issue with the hon. member for Skeena on this point. It is rather difficult to discuss frivolous candidates without using their names. This I do not choose to do. From my experience in British Columbia, I can recall at least one totally frivolous candidate who ran in a provincial election. He invented a party for the purpose of entering a party name. That particular case involved a by-election. This man did no campaigning and had very little interest in the election, yet it cost the public money. Similarly, moving from the provincial to the civic field, for many years in Vancouver, which has a greater population than one or two provinces, candidates have run for the office of mayor whom I would consider frivolous. I recall one candidate who wanted to tear up the main street and substitute a canal. While I do not recall any frivolous candidates running under the standard party labels, I can recall the occasional oddball in other elections.

• (4:50 p.m.)

Mr. Deachman: I wish to add to the list of frivolous candidates the one in England who recently changed his name in order to run with the same name as Mr. Heath. I wish to point out how far he got.

Mr. Perrault: The same thing has happened in parts of Canada; candidates with similar names were brought in simply to confuse the electorate. But as the President of the Privy Council pointed out earlier there has in fact been a reduction in the real value of this $200 deposit because of the decline in the purchasing power of the dollar, if for no other reason. If the 25 signatures to the petition put up $8 apiece they would finance the entry of their candidate in the election race, and it seems to me this is a minimum sign of confidence in the ability of a man or a woman to be a candidate.

Mr. Rowland: Perhaps I might comment briefly on what hon. members have said with regard to this proposal. It seems to me that most of them have demonstrated that the $200 deposit does not, in fact, work as a deterrent to frivolous candidates. Otherwise, all the frivolous candidates mentioned would not have been involved. Any person who is determined to be a frivolous candidate can raise the sum. What I am saying is that serious candidates are being penalized financially for contesting an election. For example, each of the candidates opposing me in my

constituency lost their deposits. The sum involved is not large enough to deter people who are determined to be frivolous candidates, but it has the effect of penalizing quite sincere candidates who have honestly contested the election but failed to gain support. In any case, I believe that modifications and improvements in the method of financing candidates will soon make this provision farcical.

Mr. Macquarrie: I want to say to the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra that the man who wanted to be on all fours with Ted Heath was probably not so frivolous after all. It is not only in the United Kingdom that similar sounding names have been used at election time. Such people have always been able to find the $200. But thanks to the wisdom of the Canadian people they have usually been discredited.

Amendment (Mr. Rowland) negatived; yeas, 5; nays, 26.

Mr. Rowland: May I ask the President of the Privy Council whether, in the light of the remarks made by various hon. members in the discussion of my amendment, he would consider standing this clause so as to enable an amendment to be drafted which would allow for the refund of the deposit in all cases?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I believe this is a question which should be considered by the special committee on election expenses, and on that basis I think we ought to proceed.

Mr. Wahn: Would it be in order, Mr. Chairman, to direct remarks to paragraphs (h) and (i) of clause 23, or has that been passed?

The Chairman: We are on subclause (2) of clause 23.

Mr. Wahn: Does this not cover the provision for placing the name of the party on the ballot?

The Chairman: Yes. I am sorry. I thought the hon. member said "eight or nine". Apparently he said "(h) and (i)". It is quite in order.

Mr. Wahn: These two paragraphs have the effect of permitting a party label to be put on the ballot, or they permit a candidate to be described as an independent. I think all of us would agree that where the names of candidates are similar or confusing, some provision should be made for placing the party label on the ballot. Although the provision is permissive in its terms, the result in practice will be that the party label will go on the ballot in all circumstances. This raises a question as to whether the practice is really desirable.

It is my contention that if the names are not confusing it is undesirable that the party label should appear on the ballot. My reasoning is this: there has been a tendency in recent years for political parties to be merchandised much in the same way as commercial products. However, one great problem in carrying out a successful merchandising effort has been that at the point of sale, namely, the polling booth, the party label has not been in evidence. This means that a candidate during the election has an extremely important function to perform, which is to make known to the electors that he is the candidate for a particular party. If the party label were allowed to appear on the ballot it would mean that the central organization, having the benefit of large election funds and having access to radio and television coverage, would be able to merchandise the entire party; there would be no need to get individual assistance from the candidates in establishing the connection between the large-scale merchandising effort carried on by the central office and the candidate in a particular constituency. In other words, the functions and the responsibility of a candidate would be greatly diminished.

My suggestion is, therefore, that party labels should not appear on the ballots as a general rule. If the vital function of the ordinary candidate in an election campaign were diminished it would mean that the importance of individual Members of Parliament would likewise be reduced; the degree of independence they possess would be lessened.

If there is any support for my proposal, I would move that paragraphs (h) and (i) of subclause (2) be deleted and replaced by a provision which would permit party labels to be used when there was some good reason for doing so, for example, if names of candidates were similar or confusing. To avoid wasting the time of the committee I shall not move an amendment unless I see there is some support for my proposal.

The Deputy Chairman (Mr. Béchard): It being five o'clock I do now leave the chair in order that the House may proceed to the consideration of private members' business as set out on the Order Paper, namely, public bills, private bills and notices of motions.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, there have been certain discussions, and I believe there is a disposition on the part of hon. members to suspend the private members' hour today and to continue consideration of the business upon which we were engaged before five o'clock.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, there had been discussions yesterday, but it was my thought that I could supplement this request by suggesting that we proceed to deal with a vitally important piece of legislation, namely the fisheries bill. I spoke about the matter to the President of the Privy Council and the Minister of Fisheries, as well as representatives from the Conservative party, but I notice that even though the Minister of Fisheries seemed to agree with my suggestion when I spoke to him he is not present to proceed with the bill. Neither are the people from the Conservative party who expressed some interest in the matter. Therefore, I suppose I cannot make this request.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Perhaps there is some misunderstanding. I understood the hon. gentleman to suggest that we proceed with the elections bill rather than the fisheries bill.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, the conversation that I had with the Minister of Fisheries and the President of the Privy Council initially revolved around the request respecting private members' hour. I suggested this would be fine provided we could deal with this other vital piece of legislation, the fisheries bill. I gave this information to the Minister of Fisheries. I am sure he did not misunderstand it, but since the minister is not here I do not think there is any point in trying to advance this suggestion in the absence of real interest on the part of the government to proceed. Inasmuch as there is a bill standing in my name under the item "Public Bills" on the Order Paper as the first item, I think we should proceed with the suggestion made by the President of the Privy Council and continue our consideration of the elections bill.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Is the House agreeable to waiving private members' hour?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles)—Social Security—Tabling of white paper in present form—Interim increase in old age pensions; the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Burton)—Communications—Grant to International Business Machines to build electronic component manufacturing plant; the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Rowland)—Fisheries—Manitoba Government offer of financial assistance to establish processing plant in Selkirk.

• (5:00 p.m.)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CANADA ELECTIONS ACT

MEASURE TO CONSOLIDATE AND REVISE

The House resumed consideration in committee of Bill C-215, respecting the franchise of electors and the election of members to the House of Commons—Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale)—Mr. Béchard in the Chair.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall subclause 2 of clause 23 as revised carry?

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Subclause 2 agreed to.

Subclause 3 agreed to.

On clause 23, subclause 4—*Political affiliation.*

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laflamme: Mr. Chairman, subclause (4) of clause 23 is now before the House.

When clause 13 was being considered, I pointed out that when the bill was studied in committee, we did not consider the special status of the Speaker when looking into the possibility of indicating, over or under the title of the candidates on the ballots, the name of their political affiliation, in compliance, of course, with past decisions made by the various political parties whereby, according to our electoral system, the Speaker holds a special status and must not be involved in

the matter of political affiliations. I should like to move the following amendment to subclause (4) of clause 23:

That Bill C-215 be amended by
(a) striking out the word "and" in line 5 on page 84; and by
(b) striking out line 10 on page 84 and substituting the following:
'scribed by the word "independent"; and
(d) if
(i) the candidate is the person who, at the election, is deemed by and for the purposes of the House of Commons Act to be the Speaker of the House of Commons, and
(ii) no instrument or request is filed in accordance with paragraph (h) or (i) of subsection (2), the candidate shall, notwithstanding paragraph (b);, be described by his occupation or by the words "Speaker of the House of Commons".

Mr. Chairman, in order that the office of Speaker of the House of Commons may not be involved directly or indirectly in political affiliation, the ballot papers should bear an indication referring to the Speaker of the House of Commons, so as to comply with the wish of all political parties that the Speaker should be independent from all political parties.

The Deputy Chairman: Mr. Laflamme moves:

That Bill C-215 be amended by
(a) striking out the word "and" in line 5 on page 84; and by
(b) striking out line 10 on page 84 and substituting the following:
'scribed by the word "independent"; and
(d) if
(i) the candidate is the person who, at the election, is deemed by and for the purposes of the House of Commons Act to be the Speaker of the House of Commons, and
(ii) no instrument or request is filed in accordance with paragraph (h) or (i) of subsection (2), the candidate shall, notwithstanding paragraph (b), be described by his occupation or by the words "Speaker of the House of Commons".

[*English*]

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, I hate to be in disagreement with my dear friend, the able and amiable chairman of the committee, but on general principle I do not believe in writing into legislation provisions that are unnecessary and which at some future date might become somewhat unhelpful. Strictly speaking, as I understand the constitutional structure of our elective House, it is at times of dissolution that this act becomes really effective. We do not in fact have a Speaker, though according to general understanding there is such a thing as a permanent Speaker, and I personally hope very much that he who occupies that post today will be occupying it for a long time.

[Mr. Laflamme.]

If this were not the case, I think the amendment would be redundant and unnecessary because we already have a provision in the bill whereby any candidate may be designated independent, as would the honourable occupant of the Chair at the present time, or he may choose not to be designated at all. With all respect to the chairman, I think it is unnecessary to add to the provision we have which will carefully cover the situation. Who knows, I hope the situation will not occur. We may not always have a Speaker who is as permanent as our Speaker now, if I may use that adjective somewhat improperly in a grammatical sense, though I am sure hon. members know what I mean. I think that this addition to the legislation would not be helpful. My primary objection to it is that it is unnecessary because the situation is already amply covered.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, I point out to the hon. member the provisions of section 15 of the House of Commons Act, which provides:

The person who fills the office of Speaker at the time of any dissolution of Parliament, shall, for the purpose of the following provisions of this Act, be deemed to be the Speaker until a Speaker is chosen by the new Parliament.

Therefore, his first point that the amendment is inaccurate is not a just one. In fact, he remains Speaker of the House under the law already existing.

I think that the amendment put by hon. friend really contemplates a situation which either the present occupant of the Chair or the future one might face. In essence, I agree that he is an independent member; but also, in essence, the Speaker, at least until we make other provisions to the contrary, is faced with a particular difficulty when standing in an election. His status may not be amply known, and this amendment will give him the opportunity to have his status as Speaker made known.

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, may I say to the minister that he need not gratuitously read to me the elections act because I read it. I spoke about the constitution.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I did not read the elections act, but the House of Commons Act.

Mr. Macquarrie: Well, I was talking about the constitutional position.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I apologize to the hon. member for having the audacity to attempt to instruct him on anything.

The Deputy Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Rowland: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, would you read the amendment again since copies have not been circulated and this has resulted in some confusion in this corner?

The Deputy Chairman: The hon. member for Montmorency moves:

That Bill C-215 be amended by
(a) striking out the word "and" in line 5 on page 84; and
(b) striking out line 10 on page 84 and substituting the following:
'scribed by the word "independent"; and
(d) if
(i) the candidate is the person who, at the election, is deemed by and for the purposes of the House of Commons Act to be the Speaker of the House of Commons, and
(ii) no instrument or request is filed in accordance with paragraph (h) or (i) of subsection (2), the candidate shall, notwithstanding paragraph (b), be described by his occupation or by the words "Speaker of the House of Commons".'

• (5:10 p.m.)

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, again it is quite difficult to follow the reading of this amendment. It would be preferable to have something to look at and relate to the bill. I wonder whether the hon. member for Montmorency would mind standing this amendment until we have an opportunity of relating the written form to the bill itself?

Mr. Laflamme: Mr. Chairman, it is quite agreeable that this amendment be allowed to stand.

The Deputy Chairman: Is it agreed that we let it stand?

Some hon. Members: Stand.

Subclause 4 stands.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall subclause 5 of clause 23 as revised carry?

Subclauses 5 to 13 inclusive agreed to.

Mr. Rowland: Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to propose which would, in effect, add a new subclause 14 to clause 23. If it is in order, I should like to move it now:

That Bill C-215 be amended by striking out line 34 on page 85 and substituting the following:

"(14) Every employer of employees to whom the *Canada Labour (Standards) Code* applies shall, upon application to him by any such employee, grant to the employee leave of absence, with or without pay, to seek nomination as a candidate and to be a candidate for election for a period ending on the day on which the candidate obtaining the highest number of votes is returned as elected or on such earlier day as may be requested by the employee if he has ceased to be a candidate."

After all the noise about the last amendment, I am embarrassed to say that I only have two copies. However, the explanation is very simple.

Under current election procedure, candidates who are able to devote a great deal of time to campaigning have a distinct advantage over opponents who are not able to do so. This amendment would simply allow a person who comes under the provisions of the Canada Labour (Standards) Code to apply to his employer for leave of absence for the purpose of campaigning full time in order to give him the opportunity of contesting an election effectively. That is the intent of the amendment. I do not think I need give lengthy explanations to hon. gentlemen, since many of them have gone through more campaigns than I.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, I would be disposed to accept the amendment but I think it should be acknowledged that it really only applies to companies and employers essentially within federal jurisdiction. If it represents that much of an advance as a principle, I think it is worth while. Some of us who are members of this House remember a former member of parliament about whom, in an article concerning his candidacy in the *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science* it was pointed out that when he sought leave of absence from his employer—one of those large reputable Canadian companies—to become a candidate in an election he was told to take all the time he needed. He was fired for becoming a candidate. If we can get over that kind of mentality by this kind of an amendment, then I am in favour of it and will support it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question to the hon. member.

The Chairman: The hon. member for Saint-Denis.

Mr. Prud'homme: Could my colleague tell us how long would that period be? Actually, a candidate could request today a leave of absence for an undetermined period and say: "I am running in the next federal election."

Would it not be advisable to specify the length of time before nomination? Should it be as of the nomination or as of the date the candidate has made known his intention of seeking nomination? In my opinion, if it were possible to foresee six months prior to an election that a citizen is going to state his intention of seeking—

[*English*]

What about an individual who gets leave to become a candidate and then works full time for the party? He might well become a candidate but at that time he may be something other than a candidate. He might be on the payroll of a political party. Could we have a slight change in your proposed amendment to make provision for a certain length of time to cover this possibility?

Mr. Rowland: I thought that eventuality was covered in the motion as presented. If the amendment does not effectively meet that point, I would have no objection to some adjustment of its wording. However, I do believe that eventuality is covered in the amendment as it is now worded.

Mr. Prud'homme: My problem is that I do not have a copy.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Perhaps I could assist the hon. gentleman. This measure is certainly similar to one in the Public Service Employment Act. Specifically, the definition of a candidate is provided in Section 2 (3) of the Canada Elections Act. This would also apply to a candidate under these circumstances. The statute provides that:

> "candidate" or "candidate at an election" means any person who is officially nominated as a candidate at any election, or who, after the day of the issue of the writ for an election, or after the dissolution of Parliament or the occurrence of a vacancy in consequence of such a writ for an election is eventually issued, is declared by himself or by others with his consent to be a candidate;—

Mr. Walker: Mr. Chairman, is this amendment not redundant in relation to this bill? If I understood the President of the Privy Council this Provision would apply only to people in the public service.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): No, this applies to every employer under the jurisdiction of the Labour (Standards) Code, and that would include a lot of private employers such as railways, banks and so on.

Mr. Walker: Is there any conflict at all? The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre will remember that when we were passing

[Mr. Prud'homme.]

the Public Service Employment Act there was not just one clause but a number. I agree with the amendment but it might be wise to check this amendment against what is already in the Public Service Employment Act to see which would take precedence if some of the clauses do not jibe.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): If anyone reads the draft, he will see that it has been compared with the provisions of the Public Service Employment Act. I am afraid the hon. member for York Centre is under a misapprehension if he thinks there is a conflict. These two provisions refer to two completely different groups of people. The provisions of the Public Service Employment Act apply to public servants; people working for the government. This provisions applies to people who do not work for the government at all but who work in those industries which come under federal labour jurisdiction including railway workers, communications workers, bank employees; those people who are getting less than $1.65 an hour. They are covered by this. This would put these people in the same position as those who work for the federal government. I agree with the President of the Privy Council that it would be nice if we could go further and include all workers, but there seems to be some question as to whether we could include those under provincial labour jurisdiction.

I am hearing some suggestions from my friend behind me, the hon. member for Greenwood, who I think is relying on some judicial decisions in the matter. He suggests that the rights citizens enjoy in a federal election have a certain amount of priority, and that perhaps we could go further.

• (5:20 p.m.)

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Chairman, I am not rising to oppose the amendment, far from it. I believe it is an excellent idea, but I hope that some time we will examine the question raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. I believe we can legislate in respect of federal elections for all employees. I believe the principle that is applicable to federal employees should be applicable to any other employee in Canada who is proposed as a candidate for election.

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, I have only one comment. I think the substance of the amendment is excellent but being a purist, like the learned, honourable chancellor, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, I

am disturbed by the position this subclause will occupy. My only argument is that I think there might be a better place for it in the clause.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that I have read once again with interest the document given to us earlier by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) and that I do not find it quite accurate. In fact, if I read clause 2 which pertains to the definition of a candidate, it does not say that a candidate could not be officially nominated as a candidate in an election, so that a railway employee for instance, could easily as of now be officially nominated as a candidate in the next general election. He would then be on a leave of absence without pay having been officially nominated.

I support my colleague, but I wonder whether he would accept, without discussion, to amend his proposal by adding after the word "period", the following:

—from the day of the issue of the writ for an election and—

The section will read then in part as follows:

—so that he may be nominated as a candidate and to be a candidate for election for a period from the day of issue of the writ or an election to the day—

Could this suggestion be agreeable to the mover of the amendment without being itself subject to an amendment?

For clarification purposes, I shall read it in English.

[*English*]

"As a candidate and to be a candidate for election for a period from the day of issue of the writ for an election". Is this acceptable to the mover of the amendment? As I pointed out in French, I think it would be easy for anyone today to nominate an employee of a Crown corporation who could campaign for two years for his own election. I have no objection in principle, but I do not think this is the objective of the hon. member.

Mr. Rowland: Mr. Chairman, my disposition would be to leave the amendment as it now stands, in view of the fact that it is highly unlikely someone would apply for two years leave of absence without pay. However, since the President of the Privy Council indicated his willingness to accept the amendment, I would be willing to consider the suggestion of the hon. member for Saint-Denis. If this particular clause were allowed to stand until we have a chance to examine it, there might be some further modification proposed.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, my information, as I have already indicated to the committee, is that the wording is identical to that to be found in the Public Service Employment Act and, as such, is wording which has stood the test of at least one federal election campaign. My advice is that the addition would be redundant in the circumstances. In order to satisfy the hon. member, I would be agreeable to have the amendment stand.

Mr. Deachman: Mr. Chairman, as we will shortly be asked to vote on this matter, and since I believe most members on all sides of the House are disposed to support it, I think it would be advisable for us to know what we mean by a candidate. If we mean a candidate in an election, then it is a person who has filed his nomination papers at a date set out in the election act. The duration of this period, therefore, would be very clear. It would run from the day of the filing of his candidacy until polling day. Otherwise, it might be considered to run for the duration of the election campaign, a period of seven weeks. I think there is merit in having it spelled out in the amendment so that both the employer and employee who become involved know precisely what it means.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Chairman, since we have stood subclause 2 of clause 23, and since it is an open matter whether or not the hon. member might consider making a change at a later stage, I wonder whether we could solve two problems at one time by providing an opportunity for consideration. I think it is a little more appropriate to have this provision under subclause 2 of clause 23, which has been stood. Allowing the Clause to stand would give the hon. gentlemen now debating this very worth-while amendment an opportunity to consider whether or not they wish to put further amendments.

Mr. Rowland: Mr. Chairman, I am disposed to allow it to stand pending consultation.

The Deputy Chairman: Is it agreed that we now revert to subclause 4, which was allowed to stand, the amendment moved by the hon. member for Montmorency.

On clause 23, subclause 4—*Political affiliation*

The Deputy Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Chairman, now that we have this amendment before us and can see what it contains, I should like to say a word in respect of it. I am prepared to support the amendment but I make a very earnest plea that no one, and this includes the government, imagine that because we have done this we have done all we need to do about the Speakership at this time. Permission merely for the speaker to put on the ballot at election time his occupation as Speaker of the House of Commons does not make him a continuing speaker, and does not deal with the problem that arises when a person who has occupied the Chair, and has been as impartial as the present incumbent, is called upon to go back to the constituency and fight a contest at election time.

I must not become involved in a discussion of another matter, particularly a bill which stands in my name, but I do feel very strongly that this Parliament must not wait much longer before making a decision concerning the nature of the Speakership, which I think should be on a continuing basis. This proposal is not in conflict with that, but I see a very real danger that the government might say it has dealt with this matter by this amendment. It does not deal with it at all. It is all right, but there is much more we must do.

• (5:30 p.m.)

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, it is a bit unusual to stand an item and then pick it up a few minutes later. I would think that standing an item meant standing it for a little more than six or seven minutes.

This is a pretty fundamental matter. I am always a little leary when we drag other pieces of legislation into the Elections Act. As the situation stands, Speakers of this House are chosen by Parliament and each new Parliament makes its choice. I believe that at the present time it is a most excellent thing that each Parliament makes the same choice, and I hope they will do so for a long, long time. But I am wondering about the device here of putting down as an occupation an honourable office which a gentleman held in a Parliament which had been dissolved. I know very well that for the purposes of the House of Commons Act, continuity of administration, matters of internal economy, and so on, certain interpretations have been made, but I think in a sense we have moved away from the practice and the understanding as to the way and the manner in which Speakers are chosen.

I never quite had the view that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has. I am more interested in the occupant rather than in the office. I said long ago in this House that when the time comes, the House will find a Speaker and make that particular person the permanent Speaker rather than mechanistically setting up the office of a permanent Speaker. There is quite an important question of principle here, a question of practice. I submit we are introducing things which are not necessary for the procedures whereby we elect on this hill a House of Commons and we add nothing to the permanency of the Speaker by this device. It may lead to a lot of misunderstanding which at some future date would not be helpful.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, I would agree this question should stand for further reflection.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall clause 23 stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Clause 23 stands.

Clauses 24 to 27 inclusive agreed to.

On clause 28, subclause 1—*Inspection of lists.*

[*Translation*]

Mr. Godin: Mr. Chairman, subclause (1) of clause 28 before the House reads as follows:

> At any reasonable time during an election, a candidate who is officially nominated in an electoral district or his accredited representative may, in the office of the returning officer for that electoral district, inspect and take extracts from the list of electors transmitted to the returning officer pursuant to subsection (2) of section 12.

Besides, in the Electoral rules concerning the Canadian Forces, paragraph 29 reads as follows:

> The list of Canadian forces electors prepared by each commanding officer is no longer open for inspection by candidates or their representatives.

In this respect, I should appreciate it if the president of the Privy Council would tell us which guidelines will be given to the returning officers, and also whether clause 28 of the act will have precedence over paragraph 29 of the Rules.

[*English*]

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out to the hon. gentleman that

he is talking about two completely different lists. The one referred to in the clause under consideration is the list of the Canadian forces or special electors from all over the world with respect to the particular constituency, gathered in the hands of the returning officer for that constituency. The list the hon. member is referring to in the later part is the base list, that is to say, the list of electors on that particular military base. In effect we are talking about two different lists, one in the hands of the returning officer here in Canada listing the special electors from all over the world who are voting in that constituency, and the second list being the one prepared at the particular location abroad and in the hands of the officers responsible on the base.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to direct a question to the President of the Privy Council. Following the interjection of the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Godin), he had just insisted on the fact that there are two separate voting lists.

If a candidate can check the lists submitted by the Chief Electoral Officer, and if, on the other hand, the candidate cannot know which members of the Armed Forces are eligible to vote, does the President of the Privy Council feel this is consistent, and does he not intend to make any changes so that candidates would know from now on how many members of the Armed Forces are eligible to vote in their constituencies, what are their names and in which parish they reside.

Mr. Forest: Mr. Chairman, I may give the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) the following answer: Clause 28 provides exactly the information he is requesting, that is, the list of the Armed Forces voters in his riding with their addresses.

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Forest) whether what he has just said may be considered as the official position on the legislation applicable to the Armed Forces, because we have had some rather unfortunate experiences with regard to the military vote. There is no doubt that, if things had been done normally, we would have two more Créditiste colleagues in the House.

Mr. Forest: Mr. Chairman, I can give that assurance to the honourable member. This is a new provision and the committee has considered the matter. This is new information that may be made available to a candidate before the election, that is the list of Armed Forces or Civil Service personnel posted abroad.

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Chairman, I shall therefore refer to *Hansard*. Our concern and our wish to obtain such an assurance will be readily understood. I therefore refer to the summary of the main amendments made to the Canada Elections Act on page 7420 of the official report dated May 27, 1970, and more particularly to item 62 which reads as follows:

62. The list of Canadian Forces electors prepared by each commanding officer is no longer open for inspection by candidates or their representatives (Paragraph 29 of the present Canadian Forces Voting Rules).

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that there is some inconsistency here, and I urge once again the President of the Privy Council to take advantage of the Chief Electoral Officer's presence to give us some assurance in this regard.

• (5:40 p.m.)

Mr. Forest: Mr. Speaker, I am informed that previously, it was necessary to obtain all the lists of electors bearing the names of members of the Canadian Armed Forces. The act was amended and the candidate will now be able to obtain the list of the military personnel residing in his electoral district and voting there.

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, I should now like to ask a much more specific question.

Can the Parliamentary Secretary assure us that any candidate will be able to obtain the list of special electors, military or otherwise, of his electoral district, notwithstanding item 62 of the summary of the main amendments made to the Canada Elections Act which was handed to us by the Chief Electoral Officer when we began our study of this bill?

Mr. Forest: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. member that under the amended act, an officially nominated candidate will be able to obtain the list of Canadian Forces members and public servants posted abroad who vote in his electoral district.

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Chairman, it must be very later or I find it very difficult to understand item 62; I shall read it again. I regret to insist on this, but this matter is extremely important to us. It says, and I quote:

62. The list of Canadian Forces electors prepared by each commanding officer is no longer open for inspection by candidates or their representatives—

I refer here to section 29 of the present Canadian Forces Voting Rules.

I should like to ask the President of the Privy Council or his Parliamentary Secretary, to interpret this amendment to the Elections Act, so that we may know exactly where we stand.

I still hold, in spite of the explanations that have been given, that there is some inconsistency here.

Mr. Forest: Mr. Chairman, I wish to refer the hon. member to item 61 of the document he is referring to, which was formerly item 62 and which says:

61. A candidate or his accredited representative will be authorized to inspect, in the office of the returning officer, the list of Canadian Forces and Public Service electors, entitled to vote under the Special Voting Rules, who are ordinarily resident of his electoral district and make extracts therefrom—

Those are the new provisions. The hon. member has referred to the former rules which have been replaced by a formula most likely to please him and which enables a candidate to get a list of the electors in his own constituency.

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Chairman, I have the impression that we are not on the same wavelength. The extract from item 61 which has just been read by the Parliamentary Secretary refers to people who are in the Canadian Forces and whose ordinary residence is in a given electoral district.

As for me, I am referring to the Canadian Forces as a whole which are governed by the Special Voting Rules and I repeat my question: What is the legal meaning of item 62 and of the amendments thereto?

Mr. Forest: Mr. Chairman, I cannot give more information to the hon. member. In fact, item 62 to which he referred is related to the former system where the list of electors was prepared in accordance with the Special Voting Rules by the commanding officers of military establishments. The old system has been replaced by item 61—which I read a while ago and which the member has also read—where the candidate or his agent may obtain the list of Canadian Forces personnel authorized to vote in his riding.

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to insist, but the Parliamentary Secretary has just said three times that item 61 was being replaced by item 62. I have here the summary of the main amendments. There is an item 61 and an item 62 which aims at restricting the application of item 61.

[Mr. Fortin.]

Indeed item 61 covers the Canadian Forces members who are ordinarily resident in the said electoral district. Item 62 makes a restriction preventing candidates to know who is entitled to vote among Canadian Forces members as long as they are not ordinary resident of the said electoral district.

This means that no candidate of a given electoral district can know who has the right to vote, how many electors are entitled to vote and where they are residing outside Canada, so that after the election, the military vote can come as a surprise and change the results, without the candidate having been able to make some kind of publicity among those people nor any other canvassing in his constituency.

Mr. Chairman, I urge again the President of the Privy Council to specify the implication of the amendment in item 62 and the restrictions it imposes on the provisions of item 61.

Mr. Chairman, if a valid explanation cannot be given on that matter, we will certainly have to resort to a filibuster, because it is essential to ensure the fair election of members rather than to act on the sly, to go from item to another and say that both mean the same thing when they are evidently inconsistent.

Mr. Laflamme: Mr. Chairman, I only wish to add a few words in the hope of enlightening the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) who has been raising certain questions.

We have before us a bill that is clear enough, in my opinion, namely clause 28 which reads as follows:

At any reasonable time during an election, a candidate who is officially nominated in an electoral district or his accredited representative may, in the office of the returning officer for that electoral district, inspect and take extracts from the list of electors transmitted to the returning officer pursuant to subsection (2) of section 12.

And if my colleague cares to refer to subclause (2) of clause 12, he will read:

Within twenty-one days after the issue of the writs ordering a general election, the Chief Electoral Officer shall transmit—

It is no longer a possibility, it is an order.

—to the returning officer for each electoral district two copies of a list containing the name and current postal address of each Canadian Forces elector and Public Service elector—

—of his constituency.

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Laflamme)

might wish to refer to subclause (2) of the same clause which states:

> Except as authorized by subsection (1), the list referred to in that subsection shall not be open for inspection.

In that case there are restrictions somewhere and that is what we want to clarify.

In the document the Chief Electoral Officer sent us when we started studying the bill in committee of the whole, he was kind enough to include all the amendments made by the committee that studied the Elections Act.

He did not mention, in that document, what the former acts were, nor what amendments were made to them. There is a glaring contradiction between items 61 and 62, which we would like explained.

Clause 28 says clearly that the voters' list can allow one to find out what military personnel live in the riding, but it seems that it will be difficult to check the names of those who are abroad, and that is what we would like to know.

Mr. Laflamme: Mr. Chairman, if the member who has just spoken understood exactly how the military personnel are put on the voters' list, he would see that clause 28, and by referring to subclause (2) of clause 12, does not deal with the military personnel who live in his riding but rather to those armed forces members who, under the Special Voting Rules applying to them, each year decide on their residence after which a list is made of their names.

The list is therefore not that of the military personnel who live in his riding, but one of those who each year avail themselves of their privilege to give their names to their commanding officer indicating their residence.

So, wherever they may be, they give their former residence and if they want to vote in my colleague's riding, they may do so. That is the list mentioned in clauses 28 and 12, and not that of the military personnel who live in his riding, for their names are usually given on the voters list drawn up by the enumerators.

• (5:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

Subclause 1 agreed to.

On subclause 2—*Limitation.*

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Chairman, if I am not mistaken, we are now on subclause (2) of clause 28.

I should like to ask again the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Laflamme), who seems an expert in these matters, what is the legal importance of subclause (2) "Limitation" which reads:

> Except as authorized by subsection (1), the list referred to in that subsection shall not be open for inspection.

Mr. Chairman, to me the control of such a list is absolutely impossible.

Mr. Laflamme: Mr. Chairman, I do not claim that I am giving an opinion to the hon. member for Lotbinière. I simply wish to call his attention to the fact that the limitation referred to in subclause (2) tends to prevent the list of all Canadian servicemen to be given to a single candidate by the returning officer.

Each candidate will have the right to obtain the list of servicemen having the right to vote in his constituency, but he will not be able to get the general list which is in the hands of the chief Electoral Officer.

[*English*]

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, I ask the President of the Privy Council whether he feels this subclause could not safely be disposed of. I would not wish to move an amendment for its deletion without having his blessing and approval. One thing that has troubled many of us here on the political scene is the wall which tends to be built up between military service voters and those voters who are in public life. That is not healthy. I know that we cannot, through the Elections Act, make for close liaison between citizens of Canada who are in the armed forces and those in public life, yet I wonder why this subclause has been included. If opening the list of electors constitutes such a breach of security that the country is no longer safe, the fact that we have had six elections in nine years will lead some of the conclusion that we gave up the ghost long ago. I wonder if it would not be just as well to strike out this restrictive subclause.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, I wish to make it clear that this provision is included really at the request of the Department of National Defence which, for its own reasons, does not want the whereabouts of its personnel to be a matter of outside study from time to time. I am inclined to accept their judgment in this regard, particularly since from the point of view of the Elections Act no particular difficulty is involved in this matter.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Chairman, I should like to direct a question to the President of the Privy Council or to his advisers. I shall refer again to the interesting document sent to us by the Chief Electoral Officer, which is entitled:

Summary of the main amendments made to the Canada Elections Act.

Item 62 reads as follows:

The list of Canadian forces electors prepared by each commanding officer is no longer opened for inspection by candidates or their representatives.

Mr. Chairman, if that list cannot be inspected by candidates or their representatives, I should like to know who is going to inspect it and to what purpose it will be used.

Mr. Forest: Mr. Chairman, under item 62, a candidate for the riding of Lotbinière, for instance, could have requested the commanding officer of Camp Valcartier to provide him with the list of all the military personnel stationed at the base, not only from the riding of Lotbinière but also from the ridings of Portneuf, Sherbrooke, Missisquoi, etc.

He wants to have the list of the members of the armed forces who are casting their ballot in the riding of Lotbinière. Under the new legislation, he will be provided with the list of all the members of the armed forces who vote in Lotbinière whether they be located at Valcartier or in Germany.

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Chairman, could the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council give me the meaning of the phrase: "special elector"?

Mr. Forest: Mr. Chairman, I suppose the hon. member means the Special Voting Rules. These rules apply to the members of the Canadian armed forces and to the members of the Public Service residing abroad who will be allowed to cast their ballot in the same way as the military personnel in the future.

[*English*]

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Chairman, I have become thoroughly confused by the non-dialogue that has been going on for the last 15 to 20 minutes. As I understand it, hon. members have been discussing nothing more than a summary, written in casual terms, indicating the amendments which have been made to the act. The process we are concerned about, as I understand it, is clear; therefore, I cannot understand what has been happening during the last 20 minutes.

[Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale).]

Prior to the introduction of this amendment, as I understand it—I hope somebody will correct me if my understanding is incorrect—in order to secure the names of armed forces electors you could go to a base, and there was authority for you to do this, examine the voters' list and pick out the names of the people who had opted to vote in your riding. The bill says that you cannot do that now. It is no more complicated than that; you cannot do it any more. Instead, you may now go to the chief returning officer, who will give you a list of the armed forces voters in all parts of the world who may vote in your riding.

The difficulty in the past was that if you went to a base, you were given only those names which happened to be on the base commander's list. In my case, there is a station at Halifax. If I called on that base commander, and some people from my riding were stationed at Esquimalt, I would have no way of knowing from the list of the base commander at Halifax whether there was anybody in Esquimalt at the moment who might be voting in my riding. That situation has now been corrected.

The Deputy Chairman: Order, please. It being six o'clock, I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed at 8 p.m.

The Chairman: Order, please. When the committee rose at six o'clock it was considering clause 28, subclause 2.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Chairman, I will be very pleased to resume my seat if the non-debate of the 15 or 20 minutes prior to the supper hour has been resolved.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Forrestall: Is it agreed, Mr. Chairman?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, the statement by the hon. member is an admirable short summary of what I understand is the position.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Chairman, on this clause, I should say that we have obtained more information after the adjournment than before.

[*English*]

The Chairman: Shall subclause 2 carry?

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a few words in benedictal tones. I am very concerned about subclause 2. Had we done what I wished, namely, adopted the permanent voters' list, I would have suggested that this would be a proper stage for the lists referred to in this clause and clause 12 to be made available annually to the officers of parties registered under another clause.

I am still concerned about the manner in which we allow military service voters to be isolated from the political process until an election is called. I think that is very wrong. While I would be the last person to breach the security of the state, I do not think that the security of this country rests upon the protection afforded under the Canada Elections Act. I would be greatly mistaken if I believed there are not more sophisticated devices in the hands of foreign powers with which to glean information about our military personnel. I hope that some day we will be able to make improvements in this area. That is all I will say, now that this ecumenical effort is again settling upon us, thank heaven. I like to think of those of us who will be around a little longer.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Chairman, one question arose during the dinner hour. Perhaps the President of the Privy Council could clear it up quickly. At the conclusion of an election, what is the disposition of armed services voters' lists which are left in the hands of returning officers? Is there a requirement that they be returned to the Chief Electoral Officer?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Yes, Mr. Chairman, they are returned to the Chief Electoral Officer.

Mr. Forrestall: Could the President of the Privy Council find out whether the lists in that depository are available for inspection from time to time, and whether it is possible to take extracts from them?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): My understanding of the arrangement is that it is up to the Department of National Defence whether the lists should be made available outside the election period; it is within the initiative of that department. I presume that in the case of a judicial contestation there would be no difficulty in having them made available; they would still be with the returning officer.

Mr. Forrestall: My point is very simple. I am trying to obtain some clarity. The lists of electors at large remain available inasmuch as they remain in the hands of those who have collected them. It seems reasonable to expect that the lists of the armed forces voters should also be available, having regard to the fact that they very quickly become outdated.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I am not prepared to contest the legitimacy of the comment made by the hon. member for Hillsborough, that perhaps this should not be our final line of defence. I feel compelled, however, to accede to the request of my colleague the Minister of National Defence. They are returned to the department to be disposed of as they see fit.

The Chairman: Shall subclause 2 of clause 28 carry?

Subclause 2 agreed to.

Clause 28 agreed to.

Clauses 29 and 30 agreed to.

On clause 31, subclause 1—*Ballotpapers.*

The Chairman: Shall clause 31, subclause 1 as revised carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Forest: Mr. Chairman, I should like to move an amendment to subclause (1) of clause 31, to provide for a somewhat unusual case, perhaps, but that might arise and create some problems. It is only a matter of adding a new paragraph providing that if two citizens with the same surname ran for office, and if the party affiliation did not appear on the ballot paper and the candidate did not have the mention "independent" entered on it, there might be two identical names, which could cause some confusion. This amendment would allow the candidate to state his address or his occupation on the ballot paper, so that the elector may identify the one candidate for which he intends to vote.

This amendment tends to clear up matters. In committee we had not anticipated this particular case and the bill does not mention it.

This amendment could provide for the case where two citizens with the same surname would run for election. With no political affiliation mentioned on the ballots, the electors could not differentiate between the candidates. This amendment would grant the candidate the right to have his address or his occupation listed on the ballots.

Canada Elections Act

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I move:

That Bill C-215 be amended by striking out lines 37 to 44 on page 92 and substituting the following:

'appear in their nomination papers;

(b) the political affiliation of each candidate if any, as indicated under section 23 at the time of nomination of that candidate, shall be set out, after or under the name of the candidate;

(c) where the political affiliation indicated by a candidate under section 23 is a registered party, the name of the registered party shall be set out in such form as has been indicated by the leader of the party pursuant to section 13; and

(d) where,

(i) there are two or more candidates having the same name, more than one of whom has filed a request in accordance with paragraph (i) of subsection (2) of section 23, and

(ii) any of those candidates has, not later than one hour after the close of nominations, informed the returning officer, in writing, that he wishes to be described on the ballot paper by his address or occupation,

the address or occupation of that candidate, as indicated by him, shall be set out, after or under the name of the candidate.'

• (8:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

Perhaps I should repeat the substance of those comments in English because we did not send the hon. Senator, the hon. member for Hillsborough, a copy of the amendment. It might happen on rare occasions that two candidates having the same family name may present themselves for election in circumstances where their names are not accompanied by a party affiliation, or where they choose not to identify themselves as independents. In such a case the candidates would have the opportunity of putting on the ballot paper either their occupation or their address so that the electors would know which candidate was which.

Mr. Macquarrie: I appreciate the hon. member's courtesy and his kindly sentiment in calling me a Senator. I was wondering whether he had worked out a formula to determine which of these people with identical names would come first on the ballot sheet—but I suppose it is not possible to think of everything. I believe the hon. member has put forward a very good suggestion.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): The major factor which resulted in the committee which considered this part of the bill determining that there should appear on the ballot simply the party affiliation of a candidate was that space on the ballot sheet was not sufficient to allow all this extra information to be given. If it is now considered by the President of the Privy Council or by whatever forces are advocating this course of action that there will in fact be room on the ballot to insert the names of the candidates, the party affiliation and, in addition, the occupation or address, then I believe the same circumstances should prevail for all candidates; each candidates should have the opportunity to indicate his occupation and address. Even though in this amendment we might be dealing with one case in a hundred, or one case in a thousand, it appears that room can be found on the ballot after all, and this being so we believe there is room for similar information to be set out for all candidates. It appears that this opportunity for additional identification by occupation or address can bring certain advantages by appealing to certain groups in a constituency, and we feel that this advantage should be equally shared. In our party we support the concept of equality.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I would suggest that the hon. member's reasoning is incorrect. A situation might arise in which a candidate, though a supporter of a particular party, did not wish to indicate his support for that party on the ballot. There might be two Paul Martins on the ballot, to select a name.

Some hon. Members: Oh, not that!

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): You would have two non-political, non-partisan individuals and there would be no way of making a choice between them. One of them, under this amendment, could elect to put beneath his name the word "statesman". This would identify him. We are dealing with an exceptional case, but it appears to me it would be careless for the House not to provide for it. The difficulty could be met without doing violence to the general principle that the ballot sheet should not be a foot or two long.

An hon. Member: Or the two men could be called Don Macdonald.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Yes, for that matter the name could be Don Macdonald.

Amendment (Mr. Forest) agreed to: Yeas, 35; nays, 7.

Subclause 1 as amended agreed to.

Subclauses 2 to 9 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 31 as amended agreed to.

Clause 32 agreed to.

On clause 33, subclauses 1 to 5 inclusive.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Are we not taking subclauses 1 to 5 inclusive now, Mr. Chair-

man? With respect to subclause 5 I wish to advance a suggestion. As the bill now stands, the subclause reads:

The poll shall be opened at the hour of eight o'clock in the forenoon and kept open until seven o'clock in the afternoon of the same day—

I wish to advance the suggestion that it be kept open from eight o'clock in the forenoon until eight o'clock in the afternoon, to follow the phraseology used. In terms of a formal motion, I move:

That clause 33 be amended by deleting lines 40 and 41 of subclause 5 and substituting therefor the following:

"of eight o'clock in the forenoon and kept open until eight o'clock in the afternoon".

• (8:20 p.m.)

The general reasoning behind this amendment, which would have greater application in a metropolitan or urban area than in a rural area, is that it is not uncommon in these areas for people to have to drive for an hour, an hour and a half or in some cases two hours from their residence to place of work. Admittedly, there is a clause further on in the bill which provides that every person shall be entitled to a three-hour period away from his employment without loss of pay, to take account of this sort of thing; but nevertheless, in urban areas people have to contend with traffic conditions, pressures of life, and so on, and this does lead to delay.

In the community of Prince Rupert there are a number of urban polling divisions, and when the polls have closed at seven o'clock I have known of instances where in this city of something like 15,000 people voters have reached the polls too late to vote even though they have made every effort to get there before time. This amendment is an attempt to broaden the opportunity for electors to get to the polling station by providing them with a little extra time in the evening. If I am not mistaken, prior to the last amendment to the Elections Act in 1960 the hours were set at from eight to eight. I could be wrong about that. Perhaps I am thinking of provincial jurisdictions which provide for a 12-hour voting period, which does give a little extra time to those who may be inconvenienced by pressures of traffic and distance away from home to cast their ballot. Industrial workers often prefer to go home, have their dinner and change their clothes before going to the polls. This amendment would give them additional opportunity to exercise their democratic right at their own convenience.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Chairman, I have nothing against the amendment of the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) designed to extend the closing time of polling stations by one hour.

However, it seems to me that they should be opened one hour later in the morning. I wonder if the opening of the polls at nine o'clock instead of eight could not be considered. In fact, on four election days, I realized that, at least in my riding, the number of voters who show up at the polls at the beginning of the day is very small indeed. Election workers must be at the polls very early in the morning and have to wait two or three hours before voters start coming.

I would therefore support the amendment of the hon. member for Skeena proposing that polls remain open until 8 o'clock at night, and that, at the same time, an opening time of 9 o'clock in the morning instead of 8 be considered.

Mr. Forest: Mr. Chairman, usually, elections are held in summer when daylight saving time is in force. If the polls open at nine o'clock instead of eight; this would in fact mean at 10 a.m.

But, many people like to vote in the morning, on their way to work, and I suggest that, if the polls open at 10 o'clock, this would be a bit late. That would also be the case if they closed at 9 o'clock instead of 8 o'clock. The results of the voting, which everyone is eager to know, would also be delayed one hour.

[*English*]

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, I have no objection at all to this amendment. When we last made a major amendment in 1960, if I recall aright, we added one hour; it used to be six o'clock. I have had no testimony from anybody involved in the electoral process that this hour has been insufficient. I agree with what the Parliamentary Secretary said about the effect of daylight saving time.

If there is in the mind of the hon. member a real need for this extra hour, I certainly would not object to the amendment, though it would make for longer hours for poll workers and would also delay the national returns. But unless there is a fairly clearly demonstrated necessity for the amendment, I see no point in it. We must always remember that we have the protection afforded by the three-hour period away from duty.

I am not quite happy with the suggestion of my hon. friend to my far left in regard to

cutting off the morning hours. A lot of people vote en route to work, especially in the heart of the city, so perhaps it is not wise to leave opening time until late in the morning. Although I have no strong views either way, I am not sure that the amendment is necessary.

Mr. Forrestall: Neither am I, Mr. Chairman, except that I would suggest that if you add an extra hour either in the morning or in the afternoon, you will have to revise your cost and fees legislation to meet the minimum wage scale and pay them $22.28 a day.

Mr. Rowland: Mr. Chairman, I have one argument to add to those made by my colleague from Skeena. We must remember that this act applies to by-elections as well as to general elections. I recently experienced a by-election. Despite the provision in the Elections Act that an employee must be granted at least three hours in which to cast his vote, in a by-election it is very difficult for some employees to get their employer to grant them that right. My experience was that a great many people missed voting because they were unable to get to the polling station from their place of employment by 7 p.m.. I think the extra hour would be worth while, especially in a by-election where there is no great insistence that the three-hour period be honoured.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I have not taken part in this debate but I rise to ask the minister whether he would consider the suggestion that has been made. He has not commented on it, but it is obvious he does not agree with it. When I was first elected to Parliament in 1962 I had been active, as hon. members know, in the practice of law on behalf of labour. On numerous occasions during elections that took place between 1950 and 1962 I was asked by union clients to telephone employers to tell them they must let their people go to the polls in time, or else.

The fact is that despite the provision in the act there are many employers in the country who simply do not observe it. I am not condemning them. There are many small employers with only a few employees who cannot afford to pay for three hours taken out of a week's work. Unless the employees or their union make a fuss, they do not get time to vote. I could go back to my files and cite many examples where precisely this sort of thing has occurred.

Nowadays work often finishes at five o'clock or shortly thereafter. Even in industrial plants some shifts finish earlier than that.

[Mr. Macquarrie.]

If there were an extra hour available until eight o'clock, there is no doubt that everybody would be able to attend the polling station. But in many cases the seven o'clock deadline is simply too soon. I do not think anybody would suffer from the extra hour being allowed. The hon. member to my right said it would delay the national returns, and this might have been true before instant communication, before results appeared almost instantaneously across the country, subject to the time zones that have to be observed. I do not think that now presents any difficulty at all. As a result of radio and television, results are flashed across the country very quickly. They may be delayed an hour, of course, but they will not be delayed to the point where that evening the effective results would not be known to every Canadian.

• (8:30 p.m.)

The effective result as to the trend, which party is leading and how the parties rank is now known at eight o'clock if you are on standard time, one hour after the polls close, and they would be known at nine o'clock, one hour after the polls closed at eight. That is certainly not any loss to the country or to the election process, whereas to disenfranchise thousands of Canadians because of an early closing of the polls is, I suggest, a very serious loss to the country and to the electoral process. I would therefore urge hon. members, and particularly the minister, to accept the very reasonable suggestion that we extend it one hour in the evening to enable thousands more people to exercise their democratic right. I repeat, that with instant communication no one and nothing would suffer because of that extension.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, I take no strong stand on this matter one way or the other, but I do not agree with the hon. gentleman. From my experience, at the times that he and I have been running in general elections in our cities I have not found there to be any difficulty at all with the existing hours in the Elections Act. I regard this as a case not proven. It seems to me that with our time span there is time enough for virtually everyone to vote. The hon. member says no one would suffer. I suppose one could say the polls staffs would suffer by having to work an extra hour at the polls.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, would the minister excuse me for asking a loaded question? Is the minister aware of the fact that before

distribution I had a section in my riding, Forest Hill Village, which did not suffer from the hours of polling. I suppose part of Rosedale may be in the same situation.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Let me point out to the hon. gentleman, if he thinks there is some virtue in representing a low-income area and that it is something to boast about, that my area is undoubtedly a lower income area than his. I am thinking in terms of Regent Park and other parts of the city. I do not know what his observation is in that regard.

I would only say that it does seem to me there has been no evidence of disenfranchisement. It is true that 76 per cent of the electors on the electoral lists voted in the last election. I think that percentage is right. This means that 24 per cent did not vote. I have seen no evidence, and we have had no evidence put before us this evening, that this occurred because of the hours of polling. I remain unconvinced, like the hon. member for Hillsborough, about the necessity for this amendment. I suppose on this particular point each member should vote as his experience indicates. Mine does not indicate the necessity for it.

Mrs. MacInnis: Mr. Chairman, I should like to present a little bit of evidence I have gathered over the years. There are a great many instances where the woman of the house waits until the man gets home from work and they usually get their supper over, get cleaned up and go to the polls together. This is particularly true in a riding like mine, where a great many families have only one car or perhaps do not have a car at all. The woman waits for her husband to get home and they then go to the polls together. I know this is so because we have been troubled at a great many polls by congestion at closing time, particularly in earlier times when the closing hour was earlier. I feel it would be a good idea to add this extra hour to facilitate families—they are very numerous—where the husband and wife make a habit of going to the polls together in the evening.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Chairman, I hope to make what I feel is another valid point. I am glad to note that the President of the Privy Council is not yet convinced one way or the other, or does not feel very strongly about this matter. I repeat what I know is a principle that every member in this chamber has in mind: our electoral laws must maximize the opportunity for the greatest number of Canadians to exercise their franchise.

Since we were not able to come up with an acceptable absentee balloting system—and I suppose this is the main point—it seems to me we should do everything possible to increase the opportunity to cast a ballot. A few amendments have already been accepted and many ideas have been put forward. I believe this is another way, although it might be considered a small point, in which the opportunity to cast a ballot would be enlarged. Surely that is a principle with which no one in this chamber would disagree.

I support the points made earlier by some of my colleagues in relation to the extra hour in the evening, particularly because of the kind of society we now have. We live in urban and suburban areas. People start doing things when they get home from their work, and presumably on election day one of the things they will do is vote. It is more likely that they will vote during that hour because it is more convenient for them. I suggest again that our electoral laws should make it as convenient as possible for voters to cast their ballots. If I were to support any change, I would prefer to see the polls open an hour later in the morning. Our amendment still refers to eight o'clock in the morning, the same as the hour proposed in the bill, but we ask for an additional hour in the evening. A number of reasons have been put forward which I hope will convince those members who are willing to be convinced that this is a worth-while change.

Mr. Alkenbrack: Mr. Chairman, having considered this clause I feel it is very reasonable as it stands. I agree with the Government House Leader that 11 hours is long enough. Moreover, I would remind the committee that if polling day is lengthened the staff will have to be paid that much more. This will increase election expenses borne by the taxpayer. Under the modern conditions of 1970, anyone who cannot get to the polls to vote after finishing work at five o'clock must work a long way from the poll. I do not believe that many people in this day and age work so far away from the poll they cannot get there by seven o'clock. For that reason I support the clause as it is.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, the matter may mean additional expenses, but it is the taxpayer we are concerned about and providing him with a fair opportunity to cast a ballot. The President of the Privy Council

has said that as far as he and the government are concerned they have no strong views one way or the other, and that we should approach this question on the basis of our individual experience. I think we must consider that suggestion together with an understanding of what is individual experience. Let me refer to the city of Prince Rupert, which has a group of urban polling divisions. In my experience, people there have missed getting to the poll because of the closing time and the distance they have had to travel.

Let me expand upon that by relating the situation to some rural polling stations on the coast of British Columbia. In some areas of Vancouver Island, loggers have travelling time, that is, the time it takes to get from home to work out in the bush, and vice versa. This time in certain areas ranges up to 2¼ or 2½ hours. Some people have to leave home at 5.30 or a quarter to six to catch the "crummy" at the marshalling point and get to work out in the bush by eight o'clock.

• (8:40 p.m.)

If you reverse this situation, assuming that the polls close at seven o'clock, with standard time in existence at the time of the election the individual receives three hours off from employment, which means he would have to leave his job out in the bush at four o'clock. We might couple that with up to 2½ hours spent in travelling from out in the bush to his home where the polling division should be. There is a half-hour leeway, which is not very much when you take into account the difficulties which might arise.

I have ridden on these "crummies" in logging camps. Sometimes they have flat tires, and during the early winter and late winter there is a very inclement weather, snow or wetness, which causes difficulty in travelling. Travelling under such conditions may take two hours or more, and in such a case the individual would miss the opportunity to vote simply because he worked at a spot which was far away from his place of residence. In many cases it is impossible for him to make the journey in time, even taking into account the three hours he is permitted to be away from his employment.

This is recognized under the elections act of British Columbia. In British Columbia provincial elections the employee is entitled to four hours free time from his employment. That takes into account the additional factor of having to travel long distances in certain areas. In rural areas in southern Ontario and in urban metropolitan centres, sometimes a person has to travel a long distance, but the same problems are not involved. I earnestly plead that this factor be given consideration. I do not think our consideration should be based entirely on the concept of its costing so much money, because our democratic process does cost money. But I believe we have a commitment in terms of spending that money in order to provide the fullest opportunity to voters to cast their ballots.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, I was not thinking of the money involved but, rather, the extra hour the polls people would have to work. However, the hon. member has talked me into it. Let us see if he has persuaded anybody else.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Asselin: Mr. Chairman, the proposal of the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) is worthless. In fact, the act stipulates that the employer must give his employees three hours to vote. If an employee leaves at 4 o'clock and cannot get to the poll by 7 o'clock it is because he is too far away. The legislation provides that these people may vote at an advance poll a week before the election.

I wonder how the hon. member for Skeena can imagine that someone who is unable to get to a polling station before 7 o'clock, because he is absent that day, cannot report at an advance poll a week before the election in order to exercise his franchise.

I think that it will not change anything to the act, and the arguments that he puts forward in order to justify adding an additional hour to polling time may apply in all circumstances. But if somebody is able to prove that he is absent from his electoral district on polling day, he may be allowed to cast his ballot a week before at an advance poll.

Therefore, I do not believe that the argument of the hon. member for Skeena is of any value.

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Chairman, I feel obliged to come back to the question that I raised earlier.

As I consider the opening and closing hours of the polling stations, I note that the election workers have to report to the polling station, at least half an hour before opening time. And if we reckon as an average another half an hour to go to the polling stations which, in summer, open at nine o'clock in the morning,

these people will have to leave their house at eight o'clock in order to be there in time.

And after the closing of the poll, at eight o'clock, daylight saving time, it takes about an hour to count the ballots and another half hour to go back home. That means that our election workers have to put in a 14 hour-day because, at the dinner hour, there is no closing of the polls.

It is a work day far too long, since the number of electors registered at each polling station generally does not exceed 300. Therefore, if we are unable in 10 or 11 hours to get these people to vote, something is wrong somewhere. As a matter of fact, that may indicate that the polling stations are badly located and that we should endeavour to put them in the centre of the electoral district.

If the election takes place in summer, the polling stations will open at nine o'clock. I believe in winter, fall or spring they should also open not earlier than 9 a.m.

Turning to the argument just put forward by the hon. member for Skeena to the effect that the voter can leave his job at 4 to go to the polling station, I believe that if polling hours are extended by one hour he will not leave at 4, but at 5, since his employer will not have to give him an hour off. He will still have only three hours to get to his polling station.

He will be no better off. Unless it is agreed to start the polling day an hour later in the morning, I must vote against the amendment of the hon. member for Skeena.

[*English*]

The Chairman: The question is on the motion of the hon. member for Skeena.

Amendment (Mr. Howard, Skeena) negatived: Yeas 13; nays 32.

The Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, we bear a cross here on the left wing.

Subclauses 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

On clause 33, subclause 6—*Central polling place.*

The Chairman: Shall subclause 6 as revised carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Chairman, on page 96, subclause (6) of clause 33 reads as follows:

> A returning officer may, where he deems it advisable, establish a central polling place where the polling stations of all or any of the polling divisions of any locality may be centralized, except that no central polling place so established shall comprise more than ten polling divisions unless it is the usual practice in a locality to establish a central polling place for civic, municipal or provincial elections and the Chief Electoral Officer has given his prior permission for the establishment of a central polling place comprising more than ten polling divisions.

Mr. Chairman, this subclause is disputable. In my constituency, I found that for two different elections at least, in a particular town, eight polling stations were centralized in the same hall. But nobody had thought of providing an easy access to that hall. It had only one door and an election worker who was posted at the door allowed the electors to enter the room only one by one. So five or six days would have been necessary to allow all electors to cast their ballots into the ballot boxes!

On each occasion, I had to discuss and argue to be authorized to open the doors and let the electors in that large hall so that they might reach the polls.

Corrective measures should be taken in this connection. I wonder whether it would not be better to make the act state that such central polling places be set up in such a way that electors may be directed by persons employed by the returning officer to the polls where they must vote, so as not to delay unduly the other voters.

To that effect, it is my intention, if this is suitable, Mr. Chairman, to move the following amendment:

> That Bill C-215, an Act respecting the franchise of electors and the election of members to the House of Commons, be amended by deleting the period at the end of subclause 6 of clause 33, line 18, on page 96 thereof, and adding thereto the following:
>
> "and that the central polling place be set up in such a way that the electors may get easily to each polling station within the central polling place."

[*English*]

The Chairman: The committee has heard the amendment.

Mr. Benjamin: Could we see the amendment, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): As I understand the position of the hon. member, he feels that at least in some polls in the past there was a difficult situation when you had more than one poll in a relatively small room, with the polls all chock-a-block on top of each other. It was difficult for the elector to sort out the poll at which he was required to vote. To give a rough translation of the amendment, it calls for the addition of the following words to

subclause 6 at the top of page 96: "that the polling booths be organized in such a way as to provide easy access for electors to the polling booths contained in the polling centre." We might also consider subclause 9 in this connection. It seems to me that the amendment adds a further instruction to the returning officer to facilitate matters for electors, and I have no objection to accept it.

Amendment (Mr. Laprise) agreed to.

Subclause 6 as amended agreed to.

Subclauses 7 to 9 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 33 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 34 to 38 inclusive agreed to.

On clause 39, subclause 1—*Who may vote and where.*

[*Translation*]

Mr. Godin: Mr. Chairman, I should like to move an amendment to subclause (1) of clause 39. Seconded by the member for Richmond (Mr. Beaudoin) I move:

That subclause (1) of clause 39 be amended by adding after the words "to be required of him" the following:

"if he is not carrying his identification card bearing his photo and duly approved by the governor in council".

I should like to make a few remarks in this connection.

According to the present act, the persons assigned to drawing up voters lists go to every home where they ask the name of the citizens, male and female, who live there and have the right to vote. Voters lists are made up in duplicate and each voter get a copy of the list of his area.

In some rural areas, the citizens exercise their franchise in a proportion of 80 per cent. There is no problem. But, in large cities, where people lose interest in politics, the proportion may be of 20 to 30 per cent. However, it happens that citizens who are not interested in politics are interested in money and they manage to earn a few dollars by selling their copy of the enumerator's notice to elector. The cost of those copies which allows the elector to vote is usually around $5. Families of five individuals with the right to vote are very happy with the present system and they feel they are doing good business since, without even having to go out, they can make $25 on election day.

Under these circumstances, it is the party with the best election funds which will be able to buy the greatest number of copies and have its candidate elected.

[Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale).]

If the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) so desires, I could bring him an election organizer, a man responsible for a "telegraph office," who was in charge of outfitting about a hundred people who, on a certain election day, cast about ten ballots each. I am sure that an identity card is not as easy to trade as the registration copy for which there is such a high demand in the present system. It is to complement the bill now before us that I propose this amendment.

Since there is nothing new in this suggestion and since this method is already applied in a number of countries, I do hope, Mr. Chairman, I will have the support of the majority of the members who are still in favour of truly honest elections.

[*English*]

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, I think this suggestion was first raised by the hon. member for Lotbinière during the debate on second reading. At that time I said that it might indeed be the kind of suggestion which could usefully have been brought forward on at least two occasions at the Standing Committee's hearings, first when it was considering the possibility of a permanent voters' list and, second, when it was considering the general changes to the Elections Act. However, that was not done. Since this amendment raises issues going well beyond the Elections Act, suggesting what in effect would be a compulsory national registration system, I personally would not favour it without a great deal more reflection. For that reason I hesitate to accept it at this time.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, we have an element of difficulty in grasping what is intended. I have the English translation of the amendment, which asks that subclause 1 of clause 39 be amended by adding, immediately after the words "of the present law" the following—and it goes on to give the additional words. However, in the English version of the bill there are no words "of the present law." In the French version the last four words of subclause 1 are "de la présente loi," which is probably authorized by the act. I am not sure of the translation between one and the other, and that makes it difficult to follow. Clause 39(1) in the English version talks in a positive sense about a person, subject to his taking an oath, being allowed to vote at the polling station on the list of electors for which his name appears. The copy of the

amendment I have states in the negative sense:

• (9:00 p.m.)

—if such person is not bearing an identification card showing his picture and duly approved by the Governor in Council.

I have difficulty following the English version of the amendment. The President of the Privy Council appeared to grasp what it was in the French language, but I had to listen to the translation and did not grasp it clearly. I wonder if we could not stand the item until we get a better idea of what is intended, because at the moment the amendment lacks understanding. I see no connection between the English version of the amendment and clause 1 of the bill.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member is suggesting something additional. This amendment would be contrary to clause 45 of the statute, which states that no elector shall be required to produce a birth certificate or evidence of citizenship. His amendment requires that not only must a person appear and identify himself, if necessary by affidavit as required in the section, but at the same time he must produce an identification card. This card, incidentally, is to be provided under a system which does not now exist under federal law. Not only must he identify himself as a voter on the list, but he must do so by means of this card. This parallels the situation which existed during the war. Without arguing the merits of such a system, I personally would not be persuaded of the wisdom of adding this provision to the Elections Act.

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, I presume the hon. member is concerned about diminishing the possibility of impersonation, but I feel that his suggested cure is fairly extreme. Not only would it be a highly sophisticated form of registration, but it would be almost a regimentation if we had to produce a certificate with a picture on it. Quite seriously, I think we are not quite ready for this refinement. Once again, and this begins to worry me a bit, I find myself in agreement with the President of the Privy Council.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Beaudoin: Mr. Chairman, I believe the amendment moved by the hon. member for Porneuf (Mr. Godin) is very timely, because in many countries, everybody has an identification card bearing his photo and must carry it with him, otherwise he could be penalized. In order to have the right to vote and that this right is not abused of, I believe the identification card is necessary.

[*English*]

The Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Amendment (Mr. Godin) negatived: Yeas, 4; nays, 37.

The Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

Subclause 1 agreed to.

On clause 39, subclause 2—*Closed lists in urban polls.*

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, I would respectfully ask that we stand subclause 2 of clause 39. When we get to clause 47 I propose to suggest an amendment with respect to providing opportunity for electors in urban polling divisions to vote upon being vouched for, notwithstanding the fact that their names do not appear on the appropriate voters' list for that urban division. If my amendment is accepted it will require a consequential amendment to subclause 2 of clause 39.

Clause 39, subclause 2, stands.

Clauses 40 to 44 inclusive agreed to.

The Chairman: The committee will now consider clause 45.

On clause 45—

Subclauses 1 to 21 inclusive agreed to.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Prud'homme: We would just like to change one word in subclause 22 of the French text.

[*English*]

The English translation is very accurate for us. There is a word that is very shocking in French.

[*Translation*]

where it says, if the hon. members would kindly follow in subclause 22:

(22) Where a polling station has been established in a sanatorium, a home for the aged—

[*English*]

You translate "home for the aged" by the words

[*Translation*]

a "home for the aged" has been translated by "un asile de vieillards". In Canada, especially in Quebec, the word "asile" is generally associated with insanity.

We would like to substitute to the expression "asile de vieillards" the term "un foyer pour personnes âgées".

[*English*]

Subclause 22 agreed to

Subclause 23 agreed to.

Clause 45 agreed to.

The Chairman: The committee will now consider clause 46, subclause 1.

On clause 46, subclause 1—*Appointment of proxy voters.*

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Chairman, I should like to move an amendment to clause 46, subclause 1, to extend the provisions of proxy voting. May I say at the outset that any amendment we may make on proxy voting does not indicate full support for or agreement with the whole system of proxy voting, but in view of the lack of time to do more about the elections bill we could not arrive at alternatives in the way of absentee polling. We are trying to improve the statute because we do not particularly like the system proposed.

I move that clause 46, subclause 1, be amended by inserting a new paragraph (b) as follows:

• (9:10 p.m.)

(b) his absence from the polling division in the course of his employment in airline, railway, bus and trucking industries, provided such employment is in the actual operation of aircraft, trains, buses or trucks,

and that the subsequent paragraphs of subclause 1 be relettered.

I know that arguments could be made in favour of other groups or occupations, but we felt that here was one group involved in the operation of modes of transport which ought to be given the option of using the proxy voting system. We know that many of these employees are away from home for many days at a time, days which could include advance polling days and polling day itself, and we thought this group at least should be added to those to whom the provisions of proxy voting apply. Other occupations could be added, but we felt there would be very little trouble in adding these people to the eligible list. I hope that members of the committee will seriously consider our proposal.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, one of the difficulties about the proxy voting system is the increased risk of loss of control, in the sense that there may be loss of assurance of the relative fidelity of the voting system. There are two principles involved here. The first is the principle which motivated the hon. member to give to the maximum number of people the opportunity of voting in an election. There is, on the other hand, the generally desirable attitude that controls over the voting system should be relatively efficacious and that so far as possible we should prevent fraud, personation, and so on.

The problem with personation under our present system exists normally where individual A, knowing that individual B is an elector on the list of a poll and has not yet gone to the poll, goes to the polling station and represents himself to be B and votes in his stead. That is a simple case of personation. The protection against this—I acknowledge it is not very effective protection in the case of an urban poll—is the possibility that he will be recognized by someone at the poll as not being the individual he holds himself out to be. There have been a number of such cases in recent years.

The problem of proxy voting is that there is the risk of personation at one stage further; that is to say, an individual may go to a poll and represent as to a document, on which he or someone else may have forged the signature of an elector, that that is the signature of the absent person. It is difficult at the best of times to know the identity of an elector at an urban poll or, for that matter, at a rural poll and very few people—I think hon. members will recognize this from their own experience—will know the exact signature of an elector. So there is a greater risk of personation in such circumstances. For that reason I understand the committee confined itself to a relatively limited number of situations where it would be physically impossible for individuals to attend at the poll and they would have to appoint an agent for this purpose.

The case which had the greatest appeal for me and for the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, because of a common friend, was that of persons who because of illness or physical incapacity are incapable of leaving their residence and going to the poll. There you would be least likely to have a case of personation.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): That is the most important case, moreover.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): My hon. friend says that is the most important case. The other two cases are occupational ones and an argument could be raised—indeed, I raised it myself on second reading—as to whether a more general wording might be applied such as, "All persons who, by the nature of their occupation, will not be able to be present either at the advance poll or at the poll on election day." It has been pointed out to me, however, that owing to the problem I have just mentioned, the risk of personation, the wording should be fairly restrictive. To the extent that we extend this provision to one occupational group we shall invite arguments as to why it should not be extended to other groups, thereby raising the risk of personation and of damage being done.

The occupations which have been cited here are fishermen, mariners and prospectors. In the case of both fishermen and mariners, you have occupations where voters are very commonly on the waters and absent from the community for a period which could cover both the advanced poll and polling day. In the same way, prospectors carry on their activities far removed from the normal places of residence in this country; that is to say, in remote areas where they do not have access to a poll.

I would express at this point my great reluctance to extending the group any further in this regard, although I will be glad to hear the views of hon. members on this point, particularly on the question whether by extending the vote to one industry we should extend it to others and thereby risk the integrity of the system.

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, this is one part of the bill, and indeed one part of the committee report, which has caused me the most concern. The introduction of proxy voting is, in the minds of many members, a compromise. Certainly so far as I am concerned, it is second best. I think we will really cover people who are not able physically to be at the place of voting only when we adopt a system of absentee voting whereby these people can get their ballot to the poll without being there themselves.

I think we must bear in mind that a proxy vote is a diluted vote. It represents some diminution of the will of the person to whom the vote is extended because he cannot control, so long as the poll remains secret, what happens. That is why I still believe we shall achieve only second best so long as in our country we avoid what has been done in other countries, namely, the establishment of a permanent voters' list as a result of which we can establish a system of absentee voting. Then we shall not have an abridged type of franchise by means of the proxy vote. When you start enumerating lists it is quite difficult to be all-encompassing and cover every one.

I remember one election in which a very large and prominent church happened to hold its national assembly. The assembly had begun before the advanced poll began, and those worthy and religious men, except the ones that happened to be resident at the site of the convention, were not able to vote. In our mobile society this sort of thing happens constantly and is not confined to mariners, fishermen and others like them. The group I am concerned about are the patients in non-chronic hospitals—I think this provision would be very useful to them—and the people who are at home and incapable of going to the poll.

I do not like the suggestion that students should vote in this way. I cannot see a student having his "old man" or his mother casting his vote back home for him. I think that is degrading of his rights as a voting citizen. I think the former system was far better even though in 1965, because of unfortunate timing, the country lost the votes of some of these people. It is second-hand voting and, as someone else has suggested, it is not a good thing. I am more kindly disposed to the system being extended to patients in non-chronic hospitals, nursing homes and institutions of that kind. However, I see great danger in all this and we delude ourselves if we think we are extending the full franchise. We are extending something less than the full franchise. I can only accept it as second best, and not a close second at that.

• (9:20 p.m.)

Mr. St. Pierre: On second reading of this bill, Mr. Chairman, I said that I intended to introduce an amendment to extend proxy voting to loggers. I have a particular concern in this matter, as do other members from British Columbia and other parts of Canada. Loggers are one group particularly discriminated against by the lack of the absentee ballot. The amendment now before us is similar to the amendment I intended to introduce with regard to loggers. I have since had time to study the lengthy deliberations of the com-

mittee on this matter. I have had conversation with officers of the Crown regarding this matter. Difficulties present themselves in extending proxy voting to one class of citizens such as loggers, and not to others, or to a broad class of citizens. Simply to introduce the proxy vote to anyone who in the course of his occupation is likely to be away from his place of residence appears to introduce so many possibilities of misuse, fraud and impersonation that I have reluctantly come to the conclusion that the extension of proxy voting beyond the very narrow categories listed here is not a very workable solution.

I have also come to this conclusion with regard to the clauses which were stood earlier today in the committee's deliberations—clause 17 of the bill, as well as clauses 9 and 10, and specifically clauses 12 and 13. I believe worthwhile amendments could be introduced here and I intend to introduce them at the appropriate time. While they will not provide the vote to all Canadians who by reason of their occupation have to be absent from their place of registration on voting day or on advance polling day, I think the franchise could be extended very considerably by amendments to these clauses. In fact, I am particularly attracted to this way of doing it because the form of the amendments I intend to introduce will not specify loggers, construction workers or any other class of worker. However, it will have general application to anyone who by reason of his occupation must be absent from the polling division in which they are registered on voting day or on advance polling day.

With some regret I have been driven back from the position I took when I first recommended absentee balloting and absentee balloting under a permanent voters' list, which as was pointed out by the hon. member for Hillsborough is the most desirable way of meeting this situation. In its wisdom, the committee found this not to be feasible. I agree with the hon. member for Hillsborough that proxy voting is a compromise. It is not as good as we might hope for, but it is better than nothing. It has limited application.

I hope the committee will agree that I can put forward an amendment to clause 17 concerning a permanent voters' list. The system could be improved considerably to enable a great many more Canadians whose occupations force them to be absent from their polling divisions on voting day or on advance polling day, to cast their vote.

[Mr. St. Pierre.]

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Chairman, I have mixed feelings about this amendment. My basic inclination is to support it. I am aware of the difficulties of too rapidly broadening the base of voting by proxy. While we are dealing generally with these categories I wish to qualify my opposition to the amendment now before us. The committee might think of it in the context that there is one exception which had a reasonable amount of consideration in the committee. I refer to the exception of elderly or other people who for one reason or another are confined to nursing homes.

The bill requires that a medical certificate be obtained in the case of illness or incapacitation. It is very difficult to get a doctor to issue a medical certificate for an elderly person who may be in a nursing home, hospital or rest home and who is neither ill nor incapacitated but because of age and infirmity is not able to go to a poll to vote. I say there are exceptions. I do not think the President of the Privy Council should be so firm and rigid in his opposition to broadening the system where there are justifiable grounds.

When the amendment now before us is dealt with, I intend to move an amendment to the effect that after the words "illness or physical incapacity" something along the following lines be added, "a patient in a hospital recognized by one or more of the several provinces and/or a patient in a nursing home recognized in one or more of the several provinces". That will take care of people in that specific category. I think the category in the context of the present amendment is a little too broad and could lend itself to abuse. I suggest by way of contrast, that people in nursing homes and similar institutions are not in the same capacity. Many members in this chamber may have parents who are in nursing homes or other institutions of this type. We had a lengthy discussion on this clause when it was before the committee. The committee agreed to at least one useful amendment. With regard to the proposal originally considered by the committee, it was established that the committee was prepared in principle to look at occupational groups, and where there was a clearly identifiable group, the committee was prepared to include these people in their new adventure in voting. I will speak to this matter later.

• (9:30 p.m.)

I suggest this is one category that is clearly identifiable and for which there can be no broadening, expansion or contraction at the

time of the prosecution of a general election or by-election. The present amendment does not meet this requirement. It is too broad. It is conceivable that there will be people who travel, such as truck drivers, airline pilots and those in the transportation industry, who by virtue of their day-to-day work will not be able to exercise their franchise on voting day or on advance polling day. In the case of identifiable groups we should ensure, while we have the opportunity to do so, that they are not excluded. But when they are not controllable units, when they cannot be defined, we must be extremely careful not to open the door to possible abuse.

Mr. Deachman: Mr. Chairman, I do not want clause 46 to pass without expressing my pleasure on finding university students included in those covered by the proxy voting procedure. Hon. members may recall that in September, 1965, thousands of students in universities across Canada were disenfranchised because they were caught between the time of the issuing of the writ and the time of taking up residence. For five years I set down on the Order Paper public bills offering a method of correcting this situation.

I presume we are all glad to see it corrected now, as far as this can be done through the proxy vote procedure. I express my thanks to the members of the Standing Committee and especially to the chairman, my hon. friend from Montmorency, for permitting me to appear before the committee and appeal on behalf of students that the act should be changed so as to enable them to vote should an election again be called in the circumstances of 1965.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, when I was much younger and much less flabby I used to be a logger. As a result of that experience I began working toward a system of absentee balloting applicable not only to loggers but to others who followed occupations which kept them away from their ordinary residences or meant their moving from one residence to another. The hon. member for Coast Chilcotin is familiar with this situation.

The hon. member for Hillsborough and I were the two members of the Standing Committee this year who were also members of the same Standing Committee in 1960 when the last major revision of the Elections Act was undertaken. In that year, those of us who advocated an absentee system of balloting were not able to get much support in the committee or, for that matter, any support. As a matter of fact, I had to prevail upon the hon. member for Ottawa West to support me in order to get a motion before the committee for its consideration. I did not realize at that time that a seconder was not needed.

At any rate, after determining that there was no support in the committee for the idea of absentee balloting, for what were obviously valid reasons, I advanced the idea of a proxy system of voting because such a system existed in Ontario for mariners and perhaps for those in other occupations. Again, the idea got nowhere. I was its only supporter. When the committee began to consider this session the question of proxy voting, I wished to extend the principle to include workers in every occupation one could think of, because I was so wedded to the idea of providing a voting opportunity for as many people as possible who normally are disenfranchised by reason of the demands of their occupations.

As I began by saying, I worked in the logging industry on the west coast; I know the difficulties the loggers encounter and realize they are shared by large numbers of miners and construction workers. The Standing Committee spent a long time dealing with the principal point enunciated by the President of the Privy Council, namely, that one must be extremely cautious about extending a facility such as this, bearing in mind the liabilities which might result from such action in terms of personation, duplication of voting and the like. The opinion was expressed that proxy voting should be confined in the main to those who would not normally have an opportunity to get to any polling station.

Earlier, we had prepared amendments covering loggers and construction workers. We reflected on the matter very seriously and in the end decided not to proceed with them because of the inherent difficulties likely to result from their application. I think the present approach is probably a good way of dealing with this question as far as it concerns a large group of workers who, unlike transportation workers, do not have a set destination or a set place of employment. Transportation workers fall into a special category. Normally they work on what is called a run. They set out for the turn-around point, at which they might spend some time, and then they return to their point of origin. So I think we can draw a distinction between transport workers and larger groups of workers, which it is virtually impossible to identify except in the most general terms, engaged in work of a

transient nature, or people who work in areas where they are located only temporarily.

• (9:40 p.m.)

I urge general support of the concept advanced by my hon. friend from Regina-Lake Centre, recognizing the difficulties encountered by this large group of people who work in areas where they are only temporarily located. I hope, too, that hon. members will endorse the proposal made by the hon. member for Coast Chilcotin when we return to clause 17. If we do this, we shall be moving with all necessary care and attention to preserving the integrity of the balloting system and protecting it against abuses which can and do develop within it. We shall be advancing properly and carefully in the direction we want, namely, that of providing the best opportunity to the greatest number of people to cast their ballots.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Chairman, my colleague said that I do not agree with him, but this is only partly true. I think if we are to have a proxy voting system it should be extended to as many people as possible. I am sure no one would disagree with the idea of as many people as possible casting their ballots in the way they wish. I am sympathetic to what has been said in favour of proxy votes, but I should like to extend the system. When elections are held during the school year, most students become disqualified from voting because they are away from their normal place of residence. I think we should give consideration more to a system of absentee voting than proxy voting. This would allow the voter to make his own decision.

Sometimes people are prevented from voting simply because they are incapacitated and cannot cast their ballot. There was a poem written by someone in my riding which I should like to read to the committee. Perhaps fortunately, I do not have it with me. It is about a galloping ballot box in a provincial election held in Timiskaming. One of the candidates had a big car and he conveyed the three scrutineers, the deputy returning officer, the clerk and the ballot box to a number of houses in the area to enable people living there to cast their ballots. Many ballots in that election were cast in kitchens, bedrooms and such places which were visited one hour before the polls closed, and this was because a good many people had not been able to vote. Although this was highly illegal, and at the same time somewhat hilarious, none of the candidates in the election—my father was one—pressed any charges relating to an infraction of the act because all of them believed it had been a good idea to let Mrs. Jones vote, and also Mr. Smith who had been confined to his home with a broken leg. In effect, they moved the polling station to the homes of the voters.

I have suggested on previous occasions that elections should be held every four years at a time when they did not conflict with students' activities. But I would not like to see our enthusiastic young people take advantage of the situation. I know there is some protection in a declaration having to be made on the preceding Friday by a person who wants to vote by proxy, but with the Postmaster General handling the mails it could take two weeks or more before the notification was received, and there would be no safeguard provided. In that event, young people who are now eligible to vote would be able to vote in two places. In view of what happened in the last election, I would not want this to happen. Nevertheless, the possibility is there. You would have mother voting at home and her son voting in Toronto or wherever his college was located. There are a number of ways of meeting this objective which would be less detrimental than the present system. Many countries have adopted the absentee balloting system and I think our Elections Act should make provision for it, in favour of the present scheme.

I also think the principle of proxy voting is wrong. I can see many more abuses than advantages flowing from this situation. This seems to me a poor substitute for a system that would eliminate abuse and still make it possible for eligible voters to cast their own ballots. It has been pointed out that a number of infirm, elderly and incapacitated people will be able to vote by proxy. I think in this regard the elderly people of the nation are being misjudged. I do not think they would tell anybody how they intended to vote. In many cases they would not even tell their own spouse. They take great satisfaction from the secrecy of the ballot.

Mr. Prud'homme: We saw that in England.

Mr. Peters: Neither are they interested in how other people voted. In England they had the same difficulty that we had during the last election; many people were not free to tell their spouses how they voted until after election day. The elderly would not ask their spouse to cast a ballot for them with any

assurance, and as a result I think this proxy voting system would be used very little.

If this is the only system that is feasible, the amendment moved by my colleague from Regina should be made applicable to those limited categories of people I have suggested, so they can exercise their franchise on election day. I would support the amendment while still being opposed to the principle of a proxy voting system, which I predict will not last more than one election. I would far sooner see absentee balloting, which I think everybody desires.

• (9:50 p.m.)

Mr. Burton: Just a few words on this particular clause, Mr. Chairman, since I feel strongly about some of the points and principles involved. Clause 46 as submitted to the House by the government arises from the report of the committee and enunciates a new principle in connection with proxy voting. The committee, of course, wrestled with some very real problems in endeavouring to enable the greatest possible number of people to exercise their right to the franchise at an election. However, I have very serious doubts about and disagreements with the principle involved in clause 46 and, as a consequence, with the amendment moved by my colleague, the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre.

I feel we must take into account the very real administrative and mechanical problems that will be involved in making this clause work in an acceptable way. All sorts of problems will exist. The hon. member for Timiskaming has pointed out some of the problems that will arise as a consequence of this clause. Beyond that, there seems to be a more basic principle involved. It seems to me the principle of proxy voting is basically inconsistent with our democratic process, with our democratic operations, with our society and our nation. I feel it is wrong in principle and that it is inconsistent with the principles of democratic government to enable a voter to transfer his right to vote to someone else, however much we may say—and this will be the fact on many occasions—that the voter who receives the proxy will carry out the wishes of the person granting it.

I feel it is a faulty principle which enables voters to transfer what in fact must be regarded as a sacred right if we are to maintain a democratic society and a democratic government in this country. I believe that extending the principle of proxy voting as has been proposed in clause 46, with the still further extension in the amendment before us, will have an eroding effect upon the election process as we know it. I feel that it will also have an eroding effect in terms of public attitude toward our functioning as a democracy.

I concur with the proposition put forward by the hon. member for Timiskaming, that we should be looking at a system of absentee voting. I feel this is the principle we should be working toward. This system in fact could and would go much further than the proposals before us in fulfilling the objectives sought. We have seen absentee voting in operation in various parts of Canada from time to time. In fact, there have been occasions when problems have arisen in this respect. I could quote instances which have occurred in my own province of Saskatchewan when the government, formed by the party of which I am a supporter, instituted a system of absentee voting. It worked very well for several elections. When it came to the close election in 1964, it was found that there were certain weaknesses in the system which had been established. I suggest that those weaknesses could have been corrected by making changes in the mechanics of the system and that in fact in principle the system was very sound.

Thus, I very much regret that the committee did not come forward with a recommendation for a system of absentee voting. Therefore, I place on record my view that we should be working toward a system of absentee voting rather than a system of proxy voting as is proposed in this bill.

The Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question on the amendment moved by the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Amendment (Mr. Benjamin) negatived: Yeas, 8; nays, 28.

The Chairman: I declare the amendment lost. Shall subclause 1 of clause 46 carry?

• (10:00 p.m.)

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago I rose to indicate that I wanted to move a further amendment. Before I do so, I wonder whether the President of the Privy Council would address himself to the suggestion I made, in a manner which will assist those of us who must find some direction not only in the words of the measure but in the spirit and the intent of this clause. He might

lend us of his learned and wise mind by giving an interpretation of the clause. Perhaps he would address himself to the interpretation of clause 46 (1) (b) in terms of whether this provision can be construed to include, as I mentioned a little earlier, the many thousands of elderly people in Canada who are at home, in nursing homes or special care institutions and who, while neither physically ill nor incapacitated, are not capable of going out, for example on a rainy day, on a bad day in the winter or on an exceptionally hot day in the spring or the early fall for the purpose of voting.

I do not know why the hon. member for Saint-Denis is laughing. If he does not care about the elderly people in Canada, that is fine; but I ask him not to laugh at me while I am trying to protect them.

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a question of privilege. My friend knows very well that is not the case. I do not like that remark to be on the record, and that is why I am saying this.

Mr. Forrestall: Well, do not laugh. I think this is a serious thing. We would be very remiss in our duty if we went to the extent we have in order to bring in this new concept of voting at federal general elections, and failed to include in the act a clear definition of what we mean. We should have an interpretation by someone in a responsible position. We would be very remiss if by failing to do either of those two things we denied to many hundreds of thousands of elderly Canadians the right to vote. I have in mind those who are mentally alert and are deeply interested in the things that are happening in their country. I think all of us, without going too far back in our personal campaigning experiences, could enumerate many instances of people who wanted to exercise their franchise but were not able to do so. I suggest we now have a vehicle by means of which this can be done.

My interpretation of the situation as it now stands—I hope I am wrong—is that a medical certificate is required. My learned friends who are members of the bar know very well that we had an interesting discussion with the chairman of our committee on this subject, and I appreciate his views. He knows very well that we shall not make a valid judgment based on an emotional matter, but that we shall make a valid judgment based on fact.

If a person should not be ill and not physically incapacitated, a doctor or other responsible authority would not sign a medical certificate saying that he was. Indeed, if I were the person for whom such a certificate was being signed, I think I would resent it. On the other hand, it is quite possible that during the winter, or because of other circumstances, it might be extremely difficult for me to get out to vote. Yet we have in this bill a clause that very nearly covers such a situation. It does not, because it only covers people who are factually ill or factually physically incapacitated to the point where they just cannot get out and do what they would wish to do.

Therefore, it is a question, if not of an amendment then certainly of our hearing a few words on the question of interpretation from the minister who is piloting this bill through the House. He should tell us just what is the intent of clause 46(1)(b). This is a fairly narrow but important point because of the number of people involved. I hope the interpretation on this narrow point will be such that the individual concerned will be able to make a value judgment. The responsibility for making a value judgment which is not necessarily based on fact would be removed from the doctor, the hospital superintendent or whoever the person might be.

I do not believe we have the right to require our professional people to make this type of judgment. On the other hand, I believe there is a very clear deficiency in the clause as it now stands. If the President of the Privy Council would address himself to this point, and if his explanation in terms of what is intended is sufficiently clear and satisfactory to me, there will be no need to move an amendment. This might simplify matters.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, for what my opinion on this point is worth, I think that here we are speaking of a medical practitioner in the sense of a doctor, head nurse of an institution or some other person who is from time to time medically treating a person in the group in question—in fact, all those persons who would be making decisions in respect of the health, to use the antonym of the word in the clause, or the physical well-being of the person. These people would be required to give a value judgment which I think would hardly be a judgment of fact such as the hon. member referred.

The hon. member suggested that the medical practitioner and the officials should not give a judgment based on anything other

than fact. I think the truth of the matter is that virtually every medical judgment is made, not on fact alone but on professional opinion based on knowledge of the facts concerning the particular individual. This ultimately is a question of opinion and judgment.

In respect of the group the hon. member has in mind, and which I certainly had in mind when advocating this change to the Election Act during the course of the current parliamentary session, I am thinking of those who because of advanced years would have the greatest difficulty. In such a case, probably the advice of their practitioner would be that in the interest of their health they should not go outside their residence, or possibly even outside the room in which, regrettably, they happen to be confined. Under such circumstances I do not have any doubt that this provision would be very broadly construed. A medical practitioner should not have difficulty in signing the kind of certificate which would be required in respect of his patient, in order to give that person an opportunity to vote by proxy.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Chairman, I think I could find this interpretation quite acceptable. I think it clarifies what is intended in this narrow provision. I think the point the President of the Privy Council is attempting to make is clear, and that returning officers seeking a clear understanding of what is intended by this clause would find the necessary counsel in simply reading the words of the President of the Privy Council. I will accept that as an interpretation.

Subclause 1 agreed to.

Subclauses 2 to 13 inclusive agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall clause 46 as amended carry?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Clause 46 agreed to on division: Yeas, 34; nays, 5.

The Deputy Chairman: I declare the clause carried.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether we might revert to clause 17 which was stood for the purpose of considering the proxy voting system.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

On clause 17—

• (10:10 p.m.)

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, we have given further consideration to this clause and I would like to suggest several amendments to subclause 9 and subclause 17 which would in effect remove the rather narrow application of subclause 9 and apply it in favour of any person who changes his place of ordinary residence from one polling division to another in the same or in another electoral district during the course of a general election campaign. The same principle would apply to subclause 17 and would cover any person who changes his ordinary residence, following the enumeration date, to another polling division in the same electoral district. This would have the effect of removing the rather narrow category referred to in subclause 9 and would broaden it to include anybody who during the time period in question had moved, therefore making it possible for such persons to be put on the voters' list of the district to which they had moved. Since it probably would not be appropriate for me to move these amendments, I would ask my colleague the hon. member for Don Valley to move them in his name.

Mr. Kaplan: Mr. Chairman, I move:

That Bill C-215 be amended

(a) by striking out lines 27 to 43 on page 28 and lines 1 to 25 on page 29 and substituting the following:

Exception '(9) For the purpose of a general election only and notwithstanding anything in this act, any person who, during the period between the enumeration date and polling day, changes his place of ordinary residence from one polling division to another polling division in the same or another electoral district, if he is otherwise qualified as an elector and so elects,

(a) may apply in person

(i) where he has moved to an urban polling division, to the revising officer appointed for the appropriate revisal district, or

(ii) where he has moved to a rural polling division, to the rural enumerator appointed for that polling division,

during the sittings for revision, to have his name included in the list of electors for the polling division in which he is ordinarily resident at the time of his application; and

(b) upon his name having been included in the list of electors for the appropriate polling division, is entitled to vote at the polling station established for that polling division.'

Canada Elections Act

(b) by renumbering subclauses 11 to 17 of clause 17 as subclauses 10 to 16, respectively, and by adding thereto, immediately after the renumbered subclause 16, the following subclause:

Idem

'(17) For the purpose of a by-election only and notwithstanding anything in this act, any person who, during the period between the enumeration date and polling day, changes his place of ordinary residence from one polling division to another polling division in the same electoral district, if he is otherwise qualified as an elector and so elects,

(a) may apply in person

(i) where he has moved to an urban polling division, to the revising officer appointed for the appropriate revisal district, or

(ii) where he has moved to a rural polling division, to the rural enumerator appointed for that polling division

during the sittings for revision to have his name included in the list of electors for the polling division in which he is ordinarily resident at the time of his application; and

(b) upon his name having been included in the list of electors for the appropriate polling division, is entitled to vote at the polling station established in that polling division.

(18) Rules 50, 51 and 52 of schedule A to section 18 do not apply to any application made pursuant to subsection 9 or 17.'

The Deputy Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Amendment (Mr. Kaplan) agreed to: Yeas, 49; nays, 7.

Mr. Kaplan: I move:

That clause 17 of Bill C-215 be further amended

(a) by striking out line 38 on page 29 and substituting the following:

Temporary workers

'(11) At a general election, a person shall be deemed to be'

(b) by striking out lines 8 and 9 on page 30 and substituting the following:

'therein since the date of the issue of the writ ordering the election;'

(c) by striking out line 16 on page 30 and substituting the following:

'mentioned in subsection 11 who has come'

(d) by striking out lines 24 to 26 on page 30 and substituting the following:

'continuous residence therein since the date of the issue of the writ ordering the election.'

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, I understand the hon. member for Coast Chilcotin had an amendment at this point to subclause 8.

[Mr. Kaplan.]

Mr. St. Pierre: Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment of which I gave notice to the committee earlier. It arises out of my earlier statement that I had hoped to extend to loggers the clause on proxy voting and for reasons which I need not repeat to the committee this has not proven feasible. As a matter of fact, like many other hon. members I am disturbed that one particular group such as loggers should be chosen in this connection. I have chosen them because they are numerous in my riding. Because of the nature of their occupation, they are often not in the place of their ordinary residence on polling day, or on advance polling day. There are many other people in the same category. Subclause 12 (b) could improve the situation for these workers.

For the benefit of those who are not familiar with west coast logging, I might explain to members of the committee—although I am sure this situation is repeated in respect of different occupations in many other parts of Canada—that it is very difficult for a person employed in the logging industry to be certain where he will be on a date some weeks or months in advance. A great many loggers have their ordinary places of residence in large towns, in the city of Vancouver or elsewhere. Their ordinary place of work is likely to be in extremely isolated areas, isolated by everything except air or sea transport, say, at the head of B.C. coastal inlets. The times of work are irregular. Naturally, they are under a union contract, yet there are many camps where even under the union contract a logger may work three weeks with one week off, which he spends at home. There is the further difficulty in that elections are usually held in the spring, summer or early autumn and during the summer months in British Columbia no one can foresee when a dry season will result in a complete shutdown of the woods industry. In the bill before the committee the provision for temporary residence reads as follows:

• (10:20 p.m.)

A person shall be deemed to be ordinarily resident, on the enumeration date for an election, in a polling division in which he is temporarily residing while temporarily employed in the pursuit of his ordinary gainful occupation—

This does not specify logger or construction worker; it merely says "in the pursuit of his ordinary gainful occupation", and this wording is good and broad. It goes on to say:

—and is entitled to have his name included in the list of electors—

Then we have paragraphs (a) and (b) and (c). Paragraph (a) deals with whether he is otherwise qualified, and (c) states as follows:

is on polling day still temporarily residing therein while temporarily employed in the pursuit of his ordinary gainful occupation.

But in (b), Mr. Chairman, it is stated:

has been in continuous residence therein for at least thirty days immediately preceding the enumeration date;

I am afraid this is an alteration of the act in the wrong direction. Under the present act the provision for residence amounts to about 56 days, but this provision of 30 days preceding enumeration date requires a residence dating back to at least 79 days before polling day. I think this is unreasonable and unnecessary, even to prevent fraud. Of course, fraud is possible in respect of everything we are passing in this committee tonight. In proxy voting there is a danger of impersonation, and in the temporary residence qualification there is the risk of fraud and impersonation. I suggest that it is the duty of the committee to make a good and sound compromise between the dangers of fraud and impersonation and the necessity of extending the franchise, most particularly to people whose livelihood requires their absence from polling divisions. I have an amendment to move to subclause 12 and, if it is accepted, a consequential amendment to subclause 13. These will not, of course, provide votes for all the people I am dealing with in my remarks, but they will considerably expand the number who will be able to vote and who in preceding elections have not been able to do so.

Like a great many members in this House, I am convinced that the only truly satisfactory system, and one which we must eventually adopt, is that of a permanent voters' list and a system of absentee balloting. At this time, however, I am not prepared to quarrel with the hard working committee which has gone into this question thoroughly and is unable to declare that to be feasible at this time. I suggest that it will become feasible when we can standardize the requirements for eligible voters among federal voters, provincial voters and, hopefully, amongst municipal voters. In this way the considerable cost of maintaining a permanent voters' list would be borne by the three levels of government and we would have an ideal system of a permanent voters' list and an absentee balloting system.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment to subclause 12, paragraph (b) is as follows:

that section 17, subsection 12, be amended by striking out lines 8 and 9 on page 30 and substituting therefor the words "therein for at least 20 days immediately preceding polling day".

While making no fundamental alteration in the security of the ballot as it exists, I suggest a 20-day period will entitle a great many more people, specifically loggers and workers in similar occupations, to cast their ballot in the next election. I invite the committee to support this motion.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, having had a conversation with the hon. member for Coast Chilcotin, and having read the amendment which he drafted earlier, I should like to indicate my support for it. The amendment relates to an earlier debate about the proxy voting system. However, I think there should be a follow-up amendment to subclause 13. This clause relates to the wife or dependant of a person. It seems to me that the President of the Privy Council had proposed amendments to precisely the same area, but I am not sure whether he actually moved them or just indicated his intention to do so. The member for Coast Chilcotin has advanced a time of 20 days before polling day, and a piece of paper which I have in my hand and which I think emanated from the President of the Privy Council states, "at the issuance of the writ ordering the election." As I say, I do not know whether he moved that amendment or not. I hope he did not, because the amendment advanced by the member for Coast Chilcotin is much less restrictive and provides greater opportunity for those people who otherwise find themselves disenfranchised by reason of following their gainful occupation.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member should wait until my amendment is put and carried, and then he could move a subsequent amendment or a subamendment. At the moment it does not happen to be in that form.

Mr. Baldwin: Do you guarantee it will pass?

An hon. Member: How can he guarantee it?

Mr. Baldwin: I thought he could guarantee anything.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, I thought the President of the Privy Council had in fact moved an amendment which covered four parts of clause 17, and I do not know how many subclauses it relates to. If

the amendment properly before us is the one moved by the President of the Privy Council and he is reluctant to withdraw those sections which the member for Coast Chilcotin also seeks to amend, we shall have to look at the proposition advanced by the member for Coast Chilcotin if he wants to put it before us now as an amendment to the amendment, to put it in its procedurally correct position.

• (10:30 p.m.)

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, while the amendment I put under subparagraph (b) would fit into the scheme of clause 12 as it exists, the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Coast Chilcotin will not. Therefore, all of clause 12 will have to be redrafted to take care of the actual circumstances. I am sure the hon. member for Don Valley would be happy to withdraw that part of the amendment referring to "since the date of the issue of the writ ordering the election".

I point out to the hon. member for Coast Chilcotin that I thought he had taken advice on this point. The amendment to clause 12 will have to be rather more substantial than the one he has introduced. Perhaps that could be done on his behalf. I am sure the hon. member for Don Valley would be prepared to agree to withdrawing subparagraph (b) as put forward with the words, "since the date of the issue of the writ ordering the election".

Mr. St. Pierre: Mr. Chairman, I understand that the hon. member for Don Valley is to withdraw that part, which would leave my motion with respect to paragraph (b). I assume a second amendment is required to clause 13, the effect of which is to change the time for 30 days immediately preceding the date of enumeration to 20 days preceding polling day. Am I correct in this assumption?

Mr. Macquarrie: If someone can do the proper patching, I should like very much to support the suggestion of the hon. member who has just resumed his seat.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Chairman, could we not stand this part while the minister considers what is to be done?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, since it appears that it will be necessary to do a fair amount of redrafting to accommodate the hon. member's amendment, perhaps we could move to another clause while the draftsmen are determining what needs be done.

The Chairman: Is that agreed?

[Mr. Howard (Skeena).]

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Chairman: Does the committee agree that all of clause 17 shall stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Clause 17 stands.

The Chairman: Does the committee agree that we turn to rule 39 of schedule A, clause 18?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, these are all amendments consequential to whatever amendments are made to clause 17. Therefore, I would suggest that we return to clause 47 and set aside for the moment the amendments moved by the hon. member for Don Valley.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

On clause 47, subclause 1—*Manner of voting by qualified elector whose name is not on the list in a rural polling division.*

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, before clause 47 carries may I seek some advice as to the procedure I ought to follow? I want to move an amendment but wish to avoid renumbering all the subsequent clauses in the bill. I could classify my amendment as clause 47A in order to avoid the consequential renumbering of clauses. May I have some advice as to whether I might do that following the passage of clause 47, or can I advance it as clause 47A while we are considering clause 47? I should like some advice as to the correct procedural course to follow.

The Chairman: Perhaps the hon. member would indicate what the amendment will be. It may then be easier to judge.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, while the amendment appears lengthy, its substance may be summed up shortly. With my amendment is a subsequent amendment affecting two of the forms in schedule 1. They are attached to the amendment and are being distributed for the sake of clarification. What you have in your hand, sir, is a proposal two pages in length. It is headed "New section 47A." There are also two other forms.

Very simply, the amendment is this: For many years there has been a provision in the act that a qualified elector in a rural polling division whose name is not upon the voters' list for the appropriate polling division may still cast his ballot after taking an oath as to who he is. In it he must undertake other obligations and give information. Also, some-

one who is a registered voter on the voters' list must appear with him, vouch for him and take an oath saying that he knows the person who seeks to vote even though his name is not on the voters' list. This is a fairly common practice in rural polling divisions and it is of advantage to those who for one reason or another are not able to have their names appear on the voters' list or at the court of revision for the rural polling division.

Some people wonder why the same provision is not available in an urban polling division and this has been a cause of concern. This is especially so in areas which at one time were classified as rural polling divisions and because of the growth and development of the area have been reclassified as urban polling divisions. People wonder why in the one case they can follow one procedure and take an oath, and then simply because the community or polling division has been reclassified or called by a different name they cannot follow that procedure. I know that many members have been interested in developing a mechanism under which the people of urban polling divisions can take advantage of such a procedure.

Perhaps the suggestion I am making is not thoroughly acceptable. Perhaps it does not contain sufficient safeguards. I am advancing it by way of amendment in the hope that as a result of further discussion we may bring about a meeting of minds. I hope we may find a way of permitting people to cast their ballots in the way suggested, while at the same time restricting and confining those areas in which abuse might take place.

Briefly, the amendment provides that a person in an urban polling division whose name is not on the voters' list for that polling division may cast his ballot if he takes an oath in which he identifies himself—similar to the oath that is taken in a rural polling division—and if he brings along with him a person, whose name is on the voters' list for that urban polling division and who is a member of a certain occupational or professional group. The occupational or professional groups which would be acceptable in the vouching procedure are those groups which are acceptable to the passport office in cases where the identity of the person must be vouched for in applying for a passport. There are an additional two, or perhaps three, occupational categories which the Canada Elections Act contemplates are composed of people worthy of taking an oath and vouching for a person under the act.

• (10:40 p.m.)

I will read the whole of proposed clause 47A. It follows to a large extent the provisions of clause 47, to make the necessary changes to give effect to what I seek to do. I move:

That clause 47 be amended by adding the following:

47A (1). Subject to this section, any person who is qualified to vote in an electoral district in which an election is pending and is, on polling day, ordinarily resident in an urban polling division may, notwithstanding that his name does not appear on the official list of electors for the urban polling division, vote at the appropriate polling station established therefor.

That is word for word clause 47 relating to rural polling divisions, with the exception that the word "urban" is substituted for the word "rural". Subclause 2 is as follows:

(2) Any person described in subsection 1 is entitled to vote only

(a) upon his being vouched for by an elector of any of the occupations or professions of mayor; postmaster; minister; priest or ecclesiastic of any religious faith or worship; barrister; solicitor; notary public; physician, surgeon; dentist; school principal; bank manager; chartered accountant; magistrate; justice of the peace; or a commissioner for taking affidavits in the province and whose name appears on the official list of electors for the urban polling division and who is ordinarily resident therein and personally attends with him at the polling station and takes an oath in Form No. 53A and—

That is identical to the provisions relating to rural polling divisions, with the exception that the word "urban" is substituted for the word "rural". The clauses or provisions are enumerated, whereas in the rural system it states "any person".

(b) upon himself taking an oath in Form No. 52A.

(3) The poll clerk shall make such entries in the poll book as the deputy returning officer directs him to make, including the name of the elector who vouched for the applicant elector and such other entries as are required by this Act.

That is identical to clause 47, subclause 3, where it relates to rural polling divisions.

(4) Every elector is guilty of an illegal practice and of an offence against this act who vouches for an applicant elector knowing that the applicant is for any reason disqualified from voting in the polling division at the election.

That provision is identical to subclause 4 which relates to rural polling divisions. I have included an additional, albeit arbitrary, provision as follows:

(5) Everyone is guilty of an illegal practice and of an offence against this act who vouches for more than two electors at an election.

The forms in schedule I of the proposed amendment are not before us. They are simply for assistance in appreciating what the full force of the amendments would be. They simply substitute the word "rural" in the appropriate places. With respect to subclause 5, I originally thought, as a further confinement and restriction, about the potential use that might be made of this provision. In areas where there are urban polls and in which there is a great deal of anonymity among residents, a person should not vouch for more than one elector. I think there are many areas in our urban polling divisions where it would be extremely difficult to find a mayor, postmaster, barrister, solicitor, bank manager or a number of the other occupations previously mentioned. Therefore I chose the arbitrary two-for-one concept. Again, that is a method to which I am not completely wedded.

We should take some steps to offer qualified electors in urban polling divisions the opportunity to cast their ballots in somewhat the same way as the opportunity available to qualified electors in rural polling divisions, taking into account the necessity of and putting some proscriptions, prohibitions or confinements on the opportunity to make sure that abuse is minimal.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, the hon. member was kind enough to tell me in a general way of his intention to move this amendment. I therefore had an opportunity of reflecting on the general proposal and looking through this and the consequential amendments. As I indicated on second reading, the Ontario election law provides a certain amount of vouching in urban polls, particularly related to the fact that a person's name may be on a previous municipal list which provides certain evidence of local residence.

I was in favour of the motion as far as extending the privilege to urban voters was concerned. My colleagues have expressed concern. I suppose one's attitude in this regard is dependant upon local experience. I personally have not found any difficulty with the Ontario law, and I find vouching feasible under some circumstances. Some of my colleagues have doubts in this regard. Therefore, I have to approach any voting proposal from the standpoint of whether the concerns expressed to me can be met. I am not satisfied that they can be met by the rather ingenious method employed by the hon. member. He has chosen a rather more limited group than was available, for example, to rural electors.

He is not choosing every elector in the poll but every elector who may come within one of these occupational classes.

There are two difficulties, particularly with reference to his analogy to passport applications. A person attesting to a passport application is required to attest not only as to his knowledge of the individual but to having known the individual for at least two years. In this case there is a situation whereby an individual would present himself to a minister, barrister, dentist, school teacher, bank manager or chartered accountant and say, "I am John Jones. I live at this address, which is in this constituency. I ask you to attest for me in this poll". Unless a person in one of those categories has actual knowledge of the individual's identity and place of residence, if he were a careful person he would say, "You may be both of those things, but how can I be sure? In view of the penalties involved, I do not propose to take that risk". That is what a person in that category would be required to say with regard to a passport application. Unlike normal vouching in a rural case, this is not a case of someone who enjoys propinquity, such as a neighbour or relative. This is a stranger picked from a list. He may not live close to the individual, and for that reason may not be able to attest to his identity and normal residence.

I agree this provision would assist in a limited number of cases where a barrister, bank manager, principal or mayor of the town happened to be a neighbour and could attest to these facts. In a large number of cases that would not apply. The amendment does not get around the basic problem of vouching in urban polls; that is the problem of the anonymity of the city, the fact that people do not necessarily know their neighbours. The difficulty arises when it comes to deciding who should be added to the list, bearing in mind the need to protect the system. My inclination would be to vote against the proposal even though I am concerned that the urban voter is placed at a disadvantage by reason of the absence of the vouching power.

• (10:50 p.m.)

Mr. Macquarrie: I have not had a chance to look at the interesting document I received a short while ago. We are all concerned about the difference between rural and urban voters when an election has been called and constituents have not been properly enumerated. I notice there are still elements of discrimina-

tion here. We are getting used to urban people receiving mail in five days and country people in six, and I am not sure I like that. But in this case only a certain group of urban people can attest, whereas in a rural poll any voter may do so. As my hon. friend, the Rhodes scholar from Edmonton-West, has pointed out, there is even discrimination in the group mentioned here. I greatly resent the suggestion that a barrister is more competent to perform this duty than a university professor. So there are internal problems.

A little more serious is the potential danger that where there is too relaxed an attitude on election day, there might be a corresponding relaxation beforehand of the activity of revising officers, and so on, so that what was gained on election day might be lost in the other stages of the enumeration process. This is the kind of consideration I should like to weigh and reflect on. I should like to consult with the sage of Peace River and others before I would be ready to say this proposal was good. It is too bad that it was not brought up in the committee, where we might have reflected on it during the long nights of the winter.

Mr. Forrestall: Had the hon. member had the wisdom to look to the mother of all elections acts in Canada, the province of Nova Scotia, he might have found a precedent for dealing with the urban vote in a more successful way. I, too, wish this matter had been brought up in the committee so we might have given attention to it there.

The principal objection I would have to the proposal is this: In spite of the long list of those eligible for duty, albeit it does not include university professors, it would be difficult on election day to find one of these individuals prepared to do this work, particularly if one did not know a person in one of the categories mentioned. I cannot imagine going to my bank manager and asking him to do something like that for me. I am not saying, of course, that I am not grateful to him; in fact, my bank manager is one of the finest men in Canada.

Mr. Forest: I will make sure he hears about what you have just said.

Mr. Forrestall: Will you? He is the manager of the Bank of Montreal across the street, and he is a tremendous fellow.

An hon. Member: Be sure to send him a copy of *Hansard.*

Mr. Forrestall: I might do that. I will take it in when I discuss my overdraft. There is a simple procedure which has been tested in Nova Scotia. In spite of the fears of those responsible for the conduct of elections, it has been found to be highly successful and no abuses were apparent. I suppose some abuses did occur, but my suggestion is that these were negligible in terms of what we are seeking to achieve. What I have in mind is that a procedure might be worked out whereby an elector who found that his name was not included on the list would appear at the poll and then be directed to a place where the returning officer would be sitting. There, he could make his argument and persuade the revising officer to issue a simple certificate which he could then take back to the polling station, accompanied by another elector whose name was on the list and who would be prepared to vouch for him by taking a simple oath.

This is the procedure which has been tested in elections in Nova Scotia and found not wanting. In the urban centres where it has been used, it has restored the right to exercise their franchise to a substantial number of people who would not otherwise have been able to vote. Once an elector has persuaded a revising officer that he is entitled to vote, the procedure is akin to that followed in the rural poll. The difference is, of course, that in a rural poll where there is general knowledge of the people entitled to vote in the area, it is not necessary for a voter to make an appearance at a special sitting of a revising officer or of the returning officer.

The Chairman: It being 11 o'clock, it is my duty to rise, report progress and request leave to sit again at the next sitting of the House.

Progress reported.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, since there are further drafts to be looked at, I think it would be desirable that we continue this discussion on Thursday. The hon. member for Selkirk put a proposition before the committee. I wonder whether it would meet the convenience of hon. members if we were to sit a few minutes longer to deal with his. I understand he may find difficulty in being present on Thursday.

Mr. Macquarrie: I do not know what "his" is, but I do not mind.

• (11:00 p.m.)

Mr. Nowlan: I do not mind the hon. member for Selkirk putting forward his point

of view if he cannot stay in the House until we rise. But the question is, for how long? This is a lot of nonsense. I should like to know how long we are going to sit. Either the elections bill will go through after sitting many extra hours tonight or it will pass in five minutes on Friday afternoon. Let us not fool around. I do not detract from anything the hon. member for Selkirk may have said, but I refuse to give consent without there being a time limit.

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Selkirk and myself—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is not in his seat. A proposition has been put to the House and a caveat has been entered. The House can proceed only with unanimous consent.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Could we have a time limit of 15 minutes, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

CANADA ELECTIONS ACT

MEASURE TO CONSOLIDATE AND REVISE

The House resumed consideration in committee of Bill C-215, respecting the franchise of electors and the election of members to the House of Commons—Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale)—Mr. Faulkner in the chair.

The Chairman: House again in committee of the whole. The hon. member for Selkirk.

On clause 23—

Mr. Rowland: Mr. Chairman, I thank the committee for its indulgence. The amendment I am proposing received agreement in principle this afternoon and it was agreed we would stand the clause to allow consultations to take place in order to deal with specific objections that had been made to it. I think these have now been dealt with. If hon. members would turn to page 85 of the bill, I should like to propose an additional subclause following subclause 13. My amendment is in these terms:

That Bill C-215 be amended by striking out line 34 on page 85 and substituting the following:

'Act are void.

Leave of absence

(14) Every employer of employees to whom the Canada Labour (Standards) Code applies shall, upon application to him by any such employee, grant to the employee leave of absence, with or without pay, to seek nomination as a candidate and to be a candidate for election for such period during an election as may be requested by the employee.'

[Mr. Nowlan.]

As I noted this afternoon, the purpose of the amendment is simply to ensure that there are no obstacles placed in the way of a candidate for election conducting an effective campaign. There were two objections raised this afternoon. The first one was raised by the hon. member for Hillsborough and was one of style. We were unable to resolve this objection in our consultations. There does not seem to be any appropriate place to put the amendment in the bill without renumbering the whole bill, so we decided to leave it where it is, stylistically inappropriate though it may be.

The other objection was one of substance. The initial amendment that I proposed did not really establish the time period within which the amendment would be effective. The amendment I am now proposing contains the phrase "during an election", which is defined in the definition clause of the bill as the period after the writs are issued. So there is now a commencement date and a termination date during which period such leave may be requested. I think this meets the objection raised this afternoon.

I therefore move the adoption of the amendment.

Amendment (Mr. Rowland) agreed to.

Clause 23 as amended agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall I rise, report progress and request leave to sit again at the next sitting of the House?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Progress reported.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

SOCIAL SECURITY—TABLING OF WHITE PAPER IN PRESENT FORM—INTERIM INCREASE IN OLD AGE PENSIONS

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, although the question of old age pensions has been raised several times since then, the question which is the

basis of this late show this evening was asked on Wednesday, April 22, as reported in *Hansard* for that date at pages 6161 and 6162. However, the question which I asked on that date, twofold in nature, has not yet been satisfactorily answered and that is why I raise it again tonight before we come to the end of this part of the session.

I said my question was twofold. In the first place, I pressed the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) for an early tabling of the government's white paper on social security and, in the second place, I asked that an interim increase in old age security pensions be brought in so that our senior citizens would not have to wait any longer for an increase which they sorely need.

The Prime Minister did not like the premise of my question which was that there were certain disagreements in the cabinet over this matter and hence he refused to answer it. I fared a little better with the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro). He at least gave me an answer. So, perhaps I might repeat my subsequent question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare as well as his answer. The exchange was as follows:

> Will the government consider tabling now the white paper on social security so that the country can know what is in it, and will it consider bringing in an interim increase in old age security pensions?
>
> Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, it would be impossible to table the white paper at this time. It is not completed, nor has consideration been given to it in its entirety by the government. So far as the latter part of the question is concerned, I do not believe it would be possible to bring in an interim increase in old age security pensions prior to the publication of the white paper.

That was on April 22. We are now on the eve of June 24, and nothing has yet been done on either of these scores, neither with regard to tabling the white paper nor making any increase in old age security pensions.

I want to say that I regard the policy of the government in this area as utterly reprehensible. To continue to tell us that nothing can be done until we have the white paper on social security is, I think, just stalling for time. In the meantime, we have had changes in some pension legislation, notably the very acceptable improvements in the pensions of retired public servants and improvements in the pensions of Members of Parliament, which some of us did not regard as acceptable.

• (11:10 p.m.)

We have also had the tabling of the white paper on unemployment insurance. We have had the tabling and acceptance by the House, at least so far as concurrence is concerned, of the second report of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs. In other words, we are getting bits and pieces of the picture so far as social legislation is concerned. Yet this document, which is supposed to be basic and fundamental to the whole story, is withheld from us. I cannot believe it is withheld because it is impossible to get the document completed, translated or anything like that. It seems to me the situation has all the earmarks of plain stalling because the government does not want to act in this field. In the meantime, our senior citizens are suffering real privation because of the rising cost of living. It has gone up now close to 18 per cent since the present level of the old age pension, plus the guaranteed income supplement, was set. The increase the pensioners have received because of the cost of living increase falls far below the increase that has taken place in the cost of living itself, so that they are being shortchanged about $10 out of every hundred.

What we are getting now, if I may use his own word, is the canard being circulated by the Prime Minister to the effect that it is the workers of this country, especially unionized workers, who are hurting the old age pensioners. He used a certain word most of us recall. I suggest this is a canard which is unworthy of the Prime Minister. It is not good enough to go to the automobile factories and tell the employees they are making life miserable for the senior citizens when it is the failure of this government to take any step in this field which is responsible for the plight of our senior citizens.

Therefore, it seems to me it is a perfectly reasonable request I have been making now for a long time that there should be an interim increase in the amount of the old age pension. I should like to see the legislation completely overhauled. I should like to see a substantial increase in the pension and see the legislation placed on a sound basis. I am prepared to admit that that would take time. In the meantime, however, there could be an increase to, say, $100 a month in the basic pension and a corresponding increase to $40 a month in the guaranteed income supplement. I suggest that nothing less than this is in order at the present time.

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

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rosaire Gendron (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the government shares the very humanitarian feelings expressed by the hon. member. It is easy to go one better in this field, particularly when one does not have the responsibility of governing and implementing the recommendations made to the government.

More than once has the government voiced its interest in senior citizens. About 1,671,000 of them receive the old age pension of $79.58 and 812,000 get the supplement of $31.33, and this is costing the nation $1,730,500,000.

The government has reduced the age for eligibility from 70 to 65, thus increasing the number of recipients by 440,000. It has also granted an increase of 2 per cent to take into account the rise in the cost of living. The universal and contributory pension fund also gives an increasing number of people each year a worthwhile income.

For those who are more especially needy, the central government, because of the new public assistance act, pays 50 per cent of all additional assistance granted by the provinces to aged persons, and 50 per cent of the cost of any additional health and welfare services not covered by hospital insurance and medical insurance plans, and more especially for those who need special at-home care.

Finally, with an across-the-board medicare plan in Canada, the government also pays most medical expenses previously borne by aged persons. All those charges are now met by the state.

We recognize that there is room for improvement, and the government is well aware of it. Thus, the government is pursuing the general review of its entire social security policy. Its conclusions will be published in a white paper, as soon as the study is completed, and it will guide the government's new policy on social security towards the well-being of all Canadians, especially the old.

[*English*]

COMMUNICATIONS—GRANT TO INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES TO BUILD ELECTRONIC COMPONENT MANUFACTURING PLANT

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, on June 9 I addressed the following question to the Postmaster General and Minister of Communications (Mr. Kierans):

In view of the minister's expressed interest in the development of a Canadian controlled computer and communications industry, would the minister inform the House whether he was consulted by the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion prior to his announcement of a $6 million grant to International Business Machines Corporation to build an electronic component manufacturing plant in Quebec?

This question is of considerable interest to me because it is a very large grant, some $6 million, and the total estimated capital cost is only $21 million. I understand from information available that this particular plant will provide some 600 to 700 jobs within three years time. This is quite a high average in terms of the amount of money spent per job produced, but in part this is an indication of the type of industry with which we are dealing. We are dealing with one of the de luxe industries of the future, one of the most important industries of the future, when we are considering questions of economic control and economic development.

There are three major questions that need to be considered in connection with this announcement. The first is the question of a Canadian controlled computer industry. I addressed the question to the minister because on a number of occasions he has expressed great interest in the development of a Canadian controlled computer and communications industry. But, on the other hand, we now see a government department providing a very substantial grant to a foreign controlled corporation to build this plant. It seems to me that we have a conflict of policy that must be resolved at once. In addition, this subsidy to a foreign corporation, International Business Machines Corporation, will provide competition for the one Canadian owned plant which is in a similar line of production.

The second matter is the entire question of the problem of foreign ownership. I have raised this matter on a number of occasions in the House in connection with the government's industrial development incentive legislation, because apparently the government is not concerned about the implications of grants which are made to foreign controlled corporations. It apparently is not concerned that these grants will conflict with its policy regarding foreign ownership, which we anticipate some time later this year. Thus, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the government, in the policy it is now following, has not exhibited any will really to come to grips with the problems involved in the high degree of foreign ownership and control which we have in the Canadian economy.

The third question that comes to my attention is, why does such a wealthy and prosperous firm, really one of the most prosperous firms on the face of the globe, have to be given a grant? It seems to me if it were felt that a public expenditure of the size that was committed in this case, namely, $6 million to build a plant in this particular location—I am not quarreling with either one of these factors in itself—was justified, then why is there not some public control or ownership of the plant itself? It seems to me that there is a need for public ownership of this plant if we are to ensure that national objectives will be achieved in the future. One of these national objectives is to ensure that there is an adequate degree of development within each of the economic regions in Canada. After all, this is the purpose of the legislation, and of these grants, but there is no guarantee that within the foreseeable future these objectives will be achieved. Once a certain period of time has elapsed, there will be no further control over this plant or its operations.

• (11:20 p.m.)

It seems to me there is a question of public interest that must be considered, and to date it has not been considered adequately by the government. I would urge the government to re-examine its approach to the industrial development incentive grants now being provided. I also urge the government to reconsider its position with respect to the development of a Canadian controlled computer industry. As the Minister of Communications said, this is something we need in Canada. It is one of the things that we should be working toward. There are many steps that are necessary if we are to ensure a Canadian identity in the future, so I uge the government to reconsider its position on these scores.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rosaire Gendron (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I believe that after all, this is more a representation than a real question directed to the Postmaster General and Minister of Communications.

To his original question, whether the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) had consulted with the Postmaster General and Minister of Communications (Mr. Kierans) before announcing his grant, the answer is no. As far as all the other questions asked tonight in respect of economic expansion programs are concerned, I believe that in the hon. member's interest, he should direct them to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 11.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, June 25, 1970

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

IMMIGRATION

TABLING OF REPORT OF COMMISSION ON DEPORTATION OF MESSRS. LEONARD, HOCKETT AND KREEGER TO UNITED STATES

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Solicitor General, for whom I am acting, the Minister of Manpower and Immigration and the Minister of National Revenue, I beg leave to table a copy of the report of the commission of investigation established under Order in Council P.C. 1970-402, dated March 4, 1970, which authorized the appointment of His Honour Judge Ernest J. C. Stewart as a commissioner under Part II of the Inquiries Act to inquire into and report upon the circumstances in which three persons, namely, Charles Allen Leonard, Earl Hockett and John Kreeger, who entered Canada from the United States, were on or about January 25, 1970, returned to the United States. The government makes no comment at this moment since the ministers concerned are still studying the report.

[*Translation*]

BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM

TABLING OF VOLUMES V AND VI OF REPORT OF COMMISSION REPORT

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table copies in English and in French of Volumes V and VI of the report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism.

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

TABLING OF SERIES OF WHITE PAPERS ON FOREIGN POLICY

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I should like to table copies in the two official languages of the series of papers on foreign policy the government indicated would be produced before the end of the present session.

AGRICULTURE

STATEMENT ON IMPORTATION OF EUROPEAN CATTLE

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, because of the recognized interest of many members, together with the interest of the livestock people involved, I would like to advise the House that permits providing for this year's importation of European cattle will be issued within the next ten to fifteen days.

As was the case last year, it is expected that 615 head of cattle can be imported from France and Switzerland this year and discussions are progressing aimed at establishing satisfactory veterinary agreements with some other European countries, including Italy.

As in the past years, many more applications were received than can be accommodated within our maximum security quarantine facilities. More than 1,200 people asked for authority to import approximately 7,000 head of cattle.

Each application must be supported by a project proposal indicating the purpose to which the imported cattle are to be put, and a committee of four geneticists then examines these project proposals advising the department on which, in their view, would contribute most to the development of the livestock industry in Canada. The permits are then issued on the basis of this priority rating given by the genetic committee.

Because applications for permits are assessed upon the basis of breeding projects, stipulating particular breeds, those receiving import permits will be restricted to purchasing the breed designated in their project proposals.

Export restrictions against imported animals will be eased this year. Many Charolais animals imported in 1966-67 have made their contribution to developing this breed in Canada and it is now felt that up to 50 per cent of these animals, which have been in Canada for at least 36 months, can now be released from the embargo.

Mr. George Muir (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, we are pleased that the Department of Agriculture is allowing the importation of these European cattle. Since 7,000 head of cattle

have been applied for but only 615 head are to be imported, we hope that all applicants will be treated fairly. We do not think the allocation should be on the basis of how big the operation is of the farmer or livestock man who is asking for the importation. We feel that the small farmer has a contribution to make to agriculture as well as the large one.

• (2:10 p.m.)

We hope these factors will be taken into consideration in granting these permits and that the permits will be divided equitably among those who are interested. Because of the large number of applications, it is hard to understand why the importation of only 615 head will be allowed when as many as 7,000 could be handled. Perhaps the minister can explain why this big reduction was necessary. After all, 7,000 cattle spread across this country would not be too many to import in one year. We hope that in another year, after this program has been studied, larger importations will be allowed.

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, we are pleased that the program of importing breeding stock to improve the production ability of the Canadian farmer is under way and that there is a proposal to extend it. The Canadian producer will now be more effective and competitive.

I would have been pleased if the minister had also stated what is being done about a problem that is now blowing up in the United States. It was stated on the CBC farm broadcast today that United States cattlemen are pressing for import quotas on the shipment of Canadian beef into the United States because Canada is allowing so much Australian and New Zealand beef to be trans-shipped through Canada to the United States. I have raised this matter in the House before. Our beef producing industry is being endangered. If our imports into the United States are restricted, we may bring in as many high quality breeding animals from Europe as we like but our price structure will decline and our marketing problems will increase.

I urge the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce or the Minister of Agriculture to announce to the House before it rises what they are going to do about the situation that is now building up because importation of beef from New Zealand and Australia has been encouraged. When I asked a question I was told that it was mostly processing beef. It is not processing beef and it is not processing beef when it passes through Canada on the way to the United States market.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) has just announced that permits will be issued to authorize the importation into Canada of cattle from Europe in order to promote their breeding here. To my mind, the minister should also give particular attention to Canadian breeds of horses and cattle.

At the present time, the emphasis is on European imports. The minister does not seem to know that the Canadian government has refused to keep at the Ottawa experimental farm the only cross-bred stock of the last 75 years.

In fact, horses and cattle of Canadian stock have no place in Canada today. This stock is indigenous to our country and today Canadian breeders are compelled to pay the costs of breeding and of advertising outside the country.

I suggest that the minister is well-advised to give Canadian breeders the opportunity to obtain specimens of European stocks, but, in co-operation with the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, the minister should give particular attention to our own Canadian cattle and horses, unkown in other countries and for which there is great demand. Unfortunately, breeders must themselves pay the costs of advertising and transport when they take part in shows in South America and elsewhere, where this stock is unkown. The Department of Agriculture could do much to develop trade in this field, especially in Canadian cattle and horses.

[*English*]

WATER RESOURCES

LEVEL OF PEACE RIVER—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to make under the terms of Standing Order 43 which Your Honour will recall requires unanimous consent before it can be put. I would hope that the Prime Minister, in his wish to see matters conducted expeditiously, can muzzle the more negative members of his cabinet and permit the motion to be put.

A recent report entitled "Death of a Delta", prepared by the University of Alberta resources committee and presented to the gov-

ernments of Canada and Alberta, has underlined the extreme seriousness of the reduced level of the Peace River following construction of the Bennett Dam. When the Liberal government betrayed the long-range interest of the north by allowing the British Columbia government to construct this dam without any protection under the Navigable Waters Protection Act or otherwise, the present situation became inevitable.

For at least two years the level of the Peace has been down, endangering water supplies to municipalities. The present report emphasizes the immense danger to the ecology of the area between the Peace and the Athabasca and the very likely effect on the McKenzie and the Great Slave Lake water system. Wildlife, transportation and the livelihood of people are all at stake.

Finally, our failure to deal with this problem makes our grandiose proposals to safeguard the far north something of a mockery and is bound to adversely affect our efforts to persuade the United States and other nations that we have any genuine concern for the north.

I would therefore move the following motion, seconded by the hon. member for Prince Edward Hastings (Mr. Hees), if unanimous consent is given:

That the report of the University of Alberta resources centre be forthwith referred to the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development for study and report before the end of this session, and that the representatives of the government appear before the committee to indicate the position of the government of Canada.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members have heard the terms of the proposed motion which requires unanimous consent before it can be put to the House. Is there such consent?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is no unanimous consent. The motion cannot be put.

PENSIONS

OLD AGE SECURITY—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, as Your Honour also knows, for a motion to be proposed under Standing Order 43 urgent and pressing necessity must be shown. These qualities will be evident in my motion, and I believe this time I have one which will find support on all sides of the House. The fact is that nothing I can think of seems to have been able to move the government with respect to the plight of our senior citizens and therefore, perhaps in desperation I ask leave to move, seconded by my hon. friend from Vancouver East (Mr. Winch);

That in view of the fact that the maximum amount payable to old age pensioners, including the additional payment available as a guaranteed income supplement, is $111.41 a month, this House is of the opinion that the Minister of National Health and Welfare should be required to live on this amount until he brings in legislation to provide a substantial increase in the amount of the old age pension.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: I have heard at least one dissenting voice. The motion cannot be put.

• (2:20 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN CITIZENSHIP ACT

AMENDMENT REDUCING RESIDENCE REQUIREMENT

Mr. Marcel Prud'homme (Saint-Denis) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-266, amending the Canadian Citizenship Act (Minimum residence requirement).

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of that bill is to reduce from 5 to 3 years the minimum residence requirement in Canada for people applying for a citizenship certificate.

In addition to enabling immigrants to take part fully in the affairs of the country as Canadian citizens, this bill will also enable landed immigrants who exercise a profession to be recognized more quickly by the various professional associations in the provinces, and it will correct existing anomalies in several provinces where certain professional associations resort to the Canadian Citizenship Act as a pretext to prevent some qualified professionals from practising in Canada.

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

[*English*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

TABLING OF EXTRACT FROM MINUTES OF MEETING OF COMMISSIONERS OF INTERNAL ECONOMY, JUNE 23, 1970

Mr. Speaker: Before calling the next item of business I have the honour to lay before

the House an extract from the minutes of a meeting of the Commissioners of Internal Economy of the House of Commons held at Ottawa on Tuesday, June 23, 1970.

Again, before calling the next item the Chair should advise hon. members that two notices under Standing Order 26 were received by the Chair at approximately the same time. Both motions deal with a similar subject and are phrased in similar terms. The fact that one came in perhaps a few moments ahead of the other leads the Chair to recognize first the hon. member for York South, after which I will allow the hon. member for Hillsborough to put his motion.

MOTIONS TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

POST OFFICE

ACCELERATED DISRUPTION OF SERVICE—FAILURE TO NEGOTIATE SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTE

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), to move the adjournment of the House under Standing Order 26 for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely, the new situation created by the acceleration and spread of the rotational strikes by postal employees, thus creating a new threat of a nation-wide postal strike, the failure of the Treasury Board to negotiate a settlement to end the disruption of postal services, and the urgent need to debate the serious situation before the House adjourns for the summer recess.

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to move the adjournment of the House under Standing Order 26. The matter is the disruption of the postal service, the indication that a more serious abridgement of normal delivery service is contemplated, and the failure of the negotiators to make progress toward a settlement of the dispute. In the face of such a serious diminution of an important service to which the Canadian public are entitled and the expected early adjournment of the House for the summer recess, I believe it is of urgent public importance that this House discuss this serious matter of public interest.

Mr. Speaker: As I said a moment ago, both the hon. member for York South and the hon. member for Hillsborough have filed the notice required by Standing Order 26. All hon. members will recognize the importance of the situation alluded to in the proposed motions. Indeed, on a number of occasions during the last month or so the suggestion has been made that there should be an emergency debate under Standing Order 26 for the purpose of discussing the postal situation. It might well be argued that this fact alone or in itself would preclude the holding of a special debate since we are dealing essentially with a continuing situation. On the other hand, both hon. members have presented the argument that there has been a change in the situation, in particular an acceleration in the rotational strikes by postal employees, and they have alluded also to the fact that the House is likely to adjourn within the next few days.

Because of the very special circumstances it may well be that hon. members would want to agree that an opportunity be provided for such a debate before the summer recess. Since there will have to be some measure of planning and consultation between House Leaders for the orderly conduct of parliamentary business during the days ahead, I would hesitate to propose to the House a debate under Standing Order 26 without further consideration and consultation with the House Leaders.

In view of all these circumstances I propose, under the provisions of section 6 of Standing Order 26, to defer my decision until later in this sitting.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

LABOUR CONDITIONS

MEASURES TO INCREASE JOB OPPORTUNITIES —AID TO STUDENTS FAILING TO OBTAIN SUMMER EMPLOYMENT

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, now that the House is presumably approaching the time of adjournment I should like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister to say whether the government proposes to take any further measures to increase job opportunities in the country? I ask this question especially in view of the high rate of unemployment and the apparent small percentage of students who are succeeding in obtaining employment, as well as the failure of the Minister of Finance to indicate any such measures.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question I cannot repeat all the many measures which have been given to the House by the various ministers involved in tackling this problem over the past many weeks.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, is it the intention of the government to continue its policy of slowing down the economy and running the economy substantially below its potential until the government's 6 per cent guideline on wage and salary increases has been accepted by organized labour?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition knows that several days ago the Minister of Finance, after his meeting with the provincial treasurers in Winnipeg, indicated that government policy now was to ease up on the magnitude of our attack on this problem by spending part of the surplus for which we have budgeted.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I understood the Minister of Finance to say it was not possible to do very much until labour had accepted the 6 per cent guideline. That is why I asked the Prime Minister that question today, to which I got such an unsatisfactory answer. I should like to ask the Minister of Manpower and Immigration whether he has any definite plans to meet with provincial authorities at an early date in order to determine the extent of student aid that will be required this autumn and to consider methods of providing the aid that will be required in order to reduced to a minimum the number of students who will have to drop out of school or college because of inadequate earnings during this summer?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): No, Mr. Speaker, there is no plan for such a meeting for such a purpose.

PRICES AND INCOMES COMMISSION

USE OF PERSONNEL ON LOAN FROM PRIVATE INDUSTRY—NATURE OF WORK, METHOD OF PAYMENT

Hon. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Have certain persons been lent from private industry to the Prices and Incomes Commission? If so, approximately what number have been lent, from what sections of industry have they come, and to what areas of investigation are they applying their efforts?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Of course this is the kind of question which normally is assigned to the Order Paper. I realize at the same time there is a possibility that the House might recess in the foreseeable future. Perhaps in the circumstances the minister might be allowed to reply to the hon. member's question.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, although I should like to check the precise figures again, I am informed that there are six people working for the commission from private industry, three from accounting firms and three from industries. As to the specific industries from which they come, I do not have this information on short notice but I shall be happy to check. I understand the arrangements in respect of such people are that they work on matters totally unrelated to the industries from which they come.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister whether the salaries of these persons who are on loan from private industries are paid by the industry from which they come or are paid by the government from the vote for the Prices and Incomes Commission?

Mr. Basford: I understand that the three people from accounting firms are paid their salaries by their firms and that the firms are reimbursed for the salaries. The others are paid travelling and living expenses.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a further supplementary. If these persons who are on loan from private industry are performing a useful function, why are they not paid by the Prices and Incomes Commission as are other employees?

Mr. Speaker: I suggest to the hon. member that the question is argumentative.

[*Translation*]

TERRORISM

OTTAWA—BOMB BLAST AT NATIONAL DEFENCE BUILDING—REWARD FOR INFORMATION LEADING TO ARREST OF THOSE RESPONSIBLE

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Prime Minister.

Yesterday, a grievous event occurred in the national capital: a bomb blast killed one person. Could the Prime Minister tell us if, in order to facilitate the inquiry now going on,

he intends to offer, as did the province of Quebec, a reward to those who could give information leading to the arrest of the persons responsible for the bombing?

[*English*]

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether I might be allowed to reply on behalf of the Prime Minister and on behalf of the Solicitor General. I think the bombing yesterday was a savage, cowardly and insane act.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I am sure all members of the House share my feeling of outrage. An innocent woman, Madame Jeanne D'Arc St.-Germain, was killed by the blast and two other employees were injured. On behalf of the government and I am sure on behalf of all members of the House I want to express to the family of Madame St.-Germain our deepest sympathy.

Yesterday the Minister of National Defence visited the site personally. Later in the day I visited the site of the blast accompanied by the Commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and by Mr. Ken Fogarty, the Mayor of Ottawa. We inspected the damage and received a report on the progress of the investigation. As a matter of fact, I spoke to Corporal Vallance who was on duty less than eight feet from the site of the blast at the time the blast occurred but who miraculously survived except for a few cuts.

The investigation of this incident is being carried out by the Ottawa City Police at the present time with the full assistance and cooperation of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, the Canadian Forces Military Police, investigation section, and the Ontario Fire Marshal's office. In respect of the specific question may I say that I have had informal discussions with the Attorney General of Ontario and the Mayor of Ottawa concerning the possibility of a reward. The government, however, wants to consider the answer to this question in light of the progress of the investigation. I want to assure the hon. member and the House that we will do everything necessary to push this investigation to a successful conclusion.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

OTTAWA—BOMB EXPLOSION, NATIONAL DEFENCE BUILDING—INCREASED SECURITY MEASURES

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpeque): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I should like to ask the minister whether he has anything to say about action the government has taken to prevent the recurrence of this sort of thing. What increase in security arrangements has been made by the Department of National Defence and other departments?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): The Minister of National Defence of course is reviewing the security provisions. I think the hon. member will realize how difficult it is to prevent this type of occurrence with complete certitude, but the entire security procedures are being rechecked and reconfirmed.

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary Centre): Mr. Speaker I have a question for the minister or the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that National Defence headquarters may be a fairly natural target for terrorist attacks of this kind, could the matter be looked into of arranging that offices which are occupied during the hours of darkness would be offices on the inside of the building rather than on the outside where bombs of this type can readily be thrown in?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I will note the representation made by the hon. member and of course relay it to my colleague.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary for the Minister of Justice. Will similar security measures be taken for all National Defence Department buildings throughout Canada?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I believe so, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

PROVISION OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT FOR BOMB BLAST HOMICIDES

Mr. A. D. Alkenbrack (Frontenac-Lennox and Addington): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question deals not with rewards for information but with penalties for these crimes. As a result of this horrible crime, will the minister promptly introduce amendments to the Criminal Code of Canada which would call for capital punishment for all persons found guilty of homicide resulting from the setting of bombing devices and other acts of terror?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I have noted the hon. member's representation.

[*Later:*]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, since several members have voiced their regret at having voted for abolition of capital punishment, I would like to ask a supplementary question to the Minister of Justice.

Does he intend to restore the death penalty in order to put an end to the recent wave of bombings?

Mr. Turner: I believe I have already answered that question, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

BREATHALYZER PROVISION—REFERENCE OF VALIDITY OF PROCLAMATION TO SUPREME COURT—APPROVED CONTAINER

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago the government submitted a reference to the Supreme Court of Canada concerning a judgment of the Supreme Court of British Columbia regarding the breathalyzer test. Is the minister now in a position to say when the Supreme Court of Canada will hand down its answer, which we are all breathlessly waiting for, to this question?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the answer probably concerns some more than others. I am led to believe the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada will be handed down tomorrow.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, whatever the judgment may be the major question is, has the government yet decided on a breath container to be given to alleged wrongdoers? What is the position in this regard because whatever the judgment is it will not have very much importance until the government determines this question?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Well, I think I would prefer to deal with that question when the judgment is rendered, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, has the government made any decision in this regard? I shall not ask what it is because I know how secretive the government is.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, the right hon. gentleman is too good a lawyer not to know that while the matter is before the court my reply necessarily is a limited one. We have considered the question of approving a machine or a sample container that would be suitable, to be an urgent one. I have ordered acceleration of the research to improve some of the machines which have been submitted to us.

TRADE

MEASURES TO ASSIST EXPORTERS FOLLOWING FREEING OF DOLLAR EXCHANGE RATE

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): I have a question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Is it the intention of the government in the near future to announce measures to assist Canadian exporters in view of the very severe disadvantages that have been imposed upon them and our inability to make sales in the export market by reason of the Canadian dollar having been unpegged and also because of the real advantages given to United States exporters, our chief competitors in the export field by President Nixon's announcement a short time ago?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): I am quite sure the hon. member is aware of the success of our exports at this time. It is one of the factors that led to the revaluation of our dollar. I think that things are going fairly well now with a 15 per cent growth for the year and a surplus of $1 billion in the trade balance as of now.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hees: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister not aware that the figures he just produced were achieved before the dollar was placed on a floating rate and that our exporters have been placed in a very precarious position by this action of the government?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. A debate seems to be arising between the minister and the hon. member. Perhaps we should go to the next question.

Mr. Hees: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The minister has simply brushed off my question by making a statement that has no basis in fact because he knows perfectly well that the export figures he gave refer to a period long before the unpegging of the dollar.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby.

Mr. Hees: The minister's answer was no answer, and he knows it.

Inquiries of the Ministry

MEASURES TO ASSIST AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY SUPPLIERS FOLLOWING FREEING OF DOLLAR EXCHANGE RATE

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): I hope the minister will be relevant in his reply to a relevant question. Has the minister taken any particular steps to ensure that suppliers in the automotive industry will not be disadvantageously affected by the unpegging of the dollar so that the favourable trade that has already taken place recently as a result of the automotive pact will not be offset due to the new conditions?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): I was just trying to show that we were operating on a very strong basis and consequently people who have developed this trade in the past are now in a better position to face the present difficulty with respect to revaluation.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Nonsense.

Mr. Pepin: As I have said, we are very eager to study any particular difficulty experienced by Canadian exporters at this time. We have a collection of programs to help them in this difficult, hopefully temporary, position.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Broadbent: Would the minister please answer the question I asked?

WATER RESOURCES

PEACE RIVER—REQUESTED RELEASE OF WATER BY BRITISH COLUMBIA TO CORRECT RIVER LEVEL

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): I have a question for the Prime Minister. In the light of the report about which I spoke earlier, which relates to conditions both in the province of Alberta and the Northwest Territories, would the Prime Minister ask the appropriate ministers, the Minister of Transport and the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources—if the latter can be detached from his duty of firing continental ballistic missiles at the United States—the need to discuss with the government of B.C. the possibility of releasing at the appropriate time adequate waters through the Bennett dam to repair the very serious condition which has now been brought about in the north?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I know that this subject has been discussed already in cabinet committee. I will convey to the appropriate ministers the message of the hon. member.

[Mr. Hees.]

PEACE RIVER—EFFECT OF WATER LEVEL ON ECOLOGY

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): I have a supplementary question for the Acting Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Would the minister conduct an inquiry into the extent to which this shortage of water, and the situation in the delta, is affecting the ecology, the birds and wildlife in the Wood Buffalo National Park, as well as the water transportation system of Great Slave Lake and the Northwest Territories?

PEACE RIVER—SUGGESTED DEMAND B.C. APPLY FOR PERMIT UNDER NAVIGABLE WATERS PROTECTION ACT

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, for the Minister of Public Works, since he is in charge of the Navigable Waters Protection Act. Would the government consider making a formal demand on the province of British Columbia to apply for a permit under that act, which it should have done when the accord with British Columbia was originally signed?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): I think that if history were uncovered it would indicate—

Mr. Stanfield: Don't uncover too much history.

Mr. Laing: I know the Leader of the Opposition would not want too much history uncovered because the construction of the dam was started in the days of the Diefenbaker government.

An hon. Member: Touché.

An hon. Member: What about the construction that is going on now?

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): That is quite wrong.

Mr. Laing: Representations have been made to the government of British Columbia and releases of water have been made. Unfortunately, the situation there is compounded now by an unusually low rate of precipitation last winter. In addition to that, we have the assurances of the government of B.C. that as far as possible they will make releases until such time as the reservoir is filled, which it is anticipated will occur by May, 1971.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise on a question of privilege. The hon. gentleman is usually very dependable, but today the statement that he made was the precise opposite of the truth. In point of fact, the arrangements were made between the hon. Paul Martin of the Pearson government and the government of British Columbia.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

An hon. Member: The minister is ready for the Senate.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I wonder whether we should engage in a historic debate at this time. The right hon. gentleman has risen on an alleged question of privilege. I am not sure that it was really a question of privilege. I do not think the matter should be pursued further. I have to bring to the attention of hon. members that we will soon be running out of time.

Mr. Baldwin: But we are running out of water.

Mr. Speaker: We would need 40 hours, rather than 40 minutes, if all the putative questioners were to be given an opportunity to ask questions.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

PROPOSED SIX PER CENT WAGE GUIDELINE—REACTION OF PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Despite the reference to previous prime ministers, may I direct a question to the present one. Last Monday I asked him about the 6 per cent guideline, in view of the telegram sent by the provincial treasurer of Ontario to the civil service association of that province with regard to that matter. The Prime Minister said that he was not aware of the report, that he understood that when the Minister of Finance met the provincial treasurers and ministers of finance in Winnipeg some weeks ago, the provinces agreed to abide by the guidelines. He said: "If there is a contradiction here I will try to see..." etc. Could the Prime Minister now inform us of the position of the respective provincial governments on this point?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I said I would refer the question to the Minister of Finance. It has been referred to him. I would prefer if the hon. member asked the question of him. I do have some information on it. I understand that Mr. Robarts' position now is that he would accept compulsory federal controls if such were to be instituted. But I do not have any specific report on what Mr. MacNaughton might have said. If the hon. member would ask the Minister of Finance in the House tomorrow, he might get an answer to that part of the question.

PRICES AND INCOMES COMMISSION—SECONDING OF OFFICERS OF PRIVATE CORPORATIONS

Mr. David Lewis (York South): May I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs—one which is perhaps related to earlier questions—and ask the minister whether the government approved the action of the Prices and Incomes Commission in having seconded to it officers of private corporations to be paid by the corporations during the time that they worked for the commission? Did the government approve of that arrangement?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I was aware of the arrangement, yes.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the same genial Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs whether it is the view of this government that it still has a guidelines policy of 6 per cent?

[*Translation*]

BANKRUPTCY ACT

PRESENTATION OF AMENDING LEGISLATION

Mr. Henry Latulippe (Compton): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

As we are witnessing in Canada an unprecedented increase in the number of bankruptcies, causing loss of capital as well as loss of revenue to governments, will the minister tell the House what steps have been taken so far to eliminate such bankruptcies, particularly fraudulent bankruptcies?

[*English*]

Mr. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): I want to make it quite clear, Mr. Speaker, that not all bankruptcies are fraudulent. There are a great many causes for bankruptcy. With regard to increasing the effectiveness of our enforcement, we are working on a revision of the Bankruptcy Act and I expect to receive the

final report on that very shortly. In the last month, I have appointed official receivers in the cities of Quebec and Hull in order to upgrade our enforcement of the provisions and the administration of the Act.

TRANSPORT

NORTH SYDNEY-PORT AUX BASQUES FERRY SERVICE—USE OF BRITISH CREW ON VESSEL REPLACING "PATRICK MORRIS"

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): I have a question for the Minister of Transport, Mr. Speaker, but in view of his necessary absence from the House and the urgency of the question, may I direct it to his Parliamentary Secretary. Has the minister received protests from the unions concerned regarding the chartering by the CNR of a British ship with a British crew to operate between North Sydney and Port Aux Basques, thus replacing a Canadian crew. If so, will the minister investigate immediately and report to the House tomorrow, in view of the large scale unemployment in the Atlantic area and the possible repercussions that could take place as a result of this action by the CNR?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I shall bring the hon. member's question to the attention of the Minister of Transport as early as tomorrow.

[*English*]

USE OF BRITISH CREW ON VESSEL REPLACING "PATRICK MORRIS"—POSSIBLE LABOUR DISPUTE

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister acquaint himself with this problem with a view to using his good offices in future to make sure there is no disruption of this most vital service?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): I thank the hon. member for bringing this matter to my attention, Mr. Speaker. I shall instruct our industry specialist, Mr. Art Gibbons, who has had much success in recent weeks in eliminating similar disruptions, to investigate and I shall report to the hon. member if the House happens to be convened at that time.

[Mr. Basford.]

INDUSTRY

SKIL CORPORATION PLANT IN VANCOUVER—DECISION TO CONTINUE OPERATION

Mr. Ray Perrault (Burnaby-Seymour): I should like to address a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. In view of the great concern being felt by employees of the British Columbia subsidiary of the Skil Corporation of Chicago with respect to the possible closure of this branch plant, is the minister able to report any action by this government to attempt to forestall such an eventuality?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, this morning we heard from the newly appointed general manager of that company that the company will continue its operation in Vancouver, producing professional chain saws for domestic and world trade and even adding a lightweight chain saw to its present production line. I am sure all members from the Vancouver area will be delighted with this development.

PENITENTIARIES

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL—INVESTIGATION OF SUICIDE OF JACQUES BOUCHER

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants asked the Solicitor General on May 27, and again on June 15, if he would review the circumstances surrounding the suicide of Jacques Boucher at St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary in view of the sentencing judge's recommendation that he be sent to another institution, and also what was the role of the classification officers.

The Solicitor General has asked me to give his answer as follows:

The matter has been carefully reviewed and I can answer the first part of the question by saying that the Warrant of Committal was to St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary and that there is no record of any recommendation in the penitentiary service files in favour of another disposition of the case.

As regards the second part of the question, the inmate was seen by several officers. A test for academic purposes revealed no abnormality. Three types of psychological tests revealed no characteristics showing potential suicide.

I should add that the coroner did not order an inquest in this case.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, I wanted to thank the Minister of Justice for his courtesy in replying. May I ask him to suggest to his colleagues that over the summer a real effort should be made to provide more psychiatric help in Canadian penitentiaries. I think this is one point about which members of the justice committee felt strongly.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

POLLUTION

GREAT LAKES—CO-OPERATION WITH UNITED STATES ON ESTABLISHMENT OF REGULATORY BODY

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry which arises from the meeting of the minister and some of his colleagues with the chairman of the U.S. Council on Environmental Quality. In view of the failure of Canadian and U.S. officials to meet the International Joint Commission recommendations for an international body, with policing and regulatory powers over the Great Lakes, is there any plan for a further meeting to try to come to some agreement on a regulatory body for this area?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that we must pursue every avenue for close co-operation with the United States including our fisheries treaty with that country, with respect to the Great Lakes but there are no specific plans in that connection being advanced.

Mr. Aiken: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is a further meeting planned for the near future with the same or other officials?

Mr. Davis: There are no immediate plans, Mr. Speaker.

SHIPBUILDING

REQUEST FOR CONTINUATION OF SUBSIDIES AS RECOMMENDED BY ROBERTSON COMMITTEE

Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Central Nova): I have a question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, Mr. Speaker. In view of the designation of the shipbuilding industry as a government mistress because it is urgently required at times and discarded when the urgency has passed, will the government now make an honest woman of the industry and continue subsidies at 23 per cent until 1973 as recommended by the Robertson Committee on Shipbuilding?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I am in no position to make an announcement on that subject today, but the report prepared by the Shipbuilding Committee is presently the object of a thorough study.

SUGGESTED AID TO BURRARD DRYDOCK

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I have a supplementary or related question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, Mr. Speaker. Have any representations been made to him regarding the Burrard Drydock in North Vancouver, where of the 850 employees some 500 have been laid off? May I ask the minister if his department is investigating to see whether economic stimulus can be provided to put these men back to work?

Mr. Pepin: I will do that immediately after my meeting with the shoe industry this afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I will allow the hon. member a further supplementary but I suggest that then we should eliminate supplementaries and give another ten or twelve members the opportunity to ask questions.

SUBSIDY FOR VESSELS CONSTRUCTED IN ATLANTIC AREA

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): My further supplementary question is directed to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry, Mr. Speaker. In view of the minister's announcement in this House some time ago that a 35 per cent subsidy would be paid through his department and the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce on ships constructed in Atlantic Canada, when can we expect that this motion will receive ratification by the cabinet and be put into effect?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, this already has cabinet approval and regulations are being finalized right now for it to be put into effect in the industry.

Inquiries of the Ministry

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

POSSIBLE LIFTING BY BRITISH GOVERNMENT OF EMBARGO ON ARMS SHIPMENTS TO SOUTH AFRICA

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): My question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs, if he has recovered from the pangs of issuing the white paper today. The question is one which I put to the Prime Minister on Tuesday.

There has been a suggestion that the British government is contemplating lifting its embargo on the shipment of arms to South Africa. In the light of the recommendation of the United Nations on this subject, and the danger that such action might lead to the break-up of the Commonwealth, will the Canadian government make its views known to the British government on this subject?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the policy of Canada with respect to the shipment of arms to South Africa is known throughout the world. It has been emphasized on many occasions, both in the United Nations and in the Commonwealth. Of course, I do not know, any more than does the hon. member, whether the British government intends to change its policy.

TRADE

IMPORTATION OF MILK POWDER

Mr. J. G. Lind (Middlesex): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Is the minister acquainted with an incident that took place at the Borden Milk Company Limited plant at Ingersoll when members of the local National Farmers Union obtained sample bags of whole milk powder which the company had imported from the Republic of Ireland?

My second question is, was any whole milk powder shipped at any time to the Republic of Ireland on which the Canadian government paid a subsidy?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, inspectors of the Department of Agriculture were at the Borden plant in Ingersoll at ten o'clock this morning. I could give a detailed answer to this question, but I should just like to advise that no whole milk powder has been subsidized by the Canadian Dairy Commission for export to any part of Europe, and no skim milk powder has been subsidized for shipment to Ireland. With respect to the changes in labels on the bags, I have a report from my inspectors on that but it would take more time than I am permitted to give the details.

COMMUNICATIONS

TELESAT CANADA—BIDS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF SATELLITE

Mr. W. C. Scott (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Communications. The question concerns the bidding on the satellite portion of the Canadian Domestic Satellite Communications System. Would the minister tell this House the status of the competitive bidding on the satellite, particularly the bids submitted by RCA Limited and Hughes Aircraft Company of California?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, I have already answered that question. We have received two bids and they are under study.

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Communications. Does the minister expect there will be a shakeup at the senior levels of the communications department. If so, when will this take place and when will an announcement be made?

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

EXPENSE EXEMPTIONS TO FISHERMEN—REQUESTED AMENDMENT

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Labour. Bearing in mind the fact that the white paper on unemployment insurance benefits will not find its way into legislation until the next session of the House, can the minister say whether he is prepared to amend those sections of the act pertaining to expense exemptions to fishermen, in order to help increase the benefits to these Canadians before the end of the present fishing season?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the personnel of the department will be considering legislation proposed for this fall, and a complete review of procedures, to make sure that unemployed people are afforded the dignity to which they are entitled. In addition, we shall review the regulations. In view of the representations of the hon. member, both in the House and out of the House, I am favourably disposed to giving priority to this particular problem of

ascertaining whether any real difficulty is being placed in the way of fishermen and whether we are unintentionally penalizing these people.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

UNITED NATIONS FAMILY PLANNING PROGRAM—CANADIAN ASSISTANCE

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Since there is no reference to the matter in the white paper just tabled, will the minister make a statement on motions tomorrow, prior to the closing of the House, indicating the government's long awaited policy regarding financial support of the United Nations program to assist those countries which request help for family planning and birth control?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, no decision has yet been made by the government and I should hesitate to make a statement in the House until that has been done.

[*Translation*]

TERRORISM

BOMB EXPLOSIONS—USE OF CHINA-MADE CLOCK MOVEMENTS

Mr. Roland Godin (Portneuf): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

In view of the fact that an investigation has revealed that in some of the bombings in Canada, the clock movements used had been made in China, can the minster tell the House whether they were smuggled into Canada or whether they were traded for Canadian wheat?

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Edmonton Centre.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REINSTATEMENT OF SUGAR REBATE

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Has the government now reinstated the sugar rebate to the Caribbean states, in accordance with my suggestion?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, although I recognize the representations made by the hon. member, the matter has been under discussion for some time within the government. On the twenty-third, the Prime Minister sent a message to the meeting of the Commonwealth heads of government in which he said that if the Commonwealth countries wished to have this reinstated, we would be prepared to comply for one year.

Mr. Paproski: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I appeal to the hon. member's sweet reason and ask him to postpone his supplementary question on sugar until tomorrow.

BRAZIL—REPRESENTATIONS CONCERNING TORTURE OF PRISONERS

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Has the Government of Canada made any representations to the Government of Brazil concerning the torture of prisoners in that country, who include political prisoners and persons wearing religious garments?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): No, Mr. Speaker, we have made no direct representations.

MIDDLE EAST—GOVERNMENT ATTITUDE TOWARD SALE OF AIRCRAFT TO ISRAEL

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. It concerns the very serious situation in the Middle East and Canada's attitude thereto. Can he advise if his recent statement in a letter to the editor of a Montreal newspaper to the effect that he had "no opposition to the sale of military aircraft to Israel" represents a change of government policy, considering that previously the minister had said this country was opposed to the sale of arms to both sides?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): No, Mr. Speaker. The letter that appeared in a newspaper—I wrote to the *Canadian Jewish News*—was founded upon the statement I had made previously to the House in reply to a question from an hon. member. I was asked whether I had made a statement in Rome about the sale of Phantom

jets to Israel. I said I had made no statement, and certainly had not expressed any opposition.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA—ALLEGED UNLAWFUL DETENTION OF JOHN LANSKY

Mr. Colin D. Gibson (Hamilton-Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Some hon. Members: Hoot, hoot, hoot.

Mr. Gibson: At the risk of sounding a bit owlish, may I ask a serious question. Since June 10 a Canadian citizen who is a resident of Hamilton, John Lansky, has been in custody in Czechoslovakia while visiting that country, on some vague and unrelated charge. We do not know with what he has been charged. Will the minister make representations of the strongest possible nature to the government of Czechoslovakia to secure his release and return to Canada?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, it would not be appropriate for Canada to interfere with the process of justice in another country anymore than we would like other countries to interfere with the process of justice in Canada. We will make appropriate representations to the government of Czechoslovakia to ensure that this man receives fair treatment and is released if he is innocent.

INFORMATION CANADA

DEPARTMENTAL POLICY IN PROVIDING PHOTOS OF PROMINENT CANADIANS

Hon. Robert Stanbury (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, on June 22 the hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster asked, with his usual good humour, if it was the policy of Information Canada when requests are received for photographs of prominent Canadians, to send pictures of the Secretary of State and of myself. I have looked into this question, with the help of the hon. member who was kind enough to refer me to the inquiry to which he referred, and I am now able to assure him that that is neither the policy nor the practice. When requests for pictures are received, these requests are referred to the offices of the persons concerned. In that particular case, they were the offices of the Prime Minister, all cabinet ministers, the leaders of the official opposition, both of them—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanbury: —and the Leader of the NDP.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanbury: —for the time being.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have to interrupt the minister. I indicated to the House a moment ago that there were just a few minutes left in the question period. I think that the question has been answered.

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): I thank the minister for his diligence. Will he add to this list the two most important officials of this House, the two official whips who make this place tick?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

COMMISSION ON EMOTIONAL AND LEARNING DISORDERS—REQUEST FOR FEDERAL ACTION

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. I wonder if the minister would indicate if he has had time to study the report of the Commission on Emotional and Learning Disorders in children. In view of its scathing indictment of present facilities, which give adequate treatment to only one quarter of the million children requiring attention, what steps does he intend to take to radically reorganize these services in Canada?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, as hon. members are I know, aware, this is primarily the responsibility of the provinces. However, we in the Department of National Health and Welfare are involved in constant consultation with the provinces in order to see how corrective measures can be taken in this area.

GRAIN

WHEAT—POSSIBLE ATTAINMENT OF FOUR BUSHEL QUOTA BY ALL DELIVERY POINTS

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister without Portfolio in charge of the

Wheat Board. On many occasions during this session, in debates and while answering questions, the minister expressed confidence and certainty that there would be sufficient movement of grain to allow the delivery of a four-bushel quota before the end of July. Can the minister now assure the House once again that there is sufficient movement of grain to allow the delivery of a four-bushel quota by all points under the jurisdiction of the Wheat Board.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I think I indicated before that the movement of grain underway, would allow the movement of a four-bushel quota from all points. However, we have now indicated also that should there be any problem in relation to a specific point, some extension or other arrangement would be made to be sure that farmers at that point do not suffer any disadvantage. However, I think it is still important that the railways and elevator companies should co-operate to the full and be sure that the equipment gets to the right place because there is enough demand to move the four bushel quota from all points.

OATS—EXTENSION OF DEADLINE ON DELIVERY OF CARLOAD LOTS

Mr. George Muir (Lisgar): I have a question for the Minister without Portfolio from Saskatoon-Humboldt. Will the minister discuss with the Wheat Board the advisability of extending the deadline on the delivery of carload lots of oats so that many producers who will be unable to do so before July 1 will be able to deliver up to July 15?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): I will be happy to look into that, Mr. Speaker.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CANADA ELECTIONS ACT

MEASURE TO CONSOLIDATE AND REVISE

The House resumed consideration in committee of Bill C-215, respecting the franchise of electors and the election of members to the House of Commons—Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale)—Mr. Faulkner in the chair.

The Chairman: When the committee rose, clause 47, subclause 1, which appears at page 122 of the bill and the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Skeena, page 8545 of *Hansard* for Tuesday, June 23, was under discussion.

On clause 47, subclause 1—*Manner of voting by qualified whose name is not on the list in a rural polling division.*

Mr. Macquarrie: I rise on a point of order which may be helpful to the committee. There have been long deliberations in the standing committee, and consultations with my colleagues. This is probably the only time they will let me speak for them. If it is helpful to other members, I wish to say that we in the official opposition have amendments to clauses 98, 99, 62 and 105. With reference to all other clauses, we are quite prepared to see them go through as put forward. We will, of course, listen carefully to amendments other members wish to put forward.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Laprise: Mr. Chairman, my remarks do not apply to the point of order raised by the previous speaker, but rather to another one. I do not know whether we should dispose of this one, but in any case, last Tuesday, when we were considering subclause (6) of clause 33, at page 96 of Bill C-215, I moved an amendment which as a matter of fact was unanimously agreed to. It read as follows:

That Bill C-215 be amended by deleting the period at the end of subclause 6 of clause 33, line 18, on page 96 thereof, and adding thereto the following:

"and that the central polling place be set up in such a way that the electors may get easily to each polling station within the central polling place."

Mr. Chairman, after discussing the matter with legal advisers, I have come with them to the conclusion that the amendment then proposed by me and subsequently agreed to would apply much better to subclause (9) of clause 33.

Therefore, with the agreement of the House, I would suggest that the amendment which I shall read again not apply to subclause (6) but rather to subclause (9). Therefore, I move:

That Bill C-215 be amended by striking out line 36 on page 96 and substituting the following:

'other suitable public building and shall locate the polling station, or the polling stations in a central polling place, at a place or places in the building that will provide ease of access to electors.'

On the whole, Mr. Chairman, the amendment remains the same but applies to subclause (9) of clause 33, instead of subclause (6) of the same clause.

[*English*]

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, I wish to comment on the suggestion made by the hon. member for Hillsborough.

The Chairman: Order, please. I thought the hon. member for Hillsborough had made a suggestion. I did not realize there would be further comment on it. That is why I recognized the hon. member for Abitibi. Maybe we should dispose of the proposition put to the committee by the hon. member for Abitibi. I take it the committee has heard the suggestion. If there are no further comments, I will ask if the committee is agreed.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Benjamin: On what?

The Chairman: I can again put the proposal of the hon. member if a certain member of the committee did not hear it. The amendment is as follows:

That Bill C-215 be amended by striking out line 36 on page 96 and substituting the following:

"other suitable public building and shall locate the polling station, or the polling stations in a central polling place, at a place or places in the building that will provide ease of access to electors."

Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Chairman: I apologize to the committee. I did not realize there was to be discussion on the point raised by the hon. member for Hillsborough. The hon. member for Skeena may now comment on the point.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I wish to make a few comments by way of general agreement with the proposition put forward by the hon. member for Hillsborough. However, I can foresee one difficulty in tying our hands that much at this moment. As we proceed, hon. members may come across a clause as a result of a debate on another clause that they think will require amendments. We would be precluding that secondary aspect of seeking to amend clauses of the bill. I agree with the general proposition, namely that we should try with some dispatch and expedition to proceed through the bill as quickly as we can. We are and have been from the start prepared to curtail the debate which seems to be unnecessary and in this way try to expedite matters. Perhaps by approaching it that way we will get along very well.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): If that is the end of the discussion on that point of order, Mr. Chairman, I wish to raise another one.

[Mr. Laprise.]

The Chairman: I do not think there is much the Chair can do. My interpretation of the point of order of the hon. member for Hillsborough is that it is an indication of what members of his party intend to do. The committee is now aware of the suggestion. I do not think there is anything further I can do, other than to ask the committee to take cognizance of it.

Mr. Macquarrie: Your Honour is perfectly correct. There is no procedure for making an official offering of this kind. This is how I had to do it.

Mr. Benjamin: May I say for the information of the committee that we will be moving amendments to clauses 52, 53, 66 and 92. If our amendment to clause 92 were to pass there would be two consequential amendments affecting clauses already standing.

• (3:20 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laflamme: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. While considering subclause (4) of clause 23 of the bill, an amendment of mine was allowed to stand by the committee. Now, after hearing a few arguments, especially those of the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie) and as the motion was meant to give the Speaker a status which should as much as possible be agreeable to hon. members and parties of the House, I am willing, with the consent of the House, to withdraw this amendment which, under the circumstances, may be premature.

[*English*]

The Chairman: Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): It will be recalled that when the committee was last considering clause 17, the hon. member for Don Valley had a considerable number of amendments outstanding. Advantage of the interval has been taken to do some redrafting in connection with the changes proposed by the hon. member for Coast Chilcotin which will have an effect on the amendments proposed by the hon. member for Don Valley. A new text has been prepared, and it is my understanding that the hon. member for Don Valley would be agreeable to withdrawing his amendments on the understanding that the hon. member for Coast Chilcotin will be moving a number to replace them.

The Chairman: Is the committee agreeable to that proposition?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. St. Pierre: If I may move those amendments at this time—

The Chairman: I believe there is simply an understanding that at some point these amendments will be moved.

I take it the committee would like, now, to consider the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Skeena to subclause (1) of clause 47.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): When I moved this amendment initially, I stated quite clearly that I was not absolutely married to its wording and contents. I was attempting to make the point that electors in urban polling divisions whose names did not appear on the list should have an opportunity to cast their ballots on election day after being vouched for by someone else.

It was then brought to my attention that the fount of all good things resides in Nova Scotia—I might accept that notion except to the extent that it relates to the fishing industry—and that the elections act of that province provides a way of enabling this objective to be realized. I was not, myself, familiar with the legislation but I understand it has worked fairly well. It may, therefore, provide a basis for an alternative suggestion. If the idea seems to gain some acceptance we might stand the clause before us now, together with the proposed amendment, to see whether or not we could develop something in the interim which would be satisfactory.

Under the Nova Scotia act, to recapitulate, a revising officer in cities or town having a population of more than 5,000 is authorized to sit on ordinary polling days at the headquarters of the returning officer. This official may be approached by a person who is qualified to vote and whose name is not on the list. After swearing an oath he is given a certificate which he takes to the polling station, accompanied by another person whose name is on the list for that polling division. The latter vouches for him and he is then able to cast his ballot. I agree there may be difficulties in very large communities in connection with this procedure since it might be impracticable for people to travel long distances to the office of the returning officer, but this is not an insurmountable problem.

If the procedure I have outlined seems to be a more practical way of affording those whose names are not on the list an opportunity to cast their ballots, and if it is accepted that it contains sufficient safeguards against abuse, I would be happy to accept such an alternative, or, indeed, any other alternative which the President of the Privy Council, perhaps after consultation with the Chief Electoral Officer, believes would be a satisfactory way of ensuring our objective which is, of course, to provide, as far as we possibly can, the widest opportunity for electors to cast their ballots on polling day.

Mr. Forrestall: The suggestion made by the hon. member for Skeena has some appeal to me. I shall not repeat the points I made when the committee last sat with regard to the Nova Scotia procedure, but if the President of the Privy Council would agree to stand this clause we would welcome any change which might extend this privilege to the electors, making sure that all voters may exercise their franchise as far as lies within our power.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Having heard the hon. gentleman's proposal, it seems to me that a problem still exists with regard to the very large communities. I have in mind the difficulty attached to making sure that the procedure of vouching is not abused. Undoubtedly, the process described by the hon. member would be effective in small communities.

Mr. Forrestall: Halifax is not a small community.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): However, in very large metropolitan centres such as Toronto and Montreal, there would be no way for the various individuals concerned to check the validity of the form of registration. It is not without significance that in Quebec, the province which, of course, would draw up the provincial voting law for Montreal, the procedure of vouching does not exist at all, either in urban or rural polls. In Ontario, they are working in the other direction from that suggested to the committee now, and taking away even the limited form of vouching which has existed so far, in the urban polls on the assumption, I take it, that there has been abuse of this procedure in the large urban centres.

I respect the efforts of the hon. member to find a solution, but the difficulty here is the anonymity of people living in the large urban communities and the difficulty of making certain that the individual who pre-

sents himself to the returning officer is who he says he is, and who resides where he says he does.

Mr. Forrestall: But the principle of the act is that we accept a man's word and do not challenge it.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): There is a process of challenging inherent in the ordinary preparation of the list; that is the reason for sending out the voters' list to the registered electors. Among other things, it gives them a chance to check whether there really are houses corresponding with addresses given and that people are living there.

Mr. Forrestall: Is that the function of the list? I thought it was to enable electors to see whether their names were on it.

• (3:30 p.m.)

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): It can hardly be the function to see whether your name is on it, because you would not get one if your name were not on it. One of the purposes is to make certain that other people who should be electors, and on the list, are in fact on the list. Equally, it provides a safeguard to prevent registration of people who are not in fact, entitled to be electors.

I still see the difficulty, but I do not know the answer at the moment to the problem of vouching. I repeat, I am concerned with this, because it does seem to me that owing to no negligence on the part of a voter he can still be left off the list. He can miss the revision dates through absence from the city, and subsequently he will find that he is unable to vote. However, I do not see any solution in large metropolitan areas.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, could I inquire of the President of the Privy Council, what is the protection now, in the procedure before the revising officer at the court of revision? Are these protective mechanisms too cumbersome to apply to election day, if the same officer were used? There may be some difficulty in the period between the court of revision procedure as presently proposed under the act and the actual election date.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I would remind the hon. member that under the revision procedures if the revising officer is not satisfied, he has accredited to him a number of agents who can investigate the matter. There is an objection procedure that can be used in the time available, the theory of which is that the political parties themselves will police each other in this regard. There is opportunity given the political parties to scrutinize names added to the list, in the same way that the original list is scrutinized so as to make certain that the names are those of real human beings living at that address, not mere additions added for the purpose of circumventing the voting system. The difficulty with taking this action on election day is that the time and opportunity do not exist, even theoretically, to make this kind of check.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, I am not really arguing the point; it is the intent that I want to get across. May I take the liberty of asking the committee to give me authority to withdraw the amendment?

The Chairman: Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Amendment withdrawn.

The Chairman: Shall clause 47 carry?

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Clause 47 agreed to.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, I have forgotten the number, but we stood the clause that resulted in a consequential amendment being made today. Unless it offends against the procedures that you are following, perhaps we could deal with this now. I think it was clause 17 that was stood.

The Chairman: Was it subclause (2) of clause 39 on page 105 of the bill?

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Yes, that was the subclause.

The Chairman: Shall subclause (2) of clause 39 carry?

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Subclause (2) of clause 39 agreed to.

Clause 39 agreed to.

On clause 17, subclause (9)—*Clergymen, teachers and persons in fishing industry.*

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, could we now follow the suggestion made by the hon. member for Skeena and deal with clause 17? As I indicated, there has been a substantial job of redrafting and a certain amount of consultation with regard to an alternative proposal which I believe the hon. member for Coast Chilcotin has to make.

Mr. St. Pierre: Mr. Chairman, this amendment arises from the general agreement

reached among the parties on Tuesday night as to the intent of the amendment I moved at that time. Again, it was a simple matter of changing a few words, though, of course, nothing is simple because there are either not enough lawyers here or too many. I have a rather lengthy series of amendments to move, and I can only assure the committee, as I have been assured, that their intent is the same as the intent of my amendment, which was to reduce the time for temporary residence to 20 days and to extend the privileges previously given to priests, teachers and a few other categories.

Without going over the ground that was previously covered, I would simply move the amendment, which is somewhat lengthy. The amendments affect several different portions of the bill. First of all, I move:

That Bill C-215 be amended

(a) by striking out lines 27 to 43 on page 28 and lines 1 to 25 on page 29 and substituting the following:

Exception

'(9) For the purpose of a general election only and notwithstanding anything in this Act, any person who, during the period between the enumeration date and polling day, changes his place of ordinary residence from one polling division to another polling division in the same or another electoral district, if he is otherwise qualified as an elector and so elects,

(*a*) may apply in person,

(i) where he has moved to an urban polling division, to the revising officer appointed for the appropriate revisal district, or

(ii) where he has moved to a rural polling division, to the rural enumerator appointed for that polling division,

during the sittings for revision, to have his name included in the list of electors for the polling division in which he is ordinarily resident at the time of his application; and

(*b*) upon the inclusion of his name in the list of electors for the appropriate polling division, is entitled to vote at the polling station established for that polling division.'

(b) by renumbering subclause (11) of Clause 17 on page 29 as subclause (10);

(c) by striking out line 38 on page 29 and substituting the following:

'(11) At a general election, a person shall be deemed to be'

(d) by striking out lines 8 and 9 on page 30 and substituting the following:

'therein since the date of the issue of the writ ordering the election;'

(e) by striking out lines 15 to 26 on page 30 and substituting the following:

Wives or dependants of temporary workers

'(12) The wife or dependant of a person mentioned in subsection (11) who has come to a polling division for the purpose of occupying residential quarters during the course and as a result of the services performed by that person shall be deemed to be ordinarily resident on the enumeration date in the polling division, if that wife or dependant has been in continuous residence therein since the date of the issue of the writ ordering the election.

Exception

(13) Where a person

(*a*) would, pursuant to subsection (11) or (12), be deemed to be ordinarily resident in a polling division except that he has not been in continuous residence therein since the date of the issue of the writ ordering an election,

(*b*) is temporarily residing in the polling division on the twentieth day before polling day, and

(*c*) is otherwise qualified as an elector and elects to vote in the polling division,

he may apply in person,

(*d*) where he has moved to an urban polling division, to the revising officer appointed for the appropriate revisal district, or

(*e*) where he has moved to a rural polling division, to the rural enumerator appointed for that polling division,

during the sittings for revision, to have his name included in the list of electors for the polling division and, upon the inclusion of his name in the list of electors for the polling division, is entitled to vote at the polling station established for that polling division.'

(f) by striking out line 36 on page 31 and substituting the following:

'on the enumeration date at the election.

Idem

(18) For the purpose of a by-election only and notwithstanding anything in this Act, any person who, during the period between the enumeration date and polling day, changes his place of ordinary residence from one polling division to another polling division in the same electoral district, if he is otherwise qualified as an elector and so elects,

(*a*) may apply in person,

(i) where he has moved to an urban polling division, to the revising officer appointed for the appropriate revisal district, or

(ii) where he has moved to a rural polling division, to the rural enumerator appointed for that polling division,

during the sittings for revision, to have his name included in the list of

Canada Elections Act

electors for the polling division in which he is ordinarily resident at the time of his application; and

(*b*) upon the inclusion of his name in the list of electors for the appropriate polling division, is entitled to vote at the polling station established in that polling division.

Limitation (19) Rules (50), (51) and (52) of Schedule A to section 18 do not apply to any application made pursuant to subsection (9), (13) or (18).'

There are other amendments consequential upon this one, and frankly I must say I am not sure to which parts of clause 17 they apply.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): They come later.

Mr. St. Pierre: Then, that is the only amendment I can move at this time to clause 17. I am sure the officials will tell me whether that is correct.

• (3:40 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. De Bané: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

May I be allowed to point out to the House the presence in the galleries of an important group of cadets from my riding who have been awarded several national trophies and who have come to visit the House of Commons. They are the Cadets of Saint-Norbert de Cap-Chat headed by Captain Jean Côté and Captain Jean-Yves Bérubé.

[*English*]

The Chairman: The committee has heard the proposition. Is there any further discussion?

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, I might say that we appreciate the courtesy extended earlier today, through the offices of the Privy Council, of having someone deliver to us the amendment now before us. In this way, those of us who have participated in the consideration of the bill thus far have had an opportunity to examine the amendment and give endorsement to it without a great amount of debate. We find the amendment quite acceptable.

Amendment (Mr. St. Pierre) agreed to.

Clause 17 agreed to.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. As the hon. member mentioned, he has a number of consequential amendments. I do not know what the preference of the committee would be, to take all the consequential amendments in one piece or wait until we get to them seriatim. Perhaps if we took them all in one piece there might be less risk of overlooking one.

The Chairman: Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. St. Pierre: I thank the committee very much for this consideration as it will make my task much easier. These are consequential amendments, and they refer to schedules, etc. I shall simply read them.

The first is to rule 42 Schedule A, Section 18 as follows:

On clause 18, Schedule A, Rule 42.

Mr. St. Pierre: The amendment reads:

That Bill C-215 be amended

(a) by striking out the word "and" in line 33 on page 52;

(b) by striking out line 39 on page 52 and substituting the following:

'him;

(*f*) in the case of a general election, personal applications made by electors who have moved after the enumeration date to the polling division from another polling division in the same or another electoral district; and

(*g*) in the case of a by-election, personal applications made by electors who have moved after the enumeration date to the polling division from another polling division within the same electoral district.'

That is a motion within itself, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps we could vote on that and proceed to the next one.

Amendment (Mr. St. Pierre) agreed to.

Mr. St. Pierre: The next is an amendment in respect of rule 16, Schedule B to section 18 as follows:

On clause 18, Schedule B, Rule 16.

Mr. St. Pierre: The amendment reads:

That Bill C-215 be amended

(a) by striking out the word "or" in line 7 on page 70;

(b) by striking out line 11 on page 70 and substituting the following:

'appears on the list;

(*d*) in the case of a general election, add to such list in the index book the name of any person who has moved after the enumeration date to the polling division from another polling division in the same or another electoral district and who personally applies to have his name added to the list; and

(*e*) in the case of a by-election, add to such list in the index book the name of any person who has moved after the enumeration date to the polling division from another polling division in the same electoral district and who personally applies to have his name added to the list.'

Amendment (Mr. St. Pierre) agreed to.

Mr. St. Pierre: The next amendment is to Form 19 Schedule I as follows:

On Schedule I, Form 19.

Mr. St. Pierre: The amendment reads:

That Form 19 set out on page 215 of Bill C-215 be amended by adding thereto, immediately before the heading "Certificate" appearing on page 216 thereof, the following:

'The following names have been added to the urban preliminary list of electors on the personal application of electors who have moved to the polling division after the enumeration date:

Name of Street (or as the case may be)	Street No.	Apartment No.	Name of Elector (Family name first)	Occupation	Remarks

Amendment (Mr. St. Pierre) agreed to.

Form 19 agreed to.

Mr. St. Pierre: Mr. Chairman, the next amendment is to Form 26 Schedule I.

On Schedule I, Form 26.

Mr. St. Pierre: The amendment reads:

That Form 26 set out on page 221 of Bill C-215 be amended by adding thereto, immediately before the heading "Certificate" appearing at the top of page 222 thereof, the following:

'The following names have been added to the preliminary list of electors in the index book on the personal application of electors who have moved to the rural polling division after the enumeration date:

Name (Family name first)	Occupation	Post office address

Amendment (Mr. St. Pierre) agreed to.

Form 26 agreed to.

Mr. St. Pierre: The next one is to Form 42, Schedule I.

On Schedule I, Form 42

Mr. St. Pierre: The amendment reads:

That Bill C-215 be amended by deleting from clause (4) of Form No. 42 of Schedule I on page 233 the following words:

'That you are a person described in subsection 17(9) or 17(10) of the'

and substituting the following words:

'That you are a person described in subsection 17(9), 17(13) or 17(18) of the'

Amendment (Mr. St. Pierre) agreed to.

Form 42, Schedule I.

Mr. St. Pierre: The next amendment is to Form 43, Schedule I.

On Schedule I, Form 43

Mr. St. Pierre: The amendment reads:

That Bill C-215 be amended by deleting from clause (3) of Form No. 43 of Schedule I on page 233 the following words:

'That I am a person described in subsection 17(9) or 17(10) of the *Canada*'

and substituting the following words:

'That I am a person described in subsection 17(9), 17(13) or 17(18) of the *Canada*'

Amendment (Mr. St. Pierre) agreed to.

Form 43 agreed to.

Mr. St. Pierre: Mr. Chairman, the next amendment is to Form 52, Schedule I:

On Schedule I, Form 52

Mr. St. Pierre: The amendment reads:

That Bill C-215 be amended by deleting from clause (4) of Form No. 52 of Schedule I on page 240 the following words:

'(*or*)

That you are a person described in subsection 17(9) or 17(10) of the *Canada Elections Act;*

Amendment (Mr. St. Pierre) agreed to.

Form 52 agreed to.

Mr. St. Pierre: The next is to Form 53, Schedule I:

On Schedule I, Form 53

Mr. St. Pierre: The amendment reads:

That Bill C-215 be amended by deleting from paragraph (c) of clause (5) of Form No. 53 of Schedule I on page 241 the following words:

'(*or*)

is a person described in subsection 17(9) or 17(10) of the *Canada Elections Act;*'

Amendment (Mr. St. Pierre) agreed to.

Form 53 agreed to.

Mr. St. Pierre: The next is to Form 74 Schedule I.

On Schedule I, Form 74

Mr. St. Pierre: The amendment reads:

That Bill C-215 be amended by
(a) deleting from Form No. 74 of Schedule I on page 261 the following words:

'(*or*)

I am a person described in subsection 17(9) or 17(10) of the *Canada Elections Act* and I was ordinarily resident in the above mentioned urban polling division on the ..... day of ....., 19.... (*naming the date of the application by the elector to be included in the list of electors for the polling division*).'

; and
(b) deleting from the said Form on page 262 the following words:

'(*or*)

is a person described in subsection 17(9) or 17(10) of the *Canada Elections Act* and was ordinarily resident in the above mentioned urban polling division on the ..... day of ....., 19.... (*naming the date of the application by the elector to be included in the list of electors for the polling division*).'

Amendment (Mr. St. Pierre) agreed to.

Form 74 agreed to.

Schedule I agreed to.

On Clause 21, subclause 2—*Exceptions.*

Mr. Forest: Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment that is consequential to an amendment adopted last Tuesday. It was moved by the hon. member for Selkirk, and added paragraph 14 to clause 23. The effect of the amendment was that every employer subject to the Canada Labour Code had to grant leave of absence to an employee who wanted to be a candidate at an election. This consequential amendment would add paragraph (h) to 21(2) and would read as follows:

(h) an employee who, under subsection (14) of section 23, has been granted and is on leave of absence to seek nomination as a candidate and to be a candidate at an election.

The necessity for this amendment is not apparent, but according to the law officers of the Crown it should be made in order to prevent contestations or litigation in the future. It is consequential to the one that was adopted Tuesday night.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, I had a brief opportunity to look at this amendment and, initially, I did not have any difficulty when attempting to ascertain why this was necessary. As I understand it, subsection (2) of 21, which is sought to be amended here, contains the saving feature about ineligible candidates. Clause 21 provides that certain persons are not eligible to be candidates, and subsclause 2 says that the application of subclause 1 shall not render certain other people ineligible. I presume here that some difficulty might arise. Again, I might point out that one needs a few moments to follow this.

• (3:50 p.m.)

For the sake of argument, suppose a person should be found guilty of a corrupt practice and thus declared ineligible for a period of five years next after the date of his being so found, reported, declared guilty and so on. Would this declaration override that provision, as would paragraph (g) of subclause 2 which relates to employees in the public service or paragraph (f) which concerns members of the reserve forces? I realize that one is not supposed to ask, nor is a minister of the Crown supposed to give, legal opinions about matters but I believe there must be an exception in this case bceause we are dealing with a bill that is above and beyond government policy. It relates to the right of people to choose candidates. Without having had more than just a moment or two to read the amendment and fit it into clause 21 of the bill, this thought immediately came to mind. Other thoughts may develop as one reads further on in clause 21 in respect of certain people who are declared to be ineligible as candidates.

Mr. Forest: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. gentleman is right. I did not see the necessity for this amendment in the first place, but it was presented at the suggestion of the law officers of the Crown. The hon. member has a point as to whether it overrides other subparagraphs of the same clause. Perhaps we could stand it and have a second look at it.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Clause 21 stands.

On clause 48—*Time for Employees for Voting.*

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, I have not written an amendment in respect of this clause but it would be easy to do so. This relates to the matters that were put before the committee when we were dealing with the clause concerning the time during which the polls would be open on election day.

As hon. members will recall, I raised the question concerning loggers on Vancouver Island, and in other parts of British Columbia, who may spend up to two or two and a half

hours getting from their place of work to their place of residence which of course would be where they would vote. A slight difficulty like a flat tire or difficulty in respect of the "crummy", the bus which brings them back into work, could under some circumstances mean they would not get back home in time to vote because of this three-hour provision. If, for argument's sake, the polls closed at eight o'clock by virtue of the daylight saving time provisions and the employee was permitted three consecutive hours free from his employment in order to vote, and this period of three consecutive hours started at four o'clock, under the circumstances which I related he would have three hours in which to get from his place of work to the polls to vote. If it should take him two and a half hours in normal circumstances he would have a very narrow period in which to establish his opportunity to vote.

I wonder whether there would be a disposition to make a change in this provision. Initially, I put this proposition forward as a suggestion, but I am fully prepared to move an amendment if there should be general agreement to the idea that we change the three consecutive hours to four consecutive hours in order to take account of this situation. I point out from my memory of the British Columbia provincial law that it provides for a four-hour period in order to take account of the situation which exists in that province. I realize it is a bit parochial to speak of loggers in British Columbia, but there may be similar situations in other parts of Canada. I put forward the proposition to see whether it meets with some agreement. If so, I would be happy to move the appropriate amendment simply to change the wording "three consecutive hours" to "four consecutive hours" wherever it appears.

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, I may say I have no objection to making it half a day, which would be four hours.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I would be agreeable, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, perhaps the committee would give me just a moment.

The Chairman: I take it that the hon. member for Skeena is now preparing the amendment in writing to put before the committee.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Yes, Mr. Chairman. I believe this relates only to subclause (1). I have not gone through all the subsequent subclauses but if it should be necessary to amend any other subclauses we could do so when we reach them. I have worded the amendment a little differently than normally. I have not referred to the pertinent lines and so on.

I move:

That subclause (1) be amended by deleting the word "three" wherever it appears and substituting therefor the word "four".

The Chairman: The committee has heard the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the amendment?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Amendment (Mr. Howard) agreed to.

Clause 48 as amended agreed to.

Clause 49 agreed to.

On clause 50—*No person to approach poll armed.*

The Chairman: The committee shall now consider subclause 1 as revised.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to present any amendment but it seems to me it is ludicrous that we should have a regulation prohibiting anybody from having a gun within half a mile of a voting booth. I just wished to make that observation.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): All I can say, Mr. Chairman, is it was even more ridiculous before it was redrafted in this way.

Subclauses 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 50 agreed to.

The Chairman: The committee will now consider clause 51, which is to be found at page 128.

Subclauses 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

On clause 51, subclause 4—*Limitation.*

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, my remarks on this clause probably lead into the short general comment I wish to make on third reading of the bill, namely, the necessity to engage in sort of an educational program in order to acquaint people with the provisions of the law. The earlier section gives some direction to the voter by saying that he shall proceed into the compartment and, if I recall the words, with the black lead pencil provided therein mark his ballot, perhaps it even says "with an X or a cross". Subclause 4 runs counter to that and reads:

• (4:00 p.m.)

No ballot paper shall be rejected pursuant to subsection (3) by reason only that—

(b) it has been marked with a writing instrument other than a black lead pencil or with a mark other than a cross, if the mark does not constitute identification of the elector.

I appreciate that it would be difficult to give instructions to the elector to mark the ballot with any kind of instrument he likes. This would be inviting trouble. We would have finger prints and I do not know what else indicating the vote on the ballot. But I want to draw to the committee's attention the fact that this provision might create confusion in the minds of the electors and certainly will create confusion in the minds of the deputy returning officers and poll clerks. For many years, both under the provincial and federal law, these people have been used to the idea that a ballot can only be marked by a cross made with a pencil. On election night, therefore, if someone marks a tick with a red pen, for argument's sake, there might be a big argument. The ballot might be invalidated because it was marked that way, not taking into account the fact that it may be identifying the elector.

Mr. Macquarrie: This tendency to discuss becomes contagious. I said earlier how much I was indebted to the hon. member for Leeds who sold me on the broadminded attitude toward marking the ballot. As I was saying at an earlier stage, this in fact should be called a Code amendment. I do think that it is extremely important that we try somehow—and this will come up later—to get across an educative process. I regret to say that in the six parliaments I have served I have not seen a measure of such public importance as this one so poorly and inadequately reported by the press of the country, so it will be all the more necessary that something be done.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Hear, hear.

Mr. Macquarrie: I had thought, however, that the forms in the back illustrated how the ballot was to be marked, whereas this clause indicates that departures from that model do not invalidate the ballot. So, I am not so concerned about this. I have still a lingering doubt about paragraph (a) which could be an invitation to some slaphappy deputy returning officer. It reads:

No ballot shall be rejected pursuant to subsection (3) by reason only that

(a) it has on it any writing, number or mark placed thereon by any deputy returning officer;

Deputy returning officers should not be placing marks thereon, and I wonder more thought was not given by all of us to looking at this provision more seriously. But if others in the committee here today rest content with it, and I know it appeared in the earlier Act, I will allow my conscience to rest.

Subclause 4 agreed to.

Subclauses 5 to 22 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 51 as amended agreed to.

On clause 52—*Communication of vote.*

Mr. Forrestall: I have a small amendment to clause 52. I propose that it be amended by adding a new subclause (3) which reads as follows:

The returning officer upon receipt from the chief electoral officer of the information respecting the number of votes cast for each candidate under the special voting rules shall, where possible, release such results together with the results of at least one of the advanced polls established in the electoral district.

Without going into it too deeply, may I explain that this is simply to add a further measure of protection to the secrecy of the franchise of the voters under the special voting rules, that is to say, the Canadian armed forces voters. We have taken substantial steps to try to protect the secrecy of their franchise in the amendments we made to this bill, and this is just one minor addition. In most instances, this provision could be followed without any difficulty at all. It is recognized that it cannot be followed in every instance because of special circumstances, but I think that inasmuch as we have started, as my friend the hon. member for Hillsborough is wont to suggest, to civilianize the armed forces vote, this is another and I think useful step that could go a long way towards that objective.

Mr. Benjamin: I am sure the hon. member who just spoke knows I support the amendment, because as all the House knows I had an amendment to this effect. The President of the Privy Council was good enough to acknowledge that he thought what I had said on second reading was a good idea and he was disposed to agree with it. All I can say is that I support the amendment but I dislike the discourtesy of the hon. member in moving in and taking it over.

Mr. Forrestall: Sit down. What are you talking about? What does he mean by discourtesy?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): As the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre indicated, I was very sympathetic to the notion of the somewhat broader proposition that he had put, namely that the election reporting system

should be structured in such a way that not only on voting night but even in the blue book which results ultimately from the election, there would be no indication to an outside observer of what part of the total of the advance poll and the service vote, was the service vote. He suggested that this should occur in this case just as it does with certain polling divisions which are grouped with larger numbers so as to assure the secrecy of the ballot. I had the opportunity to discuss this at length with those responsible for running the elections, and they pointed out to me the shortcomings of the broader proposition to which. as the hon. member indicated, I had given some approval at second reading.

The procedure, as I understand it, is as follows. The returning officer will be receiving from each of the advance polls a ballot box with the ballots in it, and for the purposes of controlling the legitimacy of the vote at each of those advance polling stations the ballot box is counted by itself. Then, the advance poll is the aggregate of each of the individual counts from those ballot boxes. That ballot box is opened and counted in the presence, not only of the chief returning officer and his clerk, but also in the presence of such representatives as the parties want to appoint.

The service ballot is handled in a somewhat different manner. This is where a further difficulty arises. It is not the same type of ballot as the other. What had appealed to me was the possibility of working on a system whereby all the ballots might be so intermingled that in the actual act of counting it would be impossible to differentiate. So far as the service ballot is concerned, it is not the standard ballot marked with an X or other distinguishing mark opposite the appropriate name but rather a ballot on which the name of the candidate selected is written in. So there are two different types of ballot, and the intermingling proposition would not work. What we have, therefore, for reasons of security and integrity of the poll as an identification at least for those working inside the returning officer's office is a breakdown as between the advance poll and the service vote because the advance poll has been counted and also because the service vote is a different kind of ballot.

• (4:10 p.m.)

What would happen, therefore, in the case of the suggestion made by the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre is that all people working on the polling staff, including representatives of the parties, would know what the service vote was. The purpose, in effect, would be to prevent the press from finding out, but they could find out quickly enough by asking around.

By this reasoning, I have been reluctantly forced to the conclusion that this kind of anonymity which I had hoped to give is not possible. It would be possible to put some controls on announcements on election night, I agree, but when the official count is being taken there would be an opportunity for the representatives to check on the advance poll and by the simple process of subtraction to find out the service vote. Under the present system, I do not see how you can ensure this ballot protection.

My understanding is that the member for Dartmouth-Halifax East was rather less ambitious in his amendment. He is really not purporting to give an instruction to anybody who is involved not to reveal what they have seen; he is giving an instruction to the returning officer which is effective only on election night. The instruction to the returning officer is that in announcing the advance poll he will commence it and the service vote together, even though he and some other people will know what the difference is. That seems to me to be a legitimate objective and I would be prepared to accept it. Perhaps it would be only fair to hear what the hon. member would have proposed had he been on his feet first.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Chairman, my amendment is almost identical to that of the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East. What I said on second reading and at an earlier stage may have been misunderstood because I said it badly. I realized you could not combine these results in the official returns in the blue book, and that they would have to be accounted for in separate ballots in the polls. As I understand the reasoning of the President of the Privy Council, he feels this would not be practical. The armed forces and overseas public service vote will be counted and communicated by the Chief Electoral Officer to each returning officer, so it seems to me it is no problem for the returning officer to hold that result until such time as all results in the advance poll come in. He does not reveal the vote on the advance polls until he has the total count. I assume the advance poll will be counted on the night it is held and the results transmitted to the office of the returning officer. Upon receipt of those results, they will be combined with the results he has received by

telephone or telegraph of the armed forces and overseas public service vote, to make one total for each candidate. This is what will be released from the office of the returning officer on election night and thereafter, of course, the advance polls and the polls of the armed forces and overseas public service vote will be separated.

I agree that anonymity should be protected as far as possible on election night, but thereafter it is the same as any other poll. We do not have to worry about identification of groups.

Instead of "at least one of the advance polls" my amendment reads "the total number of votes cast for each candidate in all of the advance polls". In other words, if there were six advance polls there would be one total. The returning officer would release the vote in a manner similar for the advance armed forces and overseas public service vote, so there would be one figure for each candidate. I see no problem here in the light of the mechanism used for counting the advance poll; the kind of ballot surely has nothing to do with this. I think the mechanism can be handled quite well by the returning officer in his office that night.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I understand the difference between the two proposals and the one by the member for Dartmouth-Halifax East seems to be the less drastic. There may be some circumstances when the service vote would be known and the count of most of the advance polls would be known, with the exception of perhaps one. The amendment of the member for Dartmouth-Halifax East would enable them to be bunched without having to wait for all of them. This seems to give more flexibility to the situation than waiting until all are in.

Amendment (Mr. Forrestall) agreed to.

Clause 52, as amended, agreed to.

The Chairman: The committee will now consider clause 53, subclause 1 to 6 inclusive.

Subclauses 1 to 6 agreed to.

The Chairman: The committee will now consider clause 53, subclause 7, amended.

On clause 53, subclause 7—*Application for recount by returning officer.*

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Chairman, this clause provides for what can be called an automatic recount. In the case of a tie in the number of votes, instead of the returning officer casting a deciding ballot that night, he shall petition for a recount. Only after recount, if there is still an equality of votes, will the returning officer cast his deciding ballot. This takes the pressure off the returning officer and it means that the cost of the recount is borne by the Treasury instead of by a candidate who lost by one vote. It does not go quite far enough, however. Everyone will agree that uncertainty and indecision have no place in an election. The electoral process should allow for a recount to be conducted under certain other conditions.

I should like to move that clause 53, subclause 7 be amended by deleting the first paragraph and substituting therefor the following:

> Where on the official addition of the votes, there is an equality of votes between two or more candidates and an additional vote for one of such candidates would entitle one of those candidates to be declared as having the largest number of votes, or where on the official addition of votes there is less than 25 votes difference between the candidate having the highest number of votes and any other candidate, the returning officer shall

The intent of this amendment is that where there is a difference between the leading candidate and one or more other candidates of 24 votes or less, the returning officer would automatically petition for a recount. The most obvious reason for this is that the costs of a recount are borne by a candidate and his party. We felt that where the difference was more than 24, the cost should be borne by a candidate and his party. We felt that this was a reasonably low enough figure to allow for a better way of getting the decision confirmed by that recount and could possibly save some time as well. It is almost certain that when a vote is close in any constituency, one or more of the candidates will petition for a recount. If there should be a small difference between the numbers of ballots cast for the leading and second candidates, the process of recounting will be undertaken more quickly. It will be done under the authority of the electoral laws and electoral officers, and you will avoid partisan activities in connection with this matter on the part of one or more of the candidates or political parties. I hope that the members of the committee will agree that this will be an improvement.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Sometimes, when seats are won by a margin of a handful of votes there are arguments and legal proceedings, and unfortunate feelings are sometimes generated in electoral districts while these proceedings are going on.

It seems to me that if, instead of petitions on the part of political parties and candidates for a recount, the matter could be undertaken by election officials and the courts, there would be a great improvement in our electoral process. Although the election results might be delayed for a few days, this matter would be much better handled than under our present system. I hope this amendment commends itself to the members of the committee.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, we will be disposed to accept the amendment. There have been suggested to me a number of drafting changes. We accept the principle and the wording will be almost the same. After the drafting changes the amendment will read somewhat as follows, if I can focus the attention of hon. members on it: "Where, on the official addition of the vote (a) there is an equality of votes between two or more candidates and an additional vote for one of such candidates would entitle one of those candidates to be declared as having the largest number of votes or (b) the number of votes separating the candidates is less than 25, the returning officer shall," and (c) and (d) would follow. It is the draftsmen's sense of elegance which dictates this rather than the substance of the amendment.

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, I have no strenuous objection to this at all. Of course, it puts out of bounds the candidate who, for good and sufficient reasons, does not care for a recount. I remember that in a certain strong Highland section of a certain province a candidate came close to winning, and certain people suggested that he should seek a recount. His response was, "If my people thought I was such a poor sport that I could not win on the hustings and therefore tried to win in the judge's chambers, they would not support me again." He did not have a recount and the next time he won the seat for his party for the first time in 50 years. Of course, I do not suggest that as a reason I might be against it.

The Chairman: Shall I put the redrafted amendment to the committee?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): There is some lightning redrafting going on. Possibly we might go to another subclause.

The Chairman: Is it agreed that subclause 7 of clause 53 shall stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Subclause 7 stands.

Subclause 8 agreed to.

The Chairman: Clause 53 stands, is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Clause 54 to 61 inclusive agreed to.

On clause 62, subclause 1—*Appointment of official agent.*

Mr. Forest: Mr. Chairman, I wish to move an amendment to subclause 1 of clause 62 concerning the legal capacity of one who acts as an official agent. We have already adopted clause 20 saying that a candidate must be 18 years of age or over, and there is no provision in the act regarding the capacity of the official agent to act in certain instances. I can envisage a case where a candidate might be 18 or 19 years old and, in certain instances, he would be somewhat restricted in his legal dealings. He might also have an official agent who might also be 18 or 19 years old, and serious difficulties might arise. I am not as familiar with the laws of other provinces as I am with those of Quebec. May I remind the committee that the official agent is the one who, on behalf of the candidate, engages in contracts for printing, advertising and other matters which involve electoral expenses. If he were to plead his minority in certain instances I can see that difficulties might arise. To prevent these I wish to move the following amendment:

That Bill C-215 be amended by striking out lines 13 to 19 on page 156 and substituting the following:

"an official agent

(a) who shall be a person who is capable of entering into contracts in the province in which the electoral district of the candidate is located, and

(b) whose name, address and occupation shall be

(i) declared to the returning officer, in the nomination paper in Form No. 27 by or on behalf of the candidate, on or before nomination day, and

(ii) published in the Notice of Grant of a Poll in Form No. 32."

I think it will be useful to take the precaution of putting a provision into the Act saying that the official agent is a person who is capable of entering into legal contracts.

• (4:30 p.m.)

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, the last amendment emanating from the founts of legal wisdom got us into a little difficulty. I am concerned about this one. I know what lawyers will probably say. I feel we are

moving toward the isolation of the candidate as an infant in the eyes of the law. I wonder if we have to build up this new status for the agent. What do we do about his principal, the candidate? Can the candidate be 18 years of age if the agent must be 21 years of age?

We are in the process of setting up a category of people who will in fact become the fathers of the Elections Act, namely, the new members of the House of Commons. Is it necessary to single out certain people to be in an age category different from that of the candidates? If we allow a candidate to be someone less than 21, he enters into contract control. I think the deposit has a certain legal validity. The candidate is the principal of the agent who has many returns to which he must attest and swear.

I wonder about isolating the agent and requiring more of him in terms of accumulation of years over the candidate. I was proposing later on in the proceedings to move an amendment to delete the requirement that the returning officer be 21. If the end product, the candidate and potential Member of Parliament, can take on all the plenitude of powers which will follow at the age of 18, I wonder why the lesser lights along the way must burn for three extra years. That may be a bit metaphoric.

There is an area of legal distinction here. I do not want to get too far away. I hate to think that the provinces of this country can curtail, inhibit and restrict us in regard to granting the franchise and appointing officers at the age of 18. I am a little concerned about all this.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, I have some doubts about the wisdom of proceeding in this way, partly because of what the hon. member for Hillsborough has said and partly because what we want to do here is to ensure that whatever contracts are entered into are considered to be valid. The hon. member for Missisquoi and the President of the Privy Council want to ensure that when a person enters into a contract he will be legally able to do so. Perhaps there is a desire, as mentioned by the hon. member for Hillsborough, to do this without setting up two different groups and elevating the position of one over that of the other. Possibly it would be simpler to say that for the purpose of the Canada Elections Act contracts entered into by the official agent are deemed to be valid.

[Mr. Macquarrie.]

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I am not prepared to concede this, Mr. Chairman. It is out of an abundance of caution as to the authority of the federal Parliament in federal elections to infringe upon the unquestioned power of the provinces over contracts. Rather than have some doubt about the matter, it seems desirable to make this kind of change. In this way the outside world, in dealing with a particular campaign, may at least look to one person who can be made legally responsible for the debts in question. I draw the attention of the committee to clause 62, subclause 2:

> In the event of the death or legal incapacity of any official agent, the candidate shall forthwith appoint another official agent—

The same type of amendment would be required in the clause anyway. For many years the Canada Elections Act has acknowledged the importance of the official agent as being the one legally responsible. I hazard the opinion that the general principles of principal and agent may not apply to these particular circumstances. This is a rather particular kind of agent whose status is defined by clause 62. Therefore the situation would be, as I stated on second reading, that of caveat vendor, let the seller beware. When he is dealing with the candidate, let the seller beware if the candidate is or is not legally responsible. We are taking a further step here to make sure that in dealing with the official agent, which essentially is the basic form of contracting in an election system, at least one of the persons in the situation should be capable of being held legally responsible.

This probably is true with the law of Ontario. I will not hazard a guess as to the law of other provinces. However, when a minor is a candidate and the agent has reached his majority you do not have the opportunity of suing both principal and agent. You are confined to suing the agent and taking your remedies against him. This is a preferable situation in terms of contracting if one of the two is to be legally responsibile under the law of the province. It is on that basis, to make the new situation consistent with the inhibition under clause 2, that I recommend this amendment to the committee.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): There is a certain hazard in trying to pose queries in legal matters when one is a layman and the other is a lawyer. I will exhibit my ignorance as a layman by posing a question to the President of the Privy Council. It is in terms of the extent to which the federal Elections Act may

be able to make incursions into the field of provincial jurisdiction, namely, the making of contracts. It seems that we already do this. At least it appears this way in subclause 7. I presume the contract referred to is what we are talking about. Subclause 7 reads:

A contract whereby any expenses are incurred on account of or in respect of the conduct or management of an election is not enforceable against a candidate unless made by the candidate himself—

If the candidate is 18 years of age or less than the age of majority in the particular province where he is running and makes a contract related to expenses, which presumably he is legally entitled to do under this Act, then that contract is enforceable against him regardless of whether he is under the age of majority. I wonder if a federal law can go into a field of the province, namely, the making of contracts? It seems that is the case. Why can we not do it in the case of the official agent? Following upon on subclause 7, you cannot draw the official agent or his subagent into it unless they are authorized in writing to enter into such contracts.

• (4:40 p.m.)

Again, in subclause 12 on page 158 we are probably making another invasion of the field of provincial jurisdiction relating to contracts, because we say that all expenses incurred by or on behalf of a candidate in connection with contracts and management of the election shall be paid within 50 days, and so on. In other words, regardless of what the law relating to such contracts in the provinces concerned may say, we insist that payment must be made within 50 days. This is another example of the committee, and presumably, Parliament, exercising jurisdiction as far as federal elections are concerned, and presumably doing so quite properly under the constitution of Canada. If these are valid points I am making—and I do not really know whether they are or not, in a legal sense—then surely we could make certain provisions with regard to contracts entered into by an agent, regardless of his age.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Subclause 12 is really a penal provision directed to the official agent and telling him when he has to pay. It may be argued that this affects the ability of those responsible for the campaign to make their own arrangements in accordance with provincial contract laws; I have not gone into that question. I think the point is well taken on the basis of subclause 7 but I am still not satisfied in my mind as to how far the federal election law can override the contractual law of a province. In any event, we shall have to do something about subclause 2 when we talk about the legal incapacity of an agent. Presumably, under the law of Ontario a succession of 18-year-olds would have to be replaced because they are regarded as legally incapable. For policy reasons my view would be that the official agent should in all circumstances be persons who are legally responsible and I would so recommend to the committee.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I support the position taken by my hon. friend from Skeena. I understand the caution which the President of the Privy Council wishes to exercise when he suggests we should not lord it over the provinces as far as the electoral law is concerned, but if he is proposing that we adopt the amendment put forward by his parliamentary secretary there is, it seems to me, one flaw in his presentation. The amendment, I take it, would provide that no person in Canada can be an official agent unless he is 21.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): No. It depends on the law of the province as to the majority.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I see. In that case the point I have been trying to make has been recognized and I will cut my speech short.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Speaker, I think that the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) as well as his Parliamentary Secretary (Mr. Forest) are right in being cautious as regards this section of the Elections Act and if we abide by subclause (4) of clause 62, which states that the official agent alone can make payments, receive contributions for the candidate and sometimes even enter into contracts in his name, I think this role gives him fairly important duties in the conduct of an election.

As in some provinces the legal voting age is 21, the amendment proposed by the Parliamentary Secretary seems appropriate to me.

[*English*]

Mr. Macquarrie: I shall not tarry long on this subject but I still have the feeling that buttressing the role of the election agent has the effect of weakening the status of the 18-year-old candidate. I also wonder why, in the various provincial jurisdictions, it was not necessary for them to make this distinction between the age of a candidate and the age of

an official agent. Perhaps we are being more cautious than they are. I suppose the whole answer will be forthcoming if and when something is done some day to lower the age of majority and, perhaps, to strike the same figure in each of the provinces. I shall not hold out on this.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 62 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 63 to 65 inclusive agreed to.

On clause 66—*Corrupt inducement of voters.*

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I thought you would call each subclause separately, Mr. Chairman. That is why I hesitated. I have a proposition to put forward in connection with subclause 2.

• (4:50 p.m.)

The Deputy Chairman: Very well. Shall subclause 1 of clause 66 carry?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Subclause 1 agreed to.

On clause 66, subclause 2—*Application.*

Mr. Howard (Skeena): In order to appreciate the point I am making I think it is necessary to consider briefly subclause 1 which we have just passed. Subclause 1 says no one shall offer food, drink or the like, or any money or valuable consideration to anybody in order to induce him to vote or refrain from voting. In other words, no one may bribe people to vote in a certain way or not to vote at all.

However, under subclause 2 we make it permissible to provide, as I understand it, sandwiches, cakes, cookies, non-alcoholic beverages and other light refreshments in an attempt to influence people into voting or refraining from voting. In other words, we say it is permissible to engage in bribery of a sort as long as it involves non-alcoholic beverages, cakes, cookies and light refreshments generally, provided they are supplied by an official agent, by any person other than a candidate or official agent, at his own expense, at a meeting of electors assembled for the purpose of promoting the election of a candidate, or by any person to an election agent at a polling station. The assumption in the first part is that the meeting is held to promote the election of a candidate. It would seem that the provision of coffee, cakes, tea and the like is a necessary extension of the public meeting and the exhortations that would take place at that meeting.

[Mr. Macquarrie.]

Paragraph (b), which is the one I want to get to, provides that such refreshments can be provided in order to induce people to vote in a certain way or to refrain from voting—in other words, to engage in a legalized sort of bribery at a meeting of electors called for the purpose of promoting a candidate. We carried subclause 1 but subclause 2 makes an exception of non-alcoholic beverages, sandwiches, cakes and cookies that are provided, under paragraph (b), by any person other than a candidate or official agent who at his own expense provides such refreshment at a meeting to promote the election of a candidate. We have recognized that this is a form of bribery, though not quite so underhanded and illegal as we conceded the situation might be as described in subclause 1. By proscribing against this sort of bribery in subclause 1 we have recognized that it might take place, that it does influence people and that it is an illegal and immoral thing to do.

By extending this concept to subclause 2, paragraph (b), we should recognize that without limiting the activities of people other than the candidate or official agent and everyone within the political party, the organization itself which would want to advance the cause of the candidate in question, cakes, cookies and so on would be provided through the official agent. While the official agent is an agent on behalf of a candidate, he is also an agent on behalf of an extension of the political party to which the candidate belongs. This is part of the campaign, and we seek to endorse it by permitting the official agent and those who are identified with the candidate in an open way to engage in this sort of activity in an attempt to convince voters to cast their vote in a certain way.

Once we go beyond this and permit any other person without restriction to provide refreshment, we are overstepping the bounds of the sort of ethics we want to see contained in the Elections Act.

I am of the view that there should be no provision in this regard, but I realize this would be asking too much because this sort of inducement does take place today. Since it is recognized that it takes place, some sort of restriction should be placed upon it. The amendment I propose to move is not much different from the present wording of paragraph (b); it simply puts a limit of $100 on the expenditure that may be made for such purposes. I am proposing a new subparagraph

(b), in substitution of the present provision, and it reads as follows:

That clause 66 be amended by deleting paragraph (b) of subclause (2), and substituting therefor the following:

"(b) by any person other than a candidate or an official agent who, at his own expense not exceeding one hundred dollars, provides such beverage or refreshment at a meeting of electors assembled for the purpose of promoting the election of a candidate; or"

Then subparagraph (c) follows immediately. I admit that this amendment is not as foolproof or as confining as we would like it to be, but I nevertheless commend it to the committee for favourable consideration.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Chairman, I kept asking myself while the hon. member was speaking whether he was really serious or just kidding us about this whole matter. I cannot see any possibility of achieving the result he has in mind by placing a $100 limit on the provision of sandwiches and cookies at such a meeting. I do not see how one could get any accounting. I appreciate the merit of his idea but I do not think his proposal would be effective in any way. Some meetings are larger than others, and some people put on a bigger show than others.

When the Act was last amended the committee felt at that time that it would be unreasonable to limit the expenditure by candidates, their agents or any particular group of people, who might want to put on, for example, a lunch at a public meeting. I do not think it would be practical to try to limit this sort of thing.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, I am a little disappointed with the hon. member because I thought he was going to move quite a different amendment. Under the elections act in the province of Ontario it is possible in the course of an election campaign not only to provide coffee and cookies but also to get a drink. I was rather hoping that we might be opening up the Act here to make it accord a little more closely with what is the practice at least in my own city. I thought he was going to delete the prohibition against the provision of non-alcoholic beverages and get down to the real thing.

I would be inclined to agree with the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka. I cannot really see electoral snoopers attending a meeting to count the cookies, do a quick audit and decide whether or not the expenditure involved amounted to more than $100. I do not think electors can be bought by cookies or even by a couple of good stiff drinks. They attend two or three meetings held by the different candidates and make up their own minds in that way. I think we should move in the opposite direction and that there should be less of a restriction in this regard.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Chairman, I partly agree with what the President of the Privy Council and the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka have said in regard to the enforcement of this proposal, but I do not think this was the intent. If more than $100 were spent at a public meeting, this would have to be shown as an election expense by the official agent in his return to the Chief Electoral Officer.

What does concern a number of hon. members is that the party with the most money, or the party that has the supporters with the most money, has an unfair advantage. In my own constituency I can visualize instances where the president of a company—

The Deputy Chairman: Order, please. It being five o'clock p.m. it is my duty to rise, report progress, and request leave to sit again later this day.

Progress reported.

• (5:00 p.m.)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

SUSPENSION OF PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR TO PROCEED WITH CANADA ELECTIONS ACT BILL

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether there would be any disposition on the part of the House to suspend the private member's hour for this day's sitting so we can continue the business in progress before five o'clock?

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Speaker, this would commend itself to us.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): That is completely agreeable, Mr. Speaker. However, I want to make one point. The business for the private member's hour that we are suspending consists, first, of Private Bills, of which there are none, and then Notices of Motions (Papers), of which there are dozens and dozens. This points up the complaint we have made on many occasions, that these motions were simply transferred for debate by the government in order that they could hide them and not deal with them. They are now asking us to participate in hiding them and therefore not being able to proceed with them. I want

to indicate to the President of the Privy Council through you, Sir, how very generous we are.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Speaker, speaking on behalf of the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie), who is not in his proper seat, I should like to indicate our agreement to go ahead with the Canada Elections Act.

Mr. Speaker: Is it so ordered?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

TIME OF EMERGENCY DEBATE ON POST OFFICE DISPUTE

Mr. Speaker: As hon. members know, two motions were made earlier today under Standing Order 26. I indicated to the House I would consider the matter and consult with the House Leaders. I have given consideration to the matter and feel that in view of all the circumstances the benefit of the doubt should be given to the hon. members who have moved these motions. I gather it would be the desire of all hon. members to have an occasion to debate this matter before the House recesses, whenever that may be. In view of the circumstances for today and tomorrow, it is my view that the debate should be held tomorrow afternoon at four o'clock. I suggest to hon. members, however, that there could very well be discussion among the House Leaders. I gather such discussions have already taken place and that there is a possibility the debate might be held this evening rather than tomorrow afternoon. I should like to leave this aspect of the negotiations in the hands of the House Leaders. I see the hon. President of the Privy Council is anxious to say a word and perhaps it is on this subject.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Yes, Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions as you have indicated. It seems to me the critical question is whether we can complete our work on the Elections Act today so that the bill may be sent to the other place for its consideration and possible passage tomorrow. What I should like to suggest is that the actual determination of the time for this debate be left until six o'clock in order to see whether we have made such progress on the Elections Act that we might reasonably expect to go ahead with the other debate this evening.

The hon. member for York South suggested to me that in the interest of moving the legislative program along the House might make a special order to start the adjournment debate at ten o'clock this evening. As you will recall, the sitting in any event will go through to eleven o'clock. If we make the requisite progress on the Elections Act, perhaps that could be done. I think we might know within the hour whether we can do that or not.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Perhaps the order could be amended to read that we would take up the Standing Order 26 item at ten o'clock or at an earlier hour if the Elections Act has been completed.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): As the hon. member knows, there are one and perhaps two other bills with which it would be desirable to deal with before we rise. If it would be possible to deal with them from nine o'clock to ten o'clock, or at least one stage, that would be desirable. I wonder whether we could not leave this matter until ten o'clock to see whether we have made sufficient progress. This will leave a little flexibility.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Could it be ten o'clock subject to renegotiation?

Mr. Aiken: No, Mr. Speaker. I think the Elections Act ought to be completed first before we go on with any other business tonight.

Mr. Speaker: Obviously there is no agreement, so the decision of the Chair will stand subject to any agreement which hon. members may be prepared to arrive at among themselves.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTION TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that there is a question to be considered at the time of the adjournment which is the following: the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Rowland)—Fisheries—Manitoba government offer of financial assistance to establish processing plant in Selkirk.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CANADA ELECTIONS ACT

MEASURE TO CONSOLIDATE AND REVISE

The House resumed consideration in committee of Bill C-215, respecting the franchise

of electors and the election of members to the House of Commons—Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale)—Mr. Béchard in the chair.

The Deputy Chairman: When the committee rose it was considering an amendment by Mr. Howard to clause 66.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Chairman, one of the things that I think bothers a number of members is the fact that the Act refers to any individual other than a candidate. That individual might be someone who could afford a $5,000 expenditure for non-alcoholic light refreshments, including ice cream, etc., for a picnic or rally the day before election day. On the surface at least this is an advantage to someone who has a wealthy supporter or contributor. This really is somewhat of a perversion of the democratic process. If that kind of expenditure is desired, why should it not go through the hands of the official agent and be reported as an election expense on the documents which must be filed? It seems to me this kind of expenditure is not accountable in any way under this section. That is the reason we want the $100 limit. It would not, of course, apply to small meetings. No one is going to run around counting the cookies and cups of coffee which are served to see whether the $100 limit is exceeded.

The intent of this section is to allow within reason those expenditures by an individual for refreshments of this kind at a meeting or gathering. Surely it is not unreasonable to place a limit on the amount. No one is going to worry about it unless the amount is blatantly in excess of $100. Then someone could take the matter up under the Elections Act and lay charges accordingly.

If a candidate or an individual on behalf of a candidate wished to spend $100, $500, $1,000 or $5,000 for this purpose he could very easily do so at a large outdoor function. That money should be given to the candidate's official agent and accounted for as an election expense. The official agent should report it accordingly. It seems to me this is a much better and more proper manner of doing it. That is the real reason this group submits this amendment for the consideration of hon. members.

We are not particularly worried about small meetings and gatherings that hon. members hold in many places in their respective constituencies. We feel we should guard against the abuses that can and undoubtedly will take place in some areas under this type of provision. When this happens it is unfair to other parties and other candidates. As I said earlier, this is a perversion of the electoral process. The amount is not accounted for and does not appear before the eyes of the public for examination.

We hope the President of the Privy Council and other hon. members will reconsider this matter and will be willing to accept this restriction as a proper one under the Elections Act.

Mr. Deachman: Mr. Chairman, it seems that the amendment really attempts to do things under the Elections Act which should properly be reserved for an Act controlling election expenses. It puts a limit on one function carried out during elections, that of holding a gathering at which refreshments are supplied. It places a limit on expenses of not more than $100. This type of function is singled out without consideration being given to the fact that one could make a contribution by the giving of an outdoor sign or a gift of printing or almost anything one could think of. I find the amendment objectionable in this instance because it does not fit this type of a clause but belongs in a statute having to do with the control of election expenses.

• (5:10 p.m.)

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Chairman, I should like to make one or two very brief comments. I think I understand clearly what the hon. member is getting at and I have some sympathy in respect of what he has said. Perhaps I am a little more practical in one sense. In any event, the only substantial point I wish to make is that all this discussion is hypothetical. The committee recognizes the difficulty involved here and the great anomalies and conflicts which exist. We have reached the point of naming a special committee to look into the whole field of election expenses and public involvement in election expenses. I think any attempt to amend the Act substantially at this stage is a little premature. Perhaps we should wait until we have the report of the committee on election expenses before us and then take a substantial whack at this situation based on the recommendations of the special committee when it reports.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, I fail to see the importance of this amendment, which aims to limit to $100 expenses incurred for alcoholic beverages served at an election meeting.

To begin with, should someone decide to spend $150, who will be able to determine this? I believe that the act will eventually set an amount for allowable election expenses. And before the committee has completed the study of this question, I do not see how this amendment could serve the cause of a candidate.

[*English*]

The Deputy Chairman: The question is on the amendment of the hon. member for Skeena which reads as follows:

That clause 66 be amended by deleting paragraph (b) of subclause (2), and substituting therefor the following:

"(b) By any person other than a candidate or an official agent who, at his own expense not exceeding one hundred dollars, provides such beverage or refreshment at a meeting of electors assembled for the purpose of promoting the election of a candidate; or"

Is the committee ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Amendment (Mr. Howard) negatived: Yeas 5; nays 26.

Mr. Deachman: Mr. Chairman, I am looking at subclause 2 of clause 66 and the words:

—does not apply in respect of the provision of—

I draw particular attention to these words:

—non-alcoholic beverages and sandwiches, cakes, cookies and other light refreshments—

There is not a member of this House of Commons who is not obligated to some party worker and who at one time or another during the course of an election has entertained people and served a drink—wine with cheese, a glass of beer, or something of that kind. If all of us here were called to task under this clause our elections would all be declared void and the whole House would be filled only with loyal members of the WCTU. This is hypocrisy, and we have no intention whatsoever of adhering to it. I think we ought to face up to the facts of life. This is not a difficult fact to face up to. I therefore move that:

Subclause (2) of clause 66 be amended by deleting "non-alcoholic beverages and sandwiches, cakes, cookies and other"

So we will just be dealing with light refreshments and it will be left to our good supporters to decide in their own wisdom what those refreshments shall be.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, I will drink to that.

[Mr. Caouette.]

Mr. Forrestall: I think I will join the President of the Privy Council.

Mr. Caouette: I think I will also join the party, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Chairman, I am as thirsty as my colleagues but I should like to throw out a word of warning that unless the committee on election expenses really deals with this matter and comes up with something before the next election many of us will regret this provision.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, in light of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Vancouver "Quandary" and in light of the fact that the Minister of National Health and Welfare has graced us with his presence, I wonder whether the amendment, if carried, would permit the providing of pot and other like substances at these meetings.

Mr. Deachman: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member for Skeena recently has taken to calling my riding the riding of Vancouver "Quandary." There is no quandary in my riding. The word "Quadra" refers to a Peruvian explorer who mapped most of the area in the constituency of the hon. member for Skeena.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): On the question of privilege may I say I was only following the designation given this constituency by a Liberal member the other day. I thought it had been changed.

Mr. Deachman: He referred to it as "squandary" which is even worse.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall the amendment carry?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Amendment (Mr. Deachman) agreed to: yeas 29; nays 3.

The Deputy Chairman: I declare the amendment carried.

Shall clause 66 as amended carry?

• (5:20 p.m.)

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, in order to make clause 66 consistent I think subclause 3 should be amended by inserting the following words preceding the words in the clause as they now read:

Except as authorized by subsection 2—

The Deputy Chairman: Shall the amendment carry?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 66 as amended agreed to.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Chairman, I wish to rise on a point of order. There was a disposition earlier to accept an amendment that I had suggested to clause 53 (7) on page 136. I have the rewording, if the committee would like to return to that clause.

The Deputy Chairman: Is it the pleasure of the committee that we revert to clause 53?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

On clause 53, subclause 7—*Application for recount by returning officer.*

Mr. Benjamin: I should like to submit the new wording of the amendment which, as I said earlier, seemed to be acceptable. It reads as follows:

That Bill C-215 be amended by striking out lines 1 to 13 on page 136 and substituting therefor the following:

"(7) Where, on the official addition of the votes,

(a) there is an equality of votes between two or more candidates and an additional vote for one of such candidates would enable one of these candidates to be declared as having obtained the largest number of votes, or

(b) the number of votes separating the candidate receiving the highest number of votes and any other candidate is less than twenty five, the returning officer shall

(c) apply for a recount to a judge to whom an application could be made pursuant to section 56; and

(d) give written notice to each candidate at the election or his official agent for a recount."

The Chairman: Is the committee agreed on the amendment?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 53 as amended agreed to.

On clause 67—*Liquor not to be sold during polling hours.*

Mr. Macquarrie: I should like to say a few words on this clause. I do not do so because the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra has whetted my appetite, nor am I referring to the state of mind of my constituents. We were very concerned about provincial jurisdiction a while ago, and if I recall my constitutional history the role of the Dominion Parliament in the whole question of liquor came under scrutiny in Russel *v.* The Queen wherein Their Lordships indicated that in times of great concern for public safety, such as a flood, pestilence or plague, if I recall correctly, or where public safety was endangered, the Dominion jurisdiction might prevail. I find it slightly repellent that after all these years we still have this jaundiced view of the capacity, the tastes and the morality of our people on election day. I wonder why the power which we were given by judicial decision under such stringent and rather frightening circumstances should be in the Canada Elections Act year after year.

In fact, we are intruding upon an area of civil rights. We say to provincial governments in effect that they shall not sell liquor, and now we are suggesting that they may sell it only until a certain time, and so on. To be more practical, if there is any suggestion of having a dry-out it is pretty ridiculous because if the stores are open until nine o'clock the night before the election, it does not require a great deal of ingenuity, effort or concerted action to obtain that which is referred to here in such delicate terms. I mention this as another aspect where our legislation has trailed behind our mores and we are retaining in our Act something which the social conditions at the time of the Scott Act prompted in our legislation. This backwardness is reprehensible to me.

Clause 67 agreed to.

Clauses 68 to 91 inclusive agreed to.

• (5:30 p.m.)

The Chairman: The committee will now consider clause 92.

On clause 92, subclause 2—*When advance polls to be open.*

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Chairman, I wish to move what I am sure the committee will be happy to learn is our last amendment to this bill. As has been pointed out many times, during meetings of the Standing Committee, on second reading and in committee of the whole, it is the desire of all hon. members to widen the provisions of this act so that the maximum number of people can attend at the polls and vote. It is our view that this can be achieved by the advance poll, and therefore I move:

Advance polls shall be open between the hours of eight o'clock in the forenoon and eight o'clock in the afternoon of Thursday, Friday, Saturday and Monday, the eleventh, tenth, ninth and seventh days before the ordinary polling day, and shall not be open at any other time.

The purpose of this amendment is to increase the number of days of the advance poll from two to four. It may be argued that little or insufficient use is made of the advance poll to merit increasing it. I think this is because the public have not been well informed on the use of the advance poll; also, previously there were restrictions on who could vote at the advance poll. But it seems to me it is now possible for anyone to cast a ballot at the advance poll, and therefore greater use should be made of it. I am sure the Chief Electoral Officer will now do a much better job of informing the public of their rights in regard to the advance poll and the manner in which it can be used. This should encourage the use of the advance poll and offset any argument about the expense involved.

I appreciate that to increase the advance poll from two days to four days would decrease the time available for the revised lists to come from the revising officers to the deputy returning officer, but if this amendment is accepted I will move two consequential amendments. These are to rules 39 and 58, schedule A, clause 18. They were introduced by the hon. member for Selkirk and allowed to stand. The amendments would move the last day of revision back to the fourteenth day before polling day rather than the thirteenth day, thus allowing three days instead of two for the transmission of the revised lists from the revising officers to the deputy returning officer. I hope hon. members will agree that this amendment will widen the opportunity for people to cast their ballot and I commend it to the committee.

Mr. St. Pierre: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take up much of the time of the committee. I support this amendment. It will improve the opportunity for people to vote at advance polls. I understand the system has been very unsatisfactory in the past. In the case of my own riding, it has served very few people. Even with this amendment, however, I am afraid the improvement will be slight because advance polls apply only in a few areas and not in some of the more remote areas of the country. It is an improvement, however, and I urge the committee to support the motion.

Mr. Macquarrie: I must say, Mr. Chairman, and not just because it is the hon. member's last amendment, that I also support this amendment. In many parts of the country four days would not be necessary, but because in some parts this amount of time is necessary, and being desirous of widening the opportunity for people to vote conveniently, I think this is a helpful suggestion.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, I should like to draw to the attention of the committee some of the consequences of this amendment, in terms of formal procedure, which have been brought to my attention. The principal concern about our having advance polls on four days instead of two is that it would increase the risk of tampering with ballot boxes. The ballot box is made available and set up on the first day of the advance poll and under our present system the poll only has to be reopened once. With this amendment the poll would be reopened two additional times and it would be around for that additional period. In the view of the Chief Electoral Officer, this increases the risk of the ballot box being tampered with.

The cost would be exactly double, but perhaps that is not the most important consideration. One of the most important changes in the section is one which the committee recommended to subclause 3 of clause 92. Under the present provisions of the act, notice of the advance poll is published only on the twelfth day before the ordinary polling day which is only two clear days before the first day of the advance poll.

It is proposed by this amendment that the notice will be published on the thirtieth day before polling day, so that much longer notice will be available. This is perhaps the most significant amendment to the advance poll proposal. One consequential amendment to which the hon. member referred would create a further problem with regard to transmitting the revised list of electors to the advance poll. The notice of objection to the entry of an elector on the revised list, which must be mailed on Friday, would certainly not be received until Monday and therefore would be virtually useless. In other words, the possibility of objection proceedings under the revisions system would be effectively reduced by this change. I hope the committee will consider these procedural and administrative problems which could arise if the amendment were adopted.

• (5:40 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Chairman, the amendment moved by the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin) is interesting, I think, because it gives Canadians a greater possibility to exercise their franchise.

However, it goes without saying as the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) would say that it could bring about some technical problems and in some ways jeopardize the integrity of the vote and the safety of the ballot boxes.

There is another point which I should like to mention, namely that advance pools will be open on a Saturday and a Monday. If people are absent on polling day or on the Saturday and Monday, advance polling days, they cannot exercise their franchise.

If a great deal of publicity comes directly from the office of the Chief Electoral Officer, with regard to advance polls, people will certainly have more opportunities to go and vote there. As members of Parliament, we are responsible for finding all possible means which will allow a greater number of citizens to take advantage of their right to vote. I am concerned about the possible technical effects of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre and therefore before giving it my support, I should like to know about the consequential amendments.

I am not ready yet to agree to the passage of this clause as proposed because it restricts the chances of the citizens to avail themselves of their right to vote. I have always considered this as a basic principle: We must offer every citizen every opportunity to exercise his franchise.

I should therefore like the member for Regina-Lake Centre to introduce his two other amendments, that hon. members might know his overall proposals with regard to advance polls and thus be enlightened.

I should also like the President of the Privy Council to tell us whether or not he intends to increase the publicity on advance polls, that the citizens might know they exist. Going by my very limited personal experience, I feel several persons do not use their franchise on election day because physically they cannot do so or because they do not know about advance polls. Adequate information in this regard may depend on the political organization of the various parties or else on that of Parliament. It seems to me those two solutions stand too far apart and that perhaps a happy medium should be found.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Yes, Mr. Chairman, I can assure the hon. member that the Chief Electoral Officer intends to give more publicity, in particular, to the matter of advance polls; he advises me that he will endeavour to obtain more credits to do so with a view to ensuring especially that all citizens know they are entitled to vote at the advance polls.

[*English*]

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a short comment about the proposition put forward. Where there is a will there is a way. If the President of the Privy Council wanted to do this, it could be done. The technical and administrative problems which have been talked about are not insurmountable. There may be some difficulty about Thursday, the eleventh day before polling day.

If there is a disposition to accept the idea in principle—I put this forward purely as my own suggestion and not as one endorsed by my colleague for Regina-Lake Centre—I submit, bearing in mind what the President of the Privy Council has said, that if we persist in proposing four days the amendment may well be defeated; therefore, the committee may well consider three days before polling day, namely, the Friday, Saturday and Monday, the tenth, ninth and seventh days before polling day. I point out that at one time advance polls, under the authority of the Canada Elections Act, used to be open for three days. They were, I believe, the Thursday, Friday and Saturday of the week preceding the week in which the election was held, or the weekend before polling day if polling day was on a Monday or a Tuesday.

That provision did not appear to present any tremendous difficulties so far as tampering with ballot boxes is concerned. I tend to discount such difficulties. I submit that if someone wants to tamper and fly in the face of the legislative sanctions which are designed to prevent abuses, he will tamper. Expanding the time to four days will not increase the likelihood of people tampering and will not really, I submit, increase the time in which there may be tampering. I did not fully grasp what was said about the time factor and about notification reaching officials in time. Rather than run the risk of seeing the entire proposal defeated, may I suggest an alternative proposal, namely, that the committee consider the Friday, Saturday and Monday, the tenth, ninth and seventh days.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the alternative suggestion reduces the risk by at least one half; it reduces it by at least one occasion. The risk about which we are concerned is still there, and is there even for two days. In the propos-

al, the risk is 50 per cent greater than it otherwise would be. With regard to the time element, this is eased by one day but it would still be very difficult for the objection procedure to operate.

The Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question on the amendment of the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre?

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Before you put the motion, Mr. Chairman, may I say that I think the President of the Privy Council in effect endorsed what I was saying, although he was pessimistic and said the alternative proposal would increase the risk by 50 per cent. Actually, it would reduce it by 50 per cent with respect to the proposition which had been put forward. Although he suggested that the administrative difficulties would be much the same, I would move an amendment to the amendment, to delete the words "Thursday" and "eleventh". If carried, the subamendment would say, "Advance polls shall be open between the hours of eight o'clock in the forenoon and eight o'clock in the afternoon of Friday, Saturday and Monday, the tenth, ninth and seventh days before the ordinary polling day, and shall not be open at any other time."

The Chairman: The committee has heard the subamendment. The question is on the subamendment.

Amendment to the amendment (Mr. Howard, Skeena) negatived: yeas, 9; nays, 16.

The Chairman: I declare the subamendment lost. The question is now on the amendment.

Amendment (Mr. Benjamin) negatived: Yeas, 6; nays, 18.

The Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

• (5:50 p.m.)

Subclauses 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 92 agreed to.

Clauses 93 to 97 inclusive agreed to.

On clause 98, subclause—1—*Who shall not be appointed election officers.*

Mr. Forest: Mr. Chairman, I wish to move an amendment in substitution of paragraph (e) so that the description of the judges who are not eligible to act as election officers will be more up-to-date, so I move:

That Bill C-215 be amended by striking out lines 11 to 18 on page 190 and substituting the following:

[Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale).]

"(e) judges and deputy judges of any superior, county or district court or any bankruptcy or insolvency court and, in the Yukon Territory and the Northwest Territories, police magistrates;"

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, I do not want to comment on the amendment; I use the occasion to ask a question. What is the rationale for excluding from these offices ministers, priests and ecclesiastics?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, I am not sure whether it is because they are regarded as being of such unimpeachable integrity that it would be undesirable to expose their integrity to impeachment, or the opposite. I know the provision has been there for quite a while.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I am not advancing their cause here particularly, but I wonder about it. If it does not appear to have any sense or rationale which can be advanced by the President of the Privy Council, why not remove it? In very remote areas such a person may be the only one available who might be able properly to operate the election machinery.

Mr. Forrestall: With all due respect to the clergy, we all know that these appointments are mostly political. I would not like to be guilty of submitting a list that includes a lot of church people, because it might be misconstrued.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Some men of the cloth who come to mind are also highly political. I cannot offer the rationale for the clause; therefore I cannot offer the rationale for continuing it. The hon. member may want to move an amendment.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): What is wrong with us, anyway?

The Chairman: There is now an amendment before the committee. Perhaps we could dispose of it before we have a further amendment.

Amendment (Mr. Forest) agreed to.

The Chairman: Are there to be further amendments to this clause?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Another reason that might be advanced is this: I know of no group who need to earn a few extra dollars more than some ministers. I move:

That paragraph (d) of subclause 1 be deleted.

Amendment (Mr. Knowles, Winnipeg North Centre) agreed to.

Subclauses 1 and 2 agreed to.

On clause 98, subclause 3—*Age of returning officer.*

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a sacrificial offering to the committee by announcing that the amendment that I indicated I would propose, regarding the age of returning officers, will not be presented. This has nothing to do with my judgment as to the prospect of its being carried.

Subclause 3 agreed to.

On clause 98, subclause 4—*Exceptions.*

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): As a result of the amendment to paragraph (d) of subclause 1, the first three lines of subclause 4 do not apply in the electoral districts mentioned in schedule III, and should be deleted. It is no longer relevant. Perhaps I can prepare an amendment in those terms.

Clause 98 stands.

On clause 99, subclause 1—*Political broadcasts forbidden.*

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to this subclause, but I notice it is now six o'clock.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed at 8 p.m.

The Chairman: Order, please. When the committee rose at six o'clock clause 99 (1) was under discussion.

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, this time I intend to proceed with a promised amendment to subclause 1. I have myself distributed to the various parties copies of this concise and incisive amendment, which reads as follows:

That subclause 1 of clause 99 of the bill be amended by striking out the words "one day" in line 7, page 191 thereof, and substituting therefor the words "two days".

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Agreed.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): This amendment will, of course, if adopted, have the effect of returning the Elections Act to the state in which it was before the last election campaign as far as this particular area is concerned.

Hon. members will recall that the Broadcasting Act was amended some years ago, reducing the blackout period or moratorium on broadcasting in political campaigns to the day before election day, plus election day itself. The Elections Act as it stood at that time had a broadcasting blackout which was operative for two days before polling day. During the last election campaign there was some doubt on the part of all parties about which provision was most binding. Some acted on the assumption that the Elections Act was applicable because it was the specific law which applied, while others acted on the basis that the Broadcasting Act was applicable because it had been most recently passed in time.

To a degree, then, this controversy will be resolved by reason of the fact that the Elections Act will now be the most recent. For my part, I would be inclined to agree with the decision of Parliament in the sixties. I do not really follow the merit of the two-day moratorium and I would be glad to hear argument on this point. I believe the committee did not deal with the question at great length.

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, My recollection is that the reduction from two days to one is a proposal by the government which differs from the recommendation of the committee. I presume the committee members here are convinced, as I am, that the original proposition did have merit. This provision has proven in many cases to be a valuable and—I believe the electorate would say—a valued reprieve from heavy electioneering. Whether the people who own the networks would prefer a 24-hour period to a 48-hour period is immaterial to me as one who has been involved in wondering how in heaven's name the bills for television and radio were ever to be paid in any case.

• (8:10 p.m.)

Considering that the election campaign period has not been diminished by the introduction of a permanent voters' list, our people are subjected to a campaign lasting something like eight weeks, during which time the bombardment through the media becomes quite intense. I think there is great value in having what one might call an intellectual cooling off period. I have talked this question over with many of my colleagues in various parties and we have found the 48 hours to be very valuable to constituents as well as extremely useful to the organizations as a means of taking

one's breath, as it were, on the Friday night, with a full day Saturday and then the sabbath. By Monday people have mulled over all the issues and the time has come for personal contact. I have also checked with people in provincial election campaigns where there is no specific blackout under the Broadcasting Act, and they expressed a pretty strong feeling that they wished to heaven the period of blackout had been 48 hours rather than 24 hours. On the aspect of expense alone, this matter is extremely important and it does clear the air of argument.

The committee may recall that it was originally thought there was value in the blackout in preventing any last minute feedback with no opportunity to straighten out any distortion or to challenge an outrageous allegation. There is still value in this. I have the feeling that after the poor public have been hammered at for eight weeks, a 48-hour respite before they go to the polls is not too much to ask. If I might discuss another piece of legislation, I think the logical step at some time is to make the Broadcasting Act consistent with the Canada Elections Act. I have never heard of any member of the public being so thirsty for an extra political speech that he had requested an extra day. I hear the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce suggesting something over there.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): He said, "You don't know the people in Drummondville".

Mr. Macquarrie: Some places offer purer springs and perhaps thereby inculcate a heavier thirst, but I think God was always able to convince my intelligent people, within the last 48 hours, what course of action they should take. But seriously, to avoid last minute contradictions, last minute pollsters, last minute repetition of Gallup polls, last minute influencing and particularly last minute bombardment of the public, I think the 48-hour blackout, which has worked very well, should be restored.

Mr. Cafik: Would the hon. member permit a question? Would he like to see all forms of advertising in broadcasting, such as broadcasting by loudspeaker, eliminated; or is he thinking of a two-day moratorium for radio and TV only?

Mr. Macquarrie: I do not want to sound like a geront on this matter, but in 1960 there was some discussion of this question. In fact, an amendment was made and many members of the committee, those from the province of Quebec in particular, pointed out that prohibiting broadcasting by loudspeaker even on the Sunday was very unhelpful because the pattern in the province of Quebec when there were gatherings on the Sunday before election day was to use a loudspeaker, which was thought very helpful. I remember the hon. member for Carleton saying that he was quite in favour of that but it would not do him any good to have a Sunday meeting in his constituency. I remember we removed that provision from the act. However, at the moment I am thinking only of radio and television. I know of no way of giving the newspaper publisher a slack day; all I had in mind was the radio and television media.

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Chairman, I would put a question to the President of the Privy Council. I do not understand why there is this kind of restriction on radio and television but no restriction on the use of loudspeakers or on newspapers. What is the reason for that?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, I think the point is well taken. I suppose there is a feeling that newspapers do not have the same immediacy and impact as the broadcasting media. There is a restriction on loudspeakers operating on polling day. I suppose it is a question of the immediacy of its effect. The assumption I was making was that newspaper advertising, particularly on election day, has less impact than radio and television. Loudspeakers would probably not be used on the Sunday for reasons of good taste.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, there are a couple of factors involved in this question. Many people take the view that because there has been a containment within the Elections Act, broadcasting by radio and television has not been permitted up until now during the 48 hours preceding polling day. This has carried with it in the minds of many people the implication that no campaigning should be conducted during the same period. I am sure every member of the House has heard someone say that he thought the campaigning ended on the Friday night, either at eight o'clock in the evening or at midnight, and that there was this period of the Saturday and Sunday, with an election being held on a Monday, as is usually the case, for quiet contemplation of the issues. The companion feeling was also expressed that the people wish this to be so in order that they have a respite from the inundation of radio and television propaganda, news propaganda and last minute efforts to convince people to vote for one party or another.

Perhaps this has been brought into sharp focus by the introduction of television into the communications media which is, in effect, a sort of invasion of a person's home and privacy—though he can, of course, repel that invasion by simply switching off the set. It has also been brought into sharp focus by the activation of political party propaganda mechanisms to the point where they will have maximum effect. The conclusion has been drawn that the maximum effect will be felt nearer to election day rather than further from it, though the general public has reacted against this. As I assess the situation from what people have said, they appreciate and enjoy the 48-hour prohibition. This prohibition is that during the last two days of an election campaign privacy shall not be invaded by political propagandizing on radio, television and the like.

• (8:20 p.m.)

There are elements within the newsmedia that do not do this. Some elements have up to now interpreted the prohibition in the Elections Act in respect of radio and television broadcasting to apply to news generally and have refused to distribute election information during that 48-hour period. They recognize the fact that the general public at that stage has had enough of inundation, advertising, promotion, propagandizing and exhortation by way of radio and television. They want a period of tranquility and non-invasion of their thoughts; they want a period when there is no political pushing and promoting.

Many people have probably made up their minds by this time. I think if you were to draw a graph of the situation you would find that as you get closer to polling day fewer and fewer people remain undecided. Perhaps the majority would say they had come to a decision and determined how they would vote. For this reason they do not need to be exhorted any longer, they do not need to be told any longer about the values of this party or the weaknesses of that party, they no longer need to be told the virtues of this candidate as opposed to another candidate, because they have decided. The people who have not decided are fewer and fewer as you get closer to election day. I think we must give cognizance to this fact.

The President of the Privy Council has said there is a proscription within the act and on election day one shall not use loud-hailers, loudspeakers or travelling microphone-amplifier systems to exhort people to vote a certain way or not to vote a certain way. The admission is that even on the day of polling there should be quietude without propagandizing through the news media. The government has also admitted that on the day prior to polling day there should be a broadcasting quietude; that is a day when there should be no radio or television promotional activity. It is hard to draw a line as to how long this period should be. One might suggest two days, three days, four days or 56 hours. Whichever one you pick is an arbitrary period, admittedly, but the fact is that for many years we have had in the Elections Act the concept that there should be a two-day period, usually a Saturday and a Sunday.

Most elections fall on Monday. I think the last election was deliberately designed to take advantage of St. Jean Baptiste Day. It was held on a Tuesday. That was a political decision. As far back as I can remember, and for many years before that, elections have been held on Monday, with the concept that the Saturday and Sunday should be days of tranquility, with relief from political pressure, propaganda, advertising, pushing and promoting. The general public appreciates the tranquility and enjoys this period. During the last week and a half or the last two weeks, depending on the judgment of the candidate and the party, there is a concentration of pressure. This two-day period of Saturday and Sunday should be a time of relative sanctity without one being subjected to the intensity of political campaign pressures. It should be a period of quietude and reflection for the voters. I endorse the idea of retaining this provision which has been in our Elections Act for many years.

Apropos the question asked earlier as to whether this proscription should apply just to radio and television—we are dealing with a particular section of the act that directs itself only to radio, television advertising and promotion—I endorse the idea that newspaper advertising and all other forms of political campaigning should cease on these days. I realize at the moment of saying or even thinking about it that it is hard to define what is political campaigning. Election day itself involves political campaigning. The fact that a candidate is present at a polling station, smiling and saying hello to the people, is political campaigning. Unless you remove the candidate and all his campaign workers you cannot have anything but campaigning right up to the last ballot being cast. There is cam-

paigning even after the polls are closed, by candidates who go around to thank the deputy returning officer. These candidates are looking to the future.

There should be some sort of legalistic or legislative cut-off date after which inundation by propaganda and information is prohibited as much as possible. Much of the information is false. I do not use that word in its true sense, because political campaigning is designed to advance the cause of one party or one candidate over another. There should be such a period of rest. I think the Saturday and Sunday before the election on Monday, the normal polling day under the Elections Act, is a sufficient period. We must also remember the view expressed by the Standing Committee. It had a majority of Liberal members. The committee studied this and many other questions in depth. That committee did its best to bring about a good Elections Act which was fair, just and equitable. The Committee was made up of Liberals, Conservatives, NDP members and members of the Ralliement Créditiste, who I might say were not in attendance very often. The committee made an attempt to treat this matter in a non-partisan way, without advancing partisan objectives.

The majority of the members of the committee felt that a two-day period was sufficient. The members thought we should be developing electoral law and should not succumb to the view expressed about the provisions of the Radio Act in relation to the Monday or a 24-hour period.

Mr. Francis: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Howard (Skeena): My friend may not ask a question at this juncture. When I have concluded my remarks I will entertain questions and do my best to answer them. The fundamental point is the one I made at the outset. The general public appreciate this period of quietude, tranquility and non-involvement, without pressure through propaganda on radio and television. This fact should have the greatest impact on us. I think we should pay attention to the desires of the electorate in this regard. So far as I have been able to assess the situation, their desire is that all campaigning should end on the Friday night. Most people have made up their minds by the Friday night preceding an election and they should have this period of non-involvement, tranquility and quietude. They want this period in order to reflect and make a determination about how they should vote on election day.

• (8:30 p.m.)

Mr. Francis: Mr. Chairman, I listened with some interest to the remarks of the hon. member. I agree with his observation that the committee, in looking at this matter, was not guided by partisan considerations. I believe, however, that the consensus of the committee is in the report which is before us. After considerable discussion on the point, the majority view was that the period should be one day.

Mr. Benjamin: Where does this appear in the report?

Mr. Francis: I attended the committee meeting at that time. I was not consistently a member. I recall the vote being put during the proceedings that day. I could find the reference, but I do not think my memory is wrong in this regard. I think the majority opinion was that it should be a period of one day before election day. Members of the committee recognized the fact as expressed by the hon. member for Skeena, that our federal elections are held on a Monday and will continue to be so held in the future. I do not believe there is any indication to the contrary. The prohibition against campaigning on Sunday is not contained entirely within the Canada Elections Act; it is also contained in municipal ordinances. In addition, many voters take exception to any political activity on Sunday. The problem is that usually there are a large number of activities on the Saturday before the Monday election.

The committee was anxious to be uniform and not discriminate among the news media. The newspapers were perfectly free to print everything they wanted to print on the Saturday before the Monday election. Door-to-door canvassers also were perfectly free to invade what the hon. member called the sanctity of the voters, including a number of supporters of this party. In this regard there was a considerable amount of confusion and discrimination among the news media. It was felt that if we were to apply the 48-hour rule consistently, across the board, we would have to apply it to newspapers and that in respect of the Broadcasting Act we would have to upset long-established practices which have been built into our electoral system since the beginning of this country. This was a decision of the majority of the committee after consid-

erable debate and after listening to many arguments. It was advocated that there was only one way in which to be consistent, and that was to put the one-day rule into effect and rigidly enforce it.

The idea is that there will be no campaigning on the Sunday before election day, no advertising and no door-to-door canvassing or use of sound equipment. This rule in no small part would be enforced, as would any general rule, by the standards of good taste in the community and a desire not to offend the electors, as much as by the prohibition which would be written into the act. No matter what members think, the fact is that if the two-day rule were put into the act, this would not stop most of the activities described as reprehensible, and there would be some discrimination between the press and other activities. On balance, members of the committee thought that the one-day rule would be enforceable and would be consistent with the good taste of the community. Any other rule, in the opinion of the committee, would not be enforceable.

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, I have a small reaction to the remarks of the hon. member who has just resumed his seat. I do not think this provision refers to the use of loudspeakers at public meetings. To that extent there is no effort made to curtail what in fact is the amplification of the human voice at a political meeting. Also, it should be borne in mind that there are communities in Canada which have Sunday newspapers. Even the 24-hour blackout will not cure this problem. I am very sorry this question has caused division in an otherwise harmonious day, but as I understand it there has been the thought in this one area at least that we could cut down some of the raucous, cacophonous sounds which are part of a healthy political campaign. Of course, this in itself would not stop the hon. member for Skeena travelling about his constituency on the Saturday. He might even do so on Sunday, though I as a God-fearing Presbyterian go to church on Sunday and hope for the best.

An hon. Member: Not all day.

Mr. Macquarrie: Not all day, but after being involved in politics so long, I need it. One has to be pragmatic about this matter. It cannot be suggested that by moving from 48 hours to 24 hours we are bringing in a foolproof measure, and that with the 24-hour period we will have a total blackout for 24 hours whereas with the 48-hour period we had only a partial blackout. I say again that the 48-hour period would work. If this means amending the Broadcasting Act, I agree with the hon. member for Skeena that it should be amended. It is no more difficult to amend the Broadcasting Act than it is to amend the Canada Elections Act. I have studied this question very carefully and I see no reason why this avenue should be left open any nearer to the actual day of decision. I should like to think that the Canadian people make up their minds after reflection and consideration. I think they are helped, as the hon. member for Skeena said, by having their living-rooms and lawns to themselves, in so far as the electronic media are concerned for that weekend, the Saturday and Sunday. There are many fine Canadians to whom Saturday is in fact the Sabbath day.

Mr. Otto: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Skeena said there are many people who would like to have a 48-hour prohibition against television and radio. I suppose there are a great many people who would like to have an eight-week prohibition against television and radio in an election campaign. But I am wondering about the sanctity of this one day. The gentleman from Skeena said that the day before the election, the Sunday, should be sacred, quiet and peaceful. He suggested that it should not be interrupted by dirty politics. I think this is the root of the whole question. There would seem to be the connotation that political activity on television or radio has some semblance of dirty business.

At one time, possibly, politics was dirty business and if one were a Presbyterian like the hon. gentleman for Hillsborough, one would wish to avoid politics at all costs, especially on Sunday. Now we have this clamour for a 48-hour prohibition so that the Sunday would be peaceful, especially on television, and so the people would not be interrupted by politics and would be able to enjoy the hockey games, "I Love Lucy," Ed Sullivan, the "FBI" and all the other programs which are shown on television on Sunday. The reason is that politics is just too horrible a subject to contemplate on a Sunday. Now they want to include Saturday.

• (8:40 p.m.)

Mr. Howard: No.

Mr. Otto: You want not only Sunday prohibited but also Saturday. Under this provi-

sion there would be a 24-hour prohibition, not a 48-hour prohibition. I suggest that a large number of people who are quite busy during the week, especially the week before an election, would have no objection to sitting at home on Saturday, if that is the day they want to sit at home, listening to the arguments put forth by all sides. Maybe on that day they would make up their minds. If they do not want to listen to the program, they can easily go out or switch to another channel; not every channel is carrying the election. I think the argument makes no sense. I think the 24-hour prohibition under the act is enough.

People do not contemplate politics on a Sunday, believe me. They contemplate many other things, the least of which is politics. If they had made up their minds on the previous Saturday, it would make no difference. If they had not made up their minds, possibly the Saturday within the 48-hour period would give them the opportunity to do so and would be of great benefit to them and to the country.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment which would in effect reinstate the provisions of the present Elections Act regarding the 48 hours prohibition rather than changing it, as proposed, to 24 hours. I do so because I rely on my memory as well as does the hon. member for Ottawa West. As I recall—I stand to be corrected on this—the committee was badly divided and it may well have erred, because there is nothing in the report concerning this item. I have gone over the report hurriedly and I may have missed it, but as far as I can see there is nothing in it on this item.

As I recall, the committee was badly divided on this question. By a slight majority it agreed that we would revert to the 24-hour prohibition. The lack of unanimity crossed party lines. The House has already set up a special committee on election expenses. I suggest this is another item—arguments were presented along this line earlier today—that might well be left until we have a report with recommendations from the committee on election expenses. The present act contains a provision for 48 hours. I think we should leave it that way until we have the proposed legislation.

I am not of the same opinion as my friends the hon. member for Hillsborough and the hon. member for Skeena regarding time for quietude and time to meditate on how I am going to vote on the Monday. I suspect that I, like most voters will head for the lake that day and I am not likely to think about how I shall vote on election day. I would rather put it on more hardnosed, realistic grounds.

This provision will give aid and comfort to the broadcasters, who will get another 24 hours of selling broadcasting time to political parties and candidates who might be suckers enough to blow some more money, because in fact most of them will have run out of money by that time, in a last-gasp, panic effort to stay elected or become elected. I also put forward a similar argument to the one I presented earlier today, that this provision would give an unfair advantage to a party or candidate who happens to have some money or supporters who can throw in a few hundred or a few thousand dollars for a last minute broadcast. The last effort to grab the voter demeans and perverts the electoral process. I understand that the Broadcasting Act provides for one day, while the Elections Act provides for two days. It seems to me that the Elections Act should take priority over the Broadcasting Act. Therefore, the Broadcasting Act should be amended, not the Elections Act, particularly until the recommendations and report of the committee on election expenses have been made.

Like the hon. member for Ottawa West, I am only relying on my memory but, as I recall, the committee agreed that in this regard the Broadcasting Act should be amended rather than the Elections Act. Either one, or both of us could be wrong on this point. That is why I think the committee of the whole should accept the amendment of the hon. member for Hillsborough until we receive the report of the committee on election expenses and the proposed legislation. I see no reason why this committee should give aid and comfort to the broadcasting industry, which will only add another 10 per cent to its tariffs because it happened to be an election period. I think we should do everything we can to head off and limit the last minute, panic, exorbitant expenditures by candidates of parties, no matter who they may be. I hope we will adopt the amendment of the hon. member for Hillsborough and leave the act as it is. We can go into the matter in greater detail at the next session of Parliament. I hope the committee will support this amendment.

Mr. Macquarrie: I know it is not the usual procedure to harp back to the proceedings of the Standing Committee, but I take exception to what the hon. member from across the way

suggested when he said that the Standing Committee supported the one-day blackout. In my firm recollection, endorsed by what my colleague the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East has shown me, it was the other way round.

Mr. Francis: The hon. member may well be right. If I am not correct, I withdraw what I said in that respect.

Mr. Forrestall: I would like to make one of the greatest speeches ever made in the House and say la même chose, me too; Dartmouth-Halifax East wants 48 hours.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): So does Winnipeg North Centre.

The Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question on the amendment?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Amendment (Mr. Macquarrie) negatived: Yeas, 21; nays, 25.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

• (8:50 p.m.)

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, I congratulate all those on the government side who obviously did not know what was going on or what the situation was, but solidly voted with the government—with the exception of the hon. member for Sarnia, of course. I did not quite grasp—

The Chairman: Order, please. I do not think this procedure is correct. If the hon. member would like to contribute to the discussion on the clause, of course he may; but I do not think it is proper to comment on the voting practice of members.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): It may not be proper, Mr. Chairman, to comment on the voting practice and the way the vote went, but I simply wanted to congratulate those "blind" people on the other side.

Mr. Walker: Mr. Chairman, on this point I found it much easier to grasp the issue than hon. members did in explaining what they had in mind.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, that is obvious. When one takes direction, as the hon. gentleman did, one does not have to grasp anything.

Mr. Cafik: Mr. Chairman, I should like to move an amendment to clause 99, subclause 1, in order to clarify a point that is rather vague. In respect of the definition of "broadcasting" in the fourth line on page 191, clause 99, subclause 1, after the word "broadcasts" I should like to insert the words "via radio, television, or loudspeaker". Most of us have agreed that there should be a period of peace and quiet in which people can decide how to cast their ballot. Although I think one day is sufficient, other hon. members may think there should be two days. In any event, if we allow messages to be blasted into the homes of unwilling listeners, this is not ensuring peace and quiet. If there is an argument for a moratorium on radio and television, surely there is a greater argument with respect to the use of loudspeakers. At least radio and television can be turned off, but this is not possible in respect of broadcasting from a car the day before the election. I suggest that this amendment should be adopted.

Mr. Otto: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the hon. gentleman a question. In his interpretation, does loudspeaker include a loudspeaker at a private meeting? A microphone is a loudspeaker. How did the hon. member define loudspeaker; must it be a loudspeaker attached to a moving vehicle?

An hon. Member: You are a loud speaker yourself.

Mr. Cafik: Mr. Chairman, there are many definitions of loud speaker; many people have accused me of being one without my having any electronic aid. I had in mind a moving loudspeaker which is taken out onto the highways and byways. I do not intend to prohibit in any way the use of a microphone by those who require it.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, I should make it clear that the word "broadcasting" is used here in the sense that is defined in the Interpretation Act and in the Broadcasting Act, that is, it is confined to broadcasting by electronic means. This amendment might be appropriate in another clause of the bill, but I suggest it is not appropriate when we are talking about the specific issue of broadcasting.

Mr. Cafik: Would the President of the Privy Council care to suggest in which clause such an amendment would be appropriate?

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, I am amazed that a government backbencher asks the advice of the government front bench on a matter that is not government policy. The

matter I wish to raise is of more serious consequence, that is, the matter of prohibition.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): We abolished that this afternoon.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Apart from the fact that everybody but the hon. member for Ontario knows that television is included in the area of broadcasting, surely we must consider this question in terms of campaigning. Maybe this is what we are getting at, a period in which to reflect. I think the member for York East put the matter in perspective when he asked what kind of loudspeaker was meant, and was it one that runs up and down the street. That point was not clarified. Is it one in use at a public meeting? This type is permissible.

This raises the question of ordinary canvassing when someone comes knocking at the door early in the morning. Are we going to proscribe this? Is it less an invasion of privacy than the loud-hailer travelling up and down the street? Which is more offensive? Telephone calls soliciting votes are also more offensive than the loud-hailer on the street, in my opinion. At least the loud-hailer passes by and sometimes is gone before one hears the message.

I think this point puts in perspective the question of having a period of quietude. To say that broadcasting should be prohibited takes the question beyond radio and television. But the member for Ontario talks about loudspeakers without defining what he means. Does he mean the mobile loudspeaker? His amendment does not clarify that point. We are here to enact law, not to interpret what somebody means. A court will not pay any attention to what the member for Ontario meant but will undoubtedly come to the conclusion that a loudspeaker used in a hall to broadcast outside the hall is the same sort of thing as a loudspeaker which is mobile because it is mounted on a truck. If we are to talk about prohibition we must be inclusive. Consider candidates campaigning in northern climes. If we have an election in the middle of winter, why not ship us off to Florida for three or four months?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Howard (Skeena): We might make the prohibition operative for two or three weeks before election day. This is what we are talking about. We are also talking about the effect of a campaign in an urban area as distinct from a rural area. As the member for York East said, one can turn the television switch to a channel being broadcast from somewhere in the United States, or you can hook up to a mechanism which we do not have at home, cablevision.

• (9:00 p.m.)

The law that we will pass provides that you shall not broadcast from outside the country a political program or political exhortation into the country, and the only news items and the like shall be carried. So it may be all right for the hon. member for York East to make his proposals: he comes from the Toronto area and Toronto is almost a province by itself. It is an enclave and its people have little knowledge of places such as British Columbia. The reverse of the situation is also true. But people in Toronto who are involved in election campaigns have no knowledge of the situation that may exist in rural areas—in Skeena, for example.

Allow me to relate the situation of my neighbour who represents the constituency of Prince George-Peace River. The area is served by one television station which is a CBC affiliate. That is all. You cannot turn to another channel; you turn your set on or off. We know that people like to watch television programs. But most of the people in northern Canada are captive. People in the far reaches of British Columbia are captive to an even greater extent because there the CBC decides not only what to show but shows it in package form. In some parts of the province we see on television hockey games that were played three weeks before. We get late in the evening, afternoon programs that are designed for the housewife. Children's programs, designed to be shown in urban areas in the monring, are shown in parts of British Columbia at supper time or early evening. That shows how captive we are. In these areas there is a reactiion against certain types of political broadcasts and the inundation of political ideas because there is no alternative to them.

Mr. Chappell: Will the hon. member permit a question at this time? I was wondering if the hon. member for—

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Skeena.

An hon. Member: See, they don't know British Columbia.

Mr. Chappell: —Skeena has considered that the mobile loudspeaker would offend anti-

noise bylaws in every reasonably developed municipality. You might say that a charge could be laid, but by the time the charge is heard in court, one month after the event, the election will be over and the fine probably will be $50. Is it fair that a politician should be able to offend that bylaw and pay a $50 fine? Should we not recognize that such noise constitutes pollution and annoys people? Should we not put into this act, where it can be meaningful, the provision that the election of candidates who break the law in this respect—people with mobile loudspeakers—may be put in jeopardy?

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I do not, on principle, disagree with that statement. I suggest to the hon. gentleman that the party he supports knows a lot more about pollution than most others and is doing less about it than anybody else. The greatest offenders in the area of noise pollution are hon. gentlemen opposite. If the question of the hon. gentleman opposite has any validity, I submit that this prohibition is valid two days before an election even more than it is on the day before an election. My hon. friend will not accept that because he has been told by the President of the Privy Council to do as he is told.

Mr. Cafik: That is not true.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): It is true.

I tell my hon. friend from Ontario that the proof of this will be found when he votes. The proof is not in what my hon. friend says.

Mr. Cafik: Mr. Chairman, I absolutely resent the hon. member's suggesting that I have been ordered by the President of the Privy Council or anybody else to vote any way on this or any other issue that I have had to vote on. It is just not true. The hon. member seems to think he can say these nasty things and get away with them. I say that he jolly well cannot.

The Chairman: Order, please. Perhaps we could return to the proposition before us. Has the hon. member for Skeena concluded his remarks?

An hon. Member: Yes.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I thought I had, Mr. Chairman, but the fact is—

The Chairman: Order, please. I would caution against continuing the dialogue that has just started. I do not think it is in our interest to continue it. I would ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the amendment.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, I could not agree with you more, because it is the hon. member for Ontario who started this conversation.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Howard (Skeena): The fact is that the hon. member for Ontario must have been completely blind to the situation, because I was not referring to him at all. He must be extremely sensitive about this matter. He must be just protesting against the fact, because I was not thinking of him at all. I know he is an independent member and I know he will tell the cabinet what he thinks.

The Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I know he will do this.

The Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Yet here he is, standing up—

The Chairman: Order, please. I have already invited the hon. member to confine his remarks to the amendment before us. The same applies to all other hon. members. It seems to me that not only is this the correct procedure but it is the procedure that is likely to yield the best results in the course of this evening's debate.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, I could not agree with you more, with great respect. I wish you had taken that tack when the hon. member for Ontario ran away with himself, but you obviously did not want to do that.

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, I ask myself, where has the sweet harmony of this afternoon gone? I expected that when the hon. member for Ontario rose he would suggest that we abolish even the 24-hour blackout, since we have heard how virtuous a matter is the exposure of the public to the electronics media. I am somewhat concerned—I hope the hon. member for York Centre will be satisfied with my presentation, because he commented on this matter earlier—by the suggestion that we broaden this prohibition. There is sometimes great wisdom in taking things step by step, rather than making sweeping, all-embracing moves.

In radio and television we knew exactly the type of media we were considering. When you start moving into other areas, you must ask yourself questions. What about the small meeting held by a gentle, mild candidate like myself, with a low voice, so low that even if there were only 40 people in the room he might need a microphone? Might this not be described, perhaps, as an electronic device? One could not use a pre-electronic age megaphone because that would be rather cumbersome.

I still think we are naïve in expecting to pass anything in this piece of legislation which will stop people from assembling together on a Saturday; and when they have assembled together it would be rather strange, in this electronics age, if we inhibited the use of those devices which make it easier for one to communicate with those who are about him. So I feel that we are embarking upon an area that is very, very difficult to define. I think we cannot go too far in this area and be productive. I mentioned earlier the question of newspapers and the fact that some publish on Sunday, although I must confess we have only a few. We shall not cover the whole bag here and we must be content with what we have. I regret very much the increasing acerbity of the debate; I trust it will not continue. I have always looked upon the Elections Act not as something designed to give advantage to this side or to that side. I am not reflecting on the vote, but I was a little surprised at the fate of the last amendment. If we look upon this as a piece of legislation which all of us as individuals, irrespective of our political label, are approaching with a desire to make as good as we can, we will make a good deal more progress.

● (9:10 p.m.)

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Chairman, at the outset I intended to second some of the remarks of the hon. member for Skeena. However, the debate became so provocative that I will try to imitate our philosopher from Prince Edward Island; I will try to be very quiet in my presentation to the committee.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chairman, unfortunately I cannot support the amendment of the member for Ontario (Mr. Cafik) for reasons that seem obvious. In view of my experience in my own province, I feel that several candidates, in rural ridings, on the very last night before the elections, and at times in the morning, when mass comes out, have to convene people from five or six neighbouring municipalities to give them a last message. There is no other way of reaching them.

The citizens in rural areas are pleased to be invited because it often happens that they are free on Saturday afternoon, or Sunday afternoon or Sunday evening and they enjoy attending local or regional political meetings to hear the arguments of the candidates. In any event, almost all the candidates in the province of Quebec hold similar meetings.

In Quebec, in almost all rural areas and even in small cities such as mine, there is an old custom whereby the night before elections a last meeting is held where loudspeakers are used because in most cases there are more people outside the hall than inside.

As for me, I am very sorry I cannot support the amendment of the member for Ontario.

On the other hand, I should like to move another amendment, because I feel the member for Ontario is totally inconsistent if he intends to forbid propaganda over the radio and television, on the eve of election day and, on that day, when it is allowed in the newspapers.

I cannot admit that a well-to-do candidate could buy a whole page of advertisement in the Sunday newspapers or in papers published on election day while another of lesser means could not do so. It is unfair for all candidates and in my opinion, clause 99 which prohibits publicity the day before or on election day is inconsistent.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to move an amendment. I apologize for having scribbled it down in such haste. I thought other hon. members would have moved it. I therefore move the following words be added in clause 99, after the words "any entertainment or advertising program":

—or publishes, distributes or causes to be distributed an advertisement in the newspapers, or circulates printed during that same period—

In my opinion, it would be only fair to standardize advertising in this respect.

[*English*]

The Chairman: Order, please. There is now an amendment before the committee. All that would be admissible at this point would be an amendment to the amendment. Possibly the hon. member would like to wait until the committee has disposed of the amendment and put forward his amendment at that time.

Mr. Cafik: Mr. Chairman, remarks have been made regarding the use of a loudspeak-

er in conducting a meeting inside a building. I explained that was not my intention. I drafted the amendment rather quickly. I do not think anything should be in the act to prohibit such action on the part of a candidate. I feel that in view of the very strong arguments put forward by hon. members, particularly the hon. member for Skeena, regarding the importance of privacy and reflection on the day prior to casting their ballot, the amendment should be accepted. I am surprised that the member does not think that the use of portable loudspeakers outside a building constitutes an invasion of privacy and interferes with that quietitude he seems to want.

I am surprised that this amendment has provoked so much discussion. I would be willing to have the amendment changed with regard to loudspeakers used outside a building, in order to qualify what I meant. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the question will be put. I know there are many other important points. This is certainly not one of the most significant. Perhaps there could be a vote on it.

Mr. Baldwin: This chamber is full of loudspeakers!

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I appreciate the difficulty in which the hon. member for Ontario finds himself. He is wondering about my reaction. We must remember the first word he said was "loudspeakers." He did not define what he meant until the hon. member for York East asked him to do so. Then he replied that he meant mobile loudspeakers, not those used inside a building. I raise this point to show how awkward it is to make accurate definitions on the spur of the moment and to delineate precisely the area we are talking about regarding the invasion of privacy on days immediately preceding polling day. I agree with the member for Ontario that those days should be for quiet reflection. Now the member says he meant loudspeakers that are used outside buildings.

Perhaps in the member's part of the country they do not have picnics. What about outdoor activities? What about rodeos? What about the picnics promoted by political parties, where it is necessary to have an amplifier or loudspeaker system in order to get your message across? I am just pointing out the further difficulties in trying to prescribe in this way. The hon. member for Ontario has reflected on my objections in this matter. All I am trying to do is seriously and conscientiously spell out what we are doing. The President of the Privy Council has a fine legal mind. He is well learned in the law. If he were not in politics he would be on the bench; there is no doubt about that. It would not matter which party was in power; even a Conservative administration would appoint him to the bench because he is able to grasp these things with his fine mind.

• (9:20 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I cannot understand the objections of the Liberal backbenchers to what I am saying. I did not realize that so many backbenchers do not appreciate the fine qualities of the President of the Privy Council. Obviously some do not. I am trying to point out that we are not here to write views, impressions, opinions or legal words. In many cases when the courts interpret the law, they completely disregard what someone in Parliament said about what was intended. They look at the law and try to interpret it precisely as it is worded. We cannot talk about intentions and high-sounding ideas.

The member for Ontario is now circumscribing the prohibition of the use of loudspeakers on the day prior to the election by saying what he really means is loudspeakers that are not used within a building. What about loudspeakers being used at a picnic—are we prohibiting them? The member can chatter all he likes from his seat. Get it on the record. Don't be obstinate; don't be afraid and don't be frustrated. If the member for Ontario wants to express views which are contrary to government policy, he should express them in precise terms so we will know what he is attempting to do. If the hon. member from Ontario or any other Liberal member would set out precisely what he thinks, he would find no difficulty in this committee.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, this is obviously a hard night for a philosopher. I endeavoured to suggest earlier that we were entering upon an issue of definition which would be extremely difficult. I ask the hon. member for Ontario to consider this situation: A candidate holds a political meeting in a large hall, using microphones. An overflow audience has gathered outside on a summer's evening. The moment he instals a loudspeaker to bring the message to the people outside, he is contravening the act, if the act is written in the way the hon. member suggests. I do not want to be didactic or to sound like one

of the gerontons of this committee, but we are getting into finicky areas when we begin making distinctions of this kinds.

The Chairman: Hon. members have heard the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Ontario. Is the committee ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Amendment (Mr. Cafik) negatived; Yeas, 4; nays, 49.

The Chairman: I declare the amendment lost. Shall subclause 1 of clause 99 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to repeat the explanations I gave earlier but I would still like to see my amendment accepted if it is in order. If it is not, I will gladly abide by your ruling bceause, as I say again, it is totally illogical to allow election advertising in the newspapers while it is blacked out on radio and television the day before the election and on polling day. As I have said, this is a case of serious discrimination towards less well-off candidates which makes it possible to come out at the last moment with a so-called scandal which can affect the results of the election.

I move once more, if I am in order, that after the words "any entertainment or advertising program", which appear in clause 99(1), the following words be added:

—or publishes, distributes or causes to be distributed a newspaper advertisement or distributes printed matter during that same period.

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Chairman, the amendment moved by the hon. member for Trois-Rivières (Mr. Mongrain) pleases me. Along with my colleagues who are in agreement with me, I wish to assure him that this is really a valid amendment which certainly deserves careful consideration.

I would certainly blame myself, as a representative of a splinter party in the House with a near total lack of financial means, if I did not say publicly how happy and in agreement we are with this amendment.

Since 1962, in every election because adequate financial means are not available to us and especially because we are fighting financial interests, we suffer from the advertising in some newspapers paid out of well-filled electoral funds. In fact, attacks are made against people or programs taking exception to this system but we have no financial means available to answer them. Since these attacks are launched at the last moment as was said by the hon. member for Trois-Rivières, it is physically impossible for us, even with adequate financial means available, to reply.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this amendment is important and I urge my colleagues to give it their support.

During the last provincial election campaign, a striking thing happened in the constituency of Arthabasca. The campaign had been an honest one on all sides up to then—and I give this example to give my colleagues something to think about—except that at the last minute, on the eve of election day, a newspaperman wrote, in collusion with a certain political party, an article that was used as an editorial by a newspaper, and the political party concerned had copies made of that article and distributed them from door to door as well as in automobiles. Mr. Chairman, I would not say such a practice was fraudulent as it was in accordance with the law, but I do not think it was fair play.

I also believe that if we agree on the amendment moved by the hon. member for Trois-Rivières, it will show not only that we respect minorities in Canada, but that we provide equal opportunities to everybody, especially to those who do not have sufficient financial means.

[*English*]

Mr. Macquarrie: I am not sure that I understood the purport of the amendment correctly; I do not have a copy before me. But if my understanding is correct, the effect would be to prohibit advertising in newspapers on the Sunday preceding an election and the distribution by hand or any other means of election material. This prohibition would prevail when the election is on a Monday, that is always except when a holiday intervenes. If this is a correct understanding, I have no reason to object to the proposition.

A great many people are doing other things on Sundays than peddling pamphlets. I imagine that people who still believe in the Lord's Day Act, and there may still be a few in this country, would automatically support the hon. member's suggestion, which strikes me as a reasonable one. The newspaper impact would be very small. I did mention earlier that there were some Sunday newspapers but, arguing the other way now, I am bound to say they are few in number. If the purport of the amendment is as I have stated it, I would find little difficulty in giving it my support.

Mr. Mongrain: That is exactly the purport of my amendment, and I would ask that the question be put now.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, we do not have copies of the amendment and it is difficult to follow these proposals simply by listening. The hon. member for Trois Rivières explained the amendment carefully, but I suppose the purpose of giving three readings to a bill is that hon. members may have the chance to hear a thing three times. If he would repeat what he said, no doubt we shall understand what he means by it.

Mr. Mongrain: I should apologize for not having had the time to get an English text prepared; to do so I would have required the help of very good translators. The purpose of the amendment is exactly what the hon. member for Hillsborough has stated—no advertising in newspapers or written advertising in circulars on the day of the election or the day before, that is, during the same period as the period in which advertising on radio and television is prohibited.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I appreciate that this was the force of the hon. member's proposition. But we do not legislate intention; we must deal with precise words, and this is the aspect in which I am interested. We were discussing this point with the hon. member for Ontario. What is meant and what is said are often very different things. I would enjoy hearing what the amendment itself says.

The Chairman: I think we may hope for a very precise translation. I will invite the Clerk Assistant to read it because I am finding some difficulty in doing so.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Slowly, please!

The Clerk Assistant:

to add after the words "any entertainment or advertising program", the following words: "or publishes, distributes or causes to be distributed a newspaper advertisement, or distributes printed matters during that same period"

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rondeau: Mr. Chairman, while we are on the amendment introduced by the member for Trois-Rivières, I am pleased to support it and to express my satisfaction about it.

I have kept in my files newspaper advertisements published during past elections, more particularly that of 1963. I have here a full page advertisement published in Montreal's *La Presse* two days before the general election of 1963, paid for by the Liberal party of Canada and full of lies which we were never able to refute because we were too close to polling day.

On whole page of advertising for which the Liberal party paid over $5,000, we recognize the alleged opponents of that time. It is quite interesting to note what those people preached eight years later. They are the same who, in 1963, spoke on behalf of the Liberal party in an attempt to run down Social Credit. The statements appeared on the eve of voting day, so that we were unable to deal with them, and that misled the electorate.

• (9:30 p.m.)

On that page, for instance, I see the picture of Mr. Adrien Plourde, President of the Canadian Federation of the Printing Industry, who was a Liberal candidate at the last provincial election in Quebec. I see also the picture of the hon. minister, then president of the CNTU, our Catholic unions back home—

Mr. Marceau: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I believe my hon. friend for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau) is obviously out of order. This is no time to make an electoral speech but to adopt a legislative measure on which most hon. members agree. We are not here to speak disparagingly of one another but to pass a new piece of legislation. I think my hon. friend is out of order.

[*English*]

The Chairman: Order, please. The amendment does refer to material distributed or circulated as printed material during the period immediately preceding an election and the hon. member is attempting to illustrate a point that he is trying to make. It is very difficult in situations like this to draw the line. I strongly suggest that the hon. member limit his intervention to the amendment that is before the committee. Not only is this the correct procedure, but as I pointed out earlier it might at the same time assist the committee in dealing expeditiously with the bill before us.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rondeau: I thank you very much for your remarks, Mr. Chairman, but in my opinion, that amendment is quite to the point, important and urgent, especially for us who have been the victims of fallacious publicity in the past, particularly just before an election. That is why I want to base my arguments on evidence.

I see at least fifteen pictures on this page of *La Presse* which I have here. If that amendment had then been implemented, great falsehoods would never had been published. The day before the election, the Liberal party even called upon the help of a Conservative senator and former minister, the Hon. Jacques Flynn. In addition, at the last minute, they resorted to Father Bouvier of Sherbrooke University. His picture was published in *La Presse* and he was credited with some comments that he never made.

Afterwards, Father Bouvier received thanks which he must have appreciated. That page was swarming with lies that we never could deny. And now, it is too late.

The hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Marceau)—I know that this bothers him, because truth is hard to take and hurts, especially as he is directly involved—benefited from such publicity.

Father Bouvier is even reported as saying such and such a thing. Later on, we received letters denying all that. Some last minute advertisements to which we could not reply and the contents of which the person concerned could only deny after the election, harmed us. Here is an excerpt, and I quote:

A monthly salary of $300, under a Créditiste administration, would quickly boil down to a purchasing power of $100. It would lose two thirds of its worth.

Now Father Bouvier never made such a statement. We keep in our records a letter condemning that ad, but the election was over, and the Liberal party benefited from the lies that cost over $5,000 a page.

That is why we cannot but approve unreservedly the motion of the hon. member for Trois-Rivières, and we hope that if his colleagues are as sincere as he is, or if they have changed their approach since 1963, they will likewise. At that time, the present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), then professor of constitutional law at the University of Montreal, and student at the London School of Economics, was reported as having said that Social Credit was thus filling an ideological vacuum in the minds of some people whose political intentions were better than their knowledge of economics.

I would ask the unanimous consent of the House to record this page of the newspaper *La Presse* in *Hansard* in order to show that the amendment moved by the hon. member for Trois-Rivières is proper, because this proves beyond all possible doubt that we have been in the past the victims of false propaganda.

[Mr. Rondeau.]

Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to have this newspaper item printed in *Hansard.*

Some hon. Members: No.

An hon. Member: Agreed.

[*English*]

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Chairman, I hope the motion is put right away and passes. I commend the hon. member for his objectivity in moving it. The motto of the Liberal Party in the past has always been that having sufficiently confused the voter it will now allow him to vote.

The Chairman: Order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but the hon. member for Shefford had sought leave of the committee to include an extract from a journal as part of his remarks in *Hansard.* As I have pointed out several times before, this is not a practice that has been allowed in the House but, as the hon. member knows, all sorts of things can happen by unanimous consent which otherwise cannot happen. So I must put it to the committee. Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: No.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rondeau: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a question of privilege—

• (9:40 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Baldwin: I will finish my remarks in two or three sentences. I think the voters of this country need to spend one day in meditation, contemplation and even prayer. If they had done that at the last election there would have been fewer votes cast for the Liberal Party and it would not now be holding office. I think it is a wonderful idea that we should have 24 hours free of all the nauseating nonsense perpetrated by political parties. I think this amendment is a good idea and I am glad the hon. member had the courage to move it. I support it.

The Chairman: I do not think we have satisfactorily disposed of the point raised by the hon. member for Shefford. I am sorry I did not understand exactly what he was proposing. I thought he wished this document to be included in *Hansard* with his remarks. I pointed out to him and the committee that this is a practice which the Chair has always cautioned against. However, the hon. member sought to do it by way of unanimous consent. I was prepared to accede to the request and I

put it to the committee. Unanimous consent was denied. If the hon. member has a further point of order, I will certainly hear it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rondeau: Mr. Chairman, I want to point out to you that, if I remember well, you have allowed in the past that documents be tabled and put on record.

I can remember one debate on housing when you agreed to the tabling of statistics, without the unanimous consent of the House. I therefore beg of you Mr. Chairman, to ask the unanimous consent so that we may know who is opposed to that.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to point out to you that I would have liked to have this fine page of advertising of seven years ago printed in *Hansard*. I cannot see why the Liberals refuse to have their own publicity put on record.

[*English*]

The Chairman: Order, please. Unfortunately, this avenue has been closed to the hon. member. He may wish to circulate the document among the members of the House.

Mr. Deakon: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask a question of the mover of this amendment. I wonder whether the hon. member could clarify the situation. Would his amendment take into account editorial comment by newspapers or other communications media containing recommendations as to candidates who are seeking office, and would it also include caricatures on the day of an election or the day before?

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Chairman, I am thinking, of course, of paid advertisements and announcements. I do not think we can prevent the press from commenting or making sketches and caricatures. I had in mind paid announcements by a candidate or his agent.

Amendment (Mr. Mongrain) negatived: Yeas, 19; nays, 26.

The Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, I rise on a question of privilege. I point out to you that while the vote was being taken an hon. gentleman who certainly should know better because he has participated in these matters before—the hon. member for Chambly—came in, sat down and subsequently rose to vote. I think that is shameful on the part of that gentleman, who knows better. I think we should discount his vote.

Subclause 1 agreed to.

On clause 99, subclauses 2 and 3—*No broadcasts outside of Canada.*

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Chairman, I have a question for the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council.

In subclauses (2) and (3) the words "during an election" are used.

For instance, at line 17 of subclause (2) and at lines 26 and 27 of subclause (3).

Does this mean on the day of the election or during the election period?

Mr. Forest: Mr. Chairman, I would refer the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe to page 1 of the bill where the expression "during an election" is defined, as follows:

> —includes the period after the issue of the writ for an election, or after the dissolution of Parliament or the occurrence of a vacancy in consequence of which a writ for an election is eventually issued, until the candidate obtaining the highest number of votes is returned as elected;

—which normally happens a few days after polling day. That is what "during the election" means.

[*English*]

Subclauses 2 and 3 inclusive agreed to.

Subclause 4 agreed to.

Clause 99 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 100 to 104 inclusive agreed to.

The Chairman: The committee will now consider clause 105, to be found at page 194.

On clause 105, subclause 1—*Premature publication of results forbidden.*

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, I indicated to the committee this afternoon that it was the intention of one of my colleagues to present an amendment to clause 105. That was my colleague the hon. member for Cumberland. His amendment was to deal with the taking of public opinion polls, a device which he thinks not very helpful to the electoral process. Regrettably, my colleague is not here tonight and will not be moving his amendment. The committee may be relieved to know that I do not intend to present it for him.

I think the pollsters have suffered a greater setback as a result of a certain event in

another country than they might have suffered as a result of anything we could do for or against them in this piece of legislation. However, my colleague will be able to deal with this question at another time. I simply wanted to tell my colleagues, who with bated breath must have been waiting for my intervention, that once again I am being the sacrificial lamb and I am withdrawing a pregnant amendment.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): In order that this might be on the record for the hon. member for Cumberland, I should indicate that this subject was dealt with by the Barbeau committee in its report and the special committee will undoubtedly be studying it. The hon. member will have an opportunity before long to make his point particularly in connection with the events of June 18.

Subclause 1 agreed to.

Subclause 2 agreed to.

Clause 105 agreed to.

On clause 106—*Variation of times at by-election.*

• (9:50 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Forest: Mr. Chairman, I wish to propose an amendment to clause 106. According to this clause, in the case of a by-election, nomination day for the candidates shall be the fourteenth day before polling day and not as it was in the past, the twenty-first day for a general election. This clause does not provide for a date limit to allow a candidate to withdraw from the race. It follows that we must provide for such a date to permit an officially nominated candidate to withdraw. To this end, Mr. Chairman, I wish to propose the following amendment:

That Bill C-215 be amended by deleting line 9 at page 195 and substituting therefor the following subclause:

(c) an officially nominated candidate can withdraw at any time before eight o'clock in the forenoon of Thursday, the eleventh day before polling; and

And it goes on with subclause (d).

This is an omission. No date limit has been provided to allow for a candidate's withdrawal. Under the general law, it is the twenty-first day, then the eighteenth day, and the nomination date is the twenty-first day before polling day. Therefore, as regards a by-election, it is still the fourteenth day. Thus, we must provide for a date limit to allow a candidate to withdraw.

[Mr. Macquarrie.]

[*English*]

The Chairman: The committee has heard the proposal. Is it the pleasure of the committee to accept the proposal?

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, on such short notice we do not appreciate the full force of the amendment. But normally the hon. gentleman from Missisquoi is lucid and careful in his presentations, although he was not in regard to a previous clause. We are willing to accept what he says as being the necessity for this omission from the bill.

Mr. Forest: Mr. Chairman, it is not an omission from the bill. No date mentioned in this clause concerning when a candidate for election can desist and retire in a by-election.

Amendment (Mr. Forest) agreed to.

Clause 106 as amended agreed to.

Clause 107 agreed to.

On clause 108, subclause 1—*Act to apply in votes taken under Canada Temperance Act.*

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether I might ask the President of the Privy Council to enlighten me concerning when a vote was last taken under the Canada Temperance Act.

Mr. Forrestall: And when he anticipates the next vote to be taken under it.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, I regret to say I have not followed that particular statute very closely. I regret I cannot give the hon. member this information, and neither can the Chief Electoral Officer.

Mr. Macquarrie: I think the Chief Electoral Officer would have to be a great deal older than he appears to be, to remember it. I wonder why we carry on this type of provision in such an omnibus type of bill. I think the provinces have firmly fastened on to the liquor trade in this country and I cannot understand why this clause should be cluttering up our legislation.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask a question appropos this matter. I am sure I will receive an answer similar to that received by the hon. member for Hillsborough. Can the President of the Privy Council tell us what the Canada Temperance Act is?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I am told it is the result of considerable legislation. I do not know what it did for temperance, but it did quite a bit to Canadian law. I gather the aim

was to control the use of alcohol, if it could be controlled by law. I gather the statute is virtually not in use now, and I for one am glad of it.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I wonder whether there might be any thought on the part of the government to expanding the provisions of the Canada Temperance Act to take into account matters which the Minister of National Health and Welfare is considering.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Perhaps the hon. member and I could meet over a drink and discuss it.

The Chairman: Shall clause 108 carry?

An hon. Member: No.

The Chairman: Did the hon. member say no?

An hon. Member: Yes.

The Chairman: The question is on clause 108.

Clause 108 agreed to on division: Yeas, 38; nays, 18.

The Chairman: I declare the motion carried.

Clauses 109 to 111 inclusive agreed to.

On clause 112, subclause (1)—*Northwest Territories elections to be conducted in accordance with this act.*

Mr. Howard (Skeena): This clause, Mr. Chairman, relates to the election of members to the Council of the Northwest Territories and to the Council of the Yukon Territory. We have within the Canada Elections Act machinery for electing members to the Northwest Territories Council and the Yukon Territory Council. I do not disagree with the machinery and the opportunity available to the people in the territories to do this; I simply want to raise at this stage my objection to the idea that the government itself wants to maintain the power to appoint people to bodies which have political jurisdiction over people with whom they have no sort of democratic affiliation, when the people have no opportunity to dissent or remove the appointees from office. That is all I wish to say on the matter.

Subclause (1) agreed to.

Subclauses (2) to (4) inclusive agreed to.

Clause 112 agreed to.

Clause 113 agreed to.

On clause 114, subclause (2)—*Continuation in office of certain persons.*

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, this is an interesting item. I refer particularly to subclause (2) which reads as follows:

> The Chief Electoral Officer, the Assistant Chief Electoral Officer and every other election officer appointed under the former act, who held office immediately prior to the coming into force of this act shall continue to hold office with like effect as though they had been so appointed under this act.

This is an interesting solicitude for office holders. Some time ago I sought information concerning the continuity in office of returning officers. I wonder whether the President of the Privy Council has obtained information concerning the survival rate in respect of returning officers who held office in 1960. I would be interested to know how many of them survived the Representation Act and other measures, moves and endeavours which to my mind would scarcely be categorized as efforts on behalf or in support of continuity of election officials. If we had the background in this regard we could more judiciously appraise the item which is before us. Perhaps we are entering a new era in respect of the protection of public servants of this type.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, in 1960, 263 returning officers were appointed. Of those 263, 79 were reappointments, that is to say, reappointments as a result of all the returning officers being discharged, under the law, in that year. In 1966, 258 returning officers were appointed. Of those, 62 returning officers were reappointments and of those 62, 31 had been initially appointed between 1963 and the proclamation of the general order of 1966, meaning that 31 were previous appointments.

Mr. Macquarrie: Do I take it that at the present time in our 264 constituencies we have a grand total of 31 returning officers who have been there from 1960?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): That would be correct.

Mr. Macquarrie: That is a remarkable survival rate. I am surprised that conversion came so late to this virtue of continuity in office, but I suppose what is done cannot be undone, and who knows what may happen.

Subclause (2) agreed to.

Subclauses (1) and (3) agreed to.

Clause 114 agreed to.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Chairman: The hon. member for Lotbinière on clause—

Mr. André Fortin: On what clause, Mr. Chairman?

The Deputy Chairman: —Clause 114?

Mr. Fortin: I would have liked to say a few words on clause 114, Mr. Chairman.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. Clause 114 was agreed to a moment ago. Does the hon. member wish to speak to clause 115?

Mr. Fortin: I said on clause 114, Mr. Chairman.

• (10:00 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Since I sit close to the hon. member for Lotbinière, I noticed that he rose while we were on clause 114. Unfortunately, Your Honour did not see him. I think we should take that into account.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Chairman: The hon. member for Lotbinière on clause 114.

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Chairman, I thank my hon. colleagues for allowing me to speak to clause 114.

I only have a word to say about this clause, and it is to protest against the solicitude and concern shown for returning officers.

Mr. Chairman, we have nothing against these appointments, but it seems to us that, in general, our opinion should be taken into account, there it is: We believe that in order for the people to have real confidence in our electoral system, it has to have confidence in its election officers. The Chief Electoral Officer has the confidence not only of hon members but also of all Canadians, and his reputation is to be envied. But the same is not true of every returning officer, precisely because several of them are known, before being appointed, as belonging to such or such a political party, for their political background.

As a result, in many a riding, the electors have less confidence in the returning officer, because they see in him an opponent or a person who would be more inclined to cooperate with his own party rather than with all candidates.

We simply want to show our concern about the reappointment, under the present legislation, of all returning officers now holding office. We firmly hope that, in the future, such appointments will have no political undertones but will be based on the competence of the appointee.

[The Deputy Chairman.]

[*English*]

Clauses 115 to 118, inclusive agreed to.

On Clause 119—*Coming into force and repeal of certain provisions.*

Mr. Forest: I have a certain minor amendment to clause 119 which deals with the coming into force of certain provisions of this Act. It is in line with what we have already adopted in this bill. The motion is as follows:

That Bill C-215 be amended by (a) by striking out lines 18 and 19 on page 200 and substituting the following:

"119. (1) The provisions of this act relating to the minister, the appointment, remuneration"

We have provided that the minister will be designated by order in council and will not be the Secretary of State, as was the case in the previous Act.

Mr. Baldwin: What do you have against the Secretary of State?

Mr. Forest: Nothing, but we have already adopted a provision that it would be the minister designated by order in council. The amendment goes on to read:

and

(b) by striking out line 28 on page 200 and substituting the following:

"qualify as electors and as candidates shall come into force on"

We have changed the minimum age not only for electors but for candidates. This provision would apply in case of a by-election before the next general election. This is in line with what has been adopted in the bill.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Chairman: Mr. Forest moves:

That Bill C-215 be amended—

[*English*]

Mr. Howard (Skeena): May I ask the parliamentary secretary, the hon. member for Missisquoi, what section of the act is it whereby the minister may be designated by order in council.

Mr. Forest: It is clause 3, subclause 3.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall the amendment carry?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Amendment (Mr. Forest) agreed to.

Clause 119 agreed to.

On Clause 18—*Preliminary Lists.*

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I believe that there was an amendment by the hon. member

for Selkirk to clause 18, schedule A, rule 39 as well as to rule 58. I wonder if they could be put now.

The Deputy Chairman: Does clause 18, schedule A, rule 39, carry?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Rule 39 agreed to.

Rule 58 Schedule A agreed to.

Schedule B, rule 16 agreed to.

Schedule B agreed to.

Clause 18 agreed to.

On Clause 21—*Ineligible candidates.*

Mr. Forest: I believe that, following the remarks of the hon. member for Skeena, we should amend clause 21 (2). The hon. member for Skeena said at the time that the provisions of this subclause would supersede the provisions of the first paragraph. This would apply also to the other people mentioned in the other paragraphs. To clarify the bill, I have another amendment which reads as follows:

That Bill C-215 be amended by striking out line 25 on page 77 and substituting the following:

"(2) Paragraphs (c) and (f) of subsection (1) do not render in ..."

That would clarify the act and would make it clear to whom it applies.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall the amendment carry?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Forest: The other motion would have to carry also. We are on clause 21 (2).

The Deputy Chairman: Shall clause 21 (2) carry as amended?

Mr. Howard (Skeena): There is some doubt as to what you are putting. As I gather, the parliamentary secretary said something to the effect that the other amendment would have to carry. Did he mean by that the amendment which he originally proposed relating to an employee? I wonder if he would make that clear?

The Deputy Chairman: The amendment reads as follows:

That Bill C-215 be amended by

(a) striking out line 9 on page 78 and substituting the following:

"consequence of war"

and

(b) striking out line 15 on page 78 and substituting the following:

"candidate at an election; or

(h) an employee who, under subsection (14) of section 23, has been granted and is on leave of absence to seek nomination as a candidate and to be a candidate at an election."

• (10:10 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fortin: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

When the amendment of the hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Forest), on subclause (2) of clause 21, was put to the House, the motion was read in English. We were given the English version and the Chairman read it very quickly in English. I then rose to find out what it meant exactly.

I tried to listen to the interpreter who is doing excellent work, but I could not understand. I would like to hear the remarks again to know exactly what they mean.

The Deputy Chairman: Mr. Forest moved:

That Bill C-215 be amended by

(a) striking out line 9 on page 78 and substituting the following:

"Consequence of war"

and

(b) striking out line 15 on page 78 and substitute the following:

"candidate at an election; or

(h) an employee who, under subsection (14) of section 23, has been granted and is on leave of absence to seek nomination as a candidate and to be a candidate at an election."

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to trouble you, but I was not referring to this amendment but to the previous one. You declared it carried, although if you had looked in this direction you would have noticed that I was standing. I would like to know what it meant in French. The amendment to subclause (2) of clause 21 was given to us in English only, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Forest: Mr. Chairman, I apologize for the fact that, as the amendment was drafted at the last moment, no translation is available; it is however easy to understand. It follows up the other amendment to subclause 2 of clause 21. As a matter of fact, on Tuesday we adopted an amendment moved by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Rowland) providing that an employer was required to grant leave of absence with or without pay to an employee wishing to seek nomination as a candidate.

In accordance with the opinion of the law officers of the Crown, we moved the amendment to subclause 2 of clause 21 so that this class of people would be mentioned in the act. And, following an objection raised by the

hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard), the government decided to indicate clearly in the act what classes of persons did not become ineligible according to subclause 1. Paragraphs (c) and (f) deal with the ineligibility of the classes of persons mentioned in subclause 2.

[*English*]

Clause 21 agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall subclause 4 of Clause 98 carry?

Some hon. Members: No.

On clause 66—*Corrupt inducement of voters.*

Mr. Forest: Mr. Chairman, I suggest there should be some amendment to clause 66, subclause 2 in line with the motion that was adopted this afternoon after the amendment presented by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra concerning beverages and alcohol. I move:

That Bill C-215 be amended by striking out line 6 on page 169 and substituting the following:
"such refreshments as an elec-"
striking out lines 12 and 13 on page 169 and substituting the following:
"expense, provides such refreshments at a meeting of electors"

I have another amendment to put at this time, although they will have to be taken separately, Mr. Chairman. I move:

That Bill C-215 be amended by striking out line 40 on page 169 and substituting the following:
"beverages to any person, except as provided by subsection 2, or has paid, in—"

These two amendments are consequential to our approval of the motion by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra this afternoon.

Mr. Macquarrie: They seem to be in the spirit of the thing!

The Deputy Chairman: Order. I imagine the hon. member for Lotbinière has understood the Parliamentary Secretary's explanations. The latter tabled the following amendment:

That Bill C-215 be amended by striking out line 25 on page 77 and substituting the following:
2. Paragraphs (c) and (f) of subclause (1) —do not render ineligible

Shall the amendment carry?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Amendment agreed to.

[Mr. Forest.]

• (10:20 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, since these amendments are introduced in English only and that we find it difficult to understand the interpreter because you read them too fast, may I ask you to read them more slowly so as to give the interpreter—I repeat, he is doing his utmost to perform his work as best he can, and I am grateful to him for that—a chance to give us a translation so that we might understand what is going on. Otherwise, we shall leave for our holidays this very evening.

The Deputy Chairman: Mr. Forest moved:

That Bill C-215 be amended by striking out line 6 on page 169 and substituting the following:
"soft drinks—

[*English*]

Striking out lines 12 and 13 on page 169 and substituting the following:

"expense, provides such refreshments at a meeting of electors"

[*Translation*]

Mr. Forest: I must point out to the hon. member for Lotbinière that we do not have French copies of the amendments, because they have just been handed to me in English. The amendment now under consideration is only designed to strike out the words:
—beverages or—

—in accordance with an amendment moved by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Deachman) and carried this afternoon.

The Deputy Chairman: Is the amendment carried?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Amendment agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Is Annex I on page 201 carried?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, I think that the hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Forest) wants to move an amendment with reference to page 190.

Mr. Forest: Mr. Chairman, we have passed today an amendment to strike out the names of ministers, priests or ecclesiastics of any religious faith or worship, from the list of persons who cannot act as election officers and, consequently, a new amendment becomes necessary.

I therefore move, Mr. Chairman:

That Bill C-215 be amended by striking out line—

It might be better if I moved the amendment in English but the line in the text may not be exactly the same—

[*English*]

On clause 66, subclause 4—*Proof of intent.*

The Deputy Chairman: Mr. Forest moves:

That Bill C-215 be amended by striking out line 40 on page 169 and substituting the following:

'beverages to any person, except as provided by subsection (2), or has paid, in-'

Amendment (Mr. Forest) agreed to.

Clause 66 agreed to.

On clause 98(4)—*Exceptions.*

Mr. Forest: Mr. Chairman, I move:

That Bill C-215 be amended by striking out line 41 to 44 on page 190 and substituting the following:

'(4) paragraph (e) of subsection (1) shall not be con-'

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, after looking very quickly at this, grasping its significance and appreciating that it is one of those fine, technical points that most hon. members would miss, I think it behooves us, not only with regard to this matter but also for other reasons, to pay our respects to the Chief Electoral Officer for his full and completely thorough understanding of the Elections Act.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I think that without his eagle eye, full knowledge and intimate understanding of it, we would have goofed and missed this.

Amendment (Mr. Forest) agreed to.

Clause 98, as amended, agreed to.

Schedules I to III inclusive agreed to.

Rules 1 to 15 inclusive of Schedule IV agreed to.

Clause 1 agreed to.

On the preamble.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, I should like to say something about the preamble. Since this bill relates to the democratic process, to elections and to the opportunity and the right of people to decide who shall make the laws governing them, I think we ought to change the preamble. It begins with the words "Her Majesty", which some may argue about. It seems common at the moment to object to them. I will not go into that matter at the moment. At any rate, the preamble says:

Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:

I think that we should in this law completely eliminate any mention of the Senate, because it has no business here whatsoever.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): We should certainly not give any consideration to a body that has no responsibility in a political or democratic sense for the people over which it has political authority, and it should have no say whatever in the electoral laws of the nation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I see that there is almost unanimity on this position. I expect that there is an obstacle somewhere along the line to our reaching agreement on this. I should like to move:

That the preamble be amended by deleting therefrom the words "Senate and".

Mr. Fairweather: That would make the bill unconstitutional.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): My hon. friend says that the bill would be unconstitutional. I am not one of those who is stuck on history and tradition.

Mr. Fairweather: This is not a matter of history.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I am inclined to think that the thing we should make unconstitutional is the Senate. Let us proceed on that basis. Let us not try to preserve this antiquity.

Mr. Fairweather: Let's not talk about it at 10.30 at night.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): My hon. friend says that we should not talk about this at 10.30 at night. So far as I am concerned, democracy is best served when it needs to be served, and not when the clock says a certain time—and certainly not when a member of the party that has no concept of progress at all interrupts. In case there is any doubt, I am taking about the Conservative party, deleting the word "progressive" because it has no business in the name.

• (10:30 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Howard (Skeena): There is laughter about this. This is a serious matter. The applause that I am receiving is from those people who do not normally agree with me. This indicates that for once they are on the right track.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): While the Chair is considering the proposed amendment, perhaps I could take the opportunity to say some words of appreciation to a number of people who have been connected with this rather voluminous bill. First and foremost, I wish to express my appreciation to the Chief Electoral Officer, Mr. Jean-Marc Hamel,—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): —who, as the hon. member for Skeena has said, with his encyclopaedic knowledge of both the act and electoral processes has been of much assistance to this committee, the standing committee and myself in particular, with my responsibilities for the bill.

I pay particular tribute to the draftsman of the bill, Miss Edythe MacDonald, for preparing this very extensive and complicated bill. With unfailing courtesy she provided amendments to members on both sides of the House, often drafting them at great speed and under considerable pressure. I draw to the attention of the committee that at the same time Miss MacDonald has responsibility for a second bill before us this session, which if anything is more complicated and nearly as voluminous. I refer to the Canada Grains Act. That will give some idea of the heavy responsibility she has been bearing while being of assistance to us in such good spirits.

I express my appreciation to the chairman and the members of the standing committee for their work. I pay special tribute to my Parliamentary Secretary, the member for Missisquoi, who has been of great assistance to me. I also wish to pay tribute to others who have been of great assistance to me in preparing the position for the bill, our former colleague Professor John B. Stewart of St. Francis Xavier University and my present legislative counsel, Mr. Yvon Marcoux. To all of these and the members of this committee, particularly those who were present this afternoon rather than necessarily those present this evening, I express my appreciation in putting through a difficult bill.

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, I know it is not necessary for me to fill in time because I am sure that Your Honour has found that which he was seeking. In this instance, I would like to add my voice and sentiments to those put forward by the President of the Privy Council. He is one member of the House with whom I do not find myself consistently in agreement. In this instance, I echo his sentiments.

I have the highest regard for the Chief Electoral Officer with respect to legislation and even more so with respect to the administration of his most important office. I am glad to make the acquaintance of Miss MacDonald. While I do not look forward to reviewing this act soon, I hope it will not be too long before we have her with us again.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Macquarrie: There is a great deal of work involved in the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections. Under the old rules it stood in the premier position among the standing committees. Now, committees are listed alphabetically, a practice with which I do not agree. We used to be the premier committee of the House. It is an onerous task to study the Canada Elections Act. I have done it on two occasions. I think much has been accomplished. While the result falls short of the objectives some of us cherish, we are confident that much has been achieved. Before I take my seat, I wish to observe with reference to the Senate that it just happens in this country we have a bicameral Parliament. That seems to be about it.

Mr. Benjamin: On behalf of my party, I wish to echo some of the words of the hon. member for Hillsborough and to add a few. In addition to our thanks to the Chief Electoral Officer and to the charming lady who aided members on both sides of the House with amendments, as well as improving the look of the Chamber a great deal, I want to express our thanks to the President of the Privy Council. I never thought I would live long enough to say that, in light of what occurred a year ago.

We in this party are extremely pleased with the degree of participation, discussion and co-operation. We appreciate the patience and tolerance exhibited by the President of the Privy Council towards the amendments that have been moved and accepted. I may catch hell for this tomorrow, but I sincerely say that in the last number of days on this bill we have had an exercise in the democratic process. It has been an education for all of us in this Chamber and, I hope, an education

for people outside the Chamber. I hope we can do this more often on other major pieces of legislation that affect all Canadians in so many ways.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my party, I should like to mention our satisfaction with respect to the work done by the committee on privileges and elections and by the committee of the whole, which reviewed the Elections Act in order to improve it.

We cannot miss this opportunity to express also our regards for the Chief Electoral Officer and his staff. That man is not only at the service of the hon. members, but also of the whole population. He is responsible for the Elections Act being at the service of the people. I wish to thank him for that and to assure him of our support and co-operation.

I would also like to extend my regards to Miss MacDonald and to thank her for her excellent work.

[*English*]

The Chairman: Order, please. Following all these laudatory remarks it is with some reluctance that the chair must end on a negative note on the final amendment.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Didn't anyone thank Your Honour?

(10:40 p.m.)

The Chairman: The ruling is not related to the fact that no one has mentioned the stirling work of the Chairman. However, this is an entirely objective ruling. The amendment moved by the hon. member for Skeena arose in part, probably, from a slight technical error. In the standard form available to the Chair, which we have used in calling the votes, by a small clerical error the words "Shall the preamble carry?" are included. In this case, as hon. members will note if they look at the bill, there is no preamble. To clarify the nature of a preamble for the purpose of this ruling I would refer to the definition to be found in a parliamentary dictionary at page 151. A preamble is there described as an introductory paragraph giving reasons for introducing a bill as set forth. In fact, this is an amendment which seeks to amend the enacting words. On this point, May, at page 548, states:

> Furthermore, amendments cannot be moved to the granting or enacting words of bills for granting aids or supplies to the Crown, or to the enacting words of other bills.

With regret, therefore, and on this somewhat negative note, I must rule that the amendment cannot be put.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I sincerely appreciate that you gave your ruling with regret, Mr. Chairman.

Title agreed to.

Bill as amended agreed to.

Bill reported.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council) moved that Bill C-215, respecting the franchise of electors and the election of members to the House of Commons, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: When shall the bill be read the third time?

Some hon. Members: By leave, now.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale) moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I be allowed a few moments on third reading to say that in addition to the congratulatory words expressed earlier in committee of the whole there is, I am sure, a feeling shared by many members in all corners of the House that more must be done than has been done in this chamber and will be done by the printing of a new act. Some effort must be made to acquaint the Canadian public with what is new in the electoral law, a law which we have revised in a major manner.

I should like to make a plea to the government and to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) in particular to see that the budget of the Chief Electoral Officer is doubled or trebled if necessary to enable him to acquaint the Canadian public with their wider rights and privileges under this law, rights which will enable them to exercise their franchise in what I believe to be a new and better manner than ever before in the history of this country. I believe expenditures for this purpose ought not to be criticized by any party or by those who write columns in the news media. In fact, I hope that the office of the Chief Electoral Officer will be encouraged in this work by editorials and by articles of a voluminous nature immediately before and during the next election campaign.

The new law is not all new, but unless this kind of exercise is carried out there is likely to be a great deal of confusion and possibly, after the election, ill will which will harm the effect of what I believe to be some worthwhile improvements to the act. It is incumbent upon government and Parliament to provide the Chief Electoral Officer with the funds and facilities to enable him to do this job.

On behalf of the New Democratic Party I should like to say that we believe we have made a major error in neglecting to provide some method of absentee polling, no matter how restricted. As soon as it became apparent that because of the relatively small size of our population and its scattered distribution we could not draw up a permanent electoral list, there was a tendency on the part of too many members both in the committee and in this House to throw out all possibility of an absentee ballot. The experience of a number of provinces whose populations are thin and widely scattered shows that an absentee balloting system could be made to work in the absence of a permanent voters' list. I still feel we could have provided an absentee polling system for at least certain groups in certain circumstances. This would have obviated the necessity for many of the other provisions we have been obliged to include in order to widen the opportunity for people to cast their ballots.

In other words, when we eliminated the prospect of a permanent list we threw out the baby with the bath water. I believe we could have introduced some form of absentee ballot, albeit limited. I hope that in another session of this Parliament, perhaps following the report of the committee on election expenses, we can amend this law even further to provide a method of absentee balloting. This will enable us to do away with many of the other facilities we have tried to incorporate in the bill. In any case, I do not believe they will prove to be all that workable. I specifically mention the system of proxy voting and repeat what I said on second reading. I hope I am wrong, but I predict that it will prove to be cumbersome from an administrative point of view and extremely inconvenient for voters. We may still have to go through this experience for one election in order to learn the lesson, but I hope that we shall decide to re-examine this bill next session and provide a system of absentee balloting.

[Mr. Benjamin.]

I close by thanking members of my own party and all other members who sat on the Standing Committee and took part in what I think have been several wonderful days in committee of the whole in arriving at this legislation. I believe it to have been one of the better exercises carried out by this House and regret very much that it should have received so little attention and publicity outside this chamber.

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, I shall moralize but briefly at this stage of the important measure before us. We tend to harp upon our own particular string. I have not yet been convinced that we were wise in not making provision for a permanent voters' list. Even that vast nation, the subcontinent of India, is now in process of compiling a permanent roll. I agree this has been a most excellent debate. However, I believe it is fundamental that efforts be made to publicize the important changes we have introduced into our electoral machinery. As I said this afternoon, I much regret the inadequate attention which has been given to this important debate by the press gallery and by the media. In the six Parliaments in which I have served so far, never have I seen a measure so important receive such inadequate and inferior treatment.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Macquarrie: This makes it all the more important that the suggestion of the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin) should be carried out. I think, too, that the weight of the work we have borne demonstrates the importance of frequent review of our electoral machinery. We should not allow years and years to pass and then have a ponderous exercise in redrafting. It is extremely important, I think, that we keep our electoral machinery well tuned and sharply honed to the needs of a vibrant, healthy majority.

• (10:50 p.m.)

Having said that, I think we have done well here. Perhaps this debate was neglected by the media because it was so lacking in partisan sharpness and so much given to something a little above partisan cut and thrust. But I have no sorrow on that score at all because I think we have acquitted ourselves well. I think this piece of electoral legislation is a vast improvement, though not quite so

good as legislation I would have evolved had I full scope to do so. However, as I say, it is a great improvement and I trust it will serve Canada well.

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to join others at this stage in adding one or two brief comments. First of all, may I express to the members of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections and the members of the House my personal appreciation of the thoughtful consideration they have given to taking the first meaningful step forward in many years to further the protection of the secrecy of the franchise of the Canadian forces voters. What we have done should indicate to this particular group that we are indeed concerned about them, that we did address ourselves to the question of absentee voting and to other methods by which the secrecy of the franchise might have been assured in even greater measure. Regrettably, and perhaps for a variety of sound reasons, at this particular time we were not able to go to the extent we might have gone in this regard. However, we have made meaningful progress.

The two previous speakers addressed themselves to the importance to the Canadian people of the measure we are now concluding. Like the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie), I too hope it will not be ten years before we return to the bill. As he and others particularly the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin) pointed out, there are still deficiencies in the manner in which Canadians are given an opportunity to exercise their franchise. Similarly, there are glaring deficiences with regard to the elderly and those who by virtue of their occupation are not able to qualify for or to be present at the advance poll or on the day of voting, or to avail themselves of the proxy vote.

I must differ with my friend from Regina-Lake Centre in his pessimism about the practical appreciation of the proxy vote. Another great province, the province where all great political wisdom was born well over 200 years ago, has implemented this provision and it has worked. There has not been the abuse of the system that some hon. members have feared, perhaps with justification as a result of their own experience. The proxy in our province has not been abused to any widespread extent. Indeed, it has afforded to thousands of Nova Scotians who otherwise would not have been able to do so for reasons of physical incapacity or of employment, the opportunity to exercise their franchise.

I also think the extension of the right to vote to Canadians of 18 years and over is another meaningful step. As the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre said, it is important that this and all the other very meaningful aspects of the changes that have been made, both in committee of the whole House and in the Standing Committee, be communicated to all Canadians. The method of doing so has been discussed in the Standing Committee. If there was no direction given there, there was at least clear evidence relating to the wishes of the committee and in this respect there was some degree of unanimity.

If it is not too late, I should like to join previous speakers in expressing my own appreciation to the Chief Electoral Officer and his staff for the tremendous assistance they have given us, and also to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) for the manner in which he conducted the deliberations of the Standing Committee when it had this measure before it. I think it is a measure of the wisdom and maturity of this House that the bill was dealt with on a non-partisan basis. Unlike some comments made earlier this evening, perhaps partly in jest, I did not suspect more than once or twice that the President of the Privy Council was trying to lead anybody. On the contrary, I think he did an excellent job and should be commended for it.

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, after listening to the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall) telling us about how much the province of Nova Scotia is the fount of all wisdom, dating back some 200 years, and how we the Parliament of Canada have now adopted this very wise provision relating to proxy voting that his province has put into effect, may I be permitted to point out, because I know the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) would be too timorous and humble to do so, that the province of Nova Scotia undoubtedly adopted the proxy system from Ontario, where it has been in effect since some years prior to its introduction in Nova Scotia.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, it looks very much as though we might not make further progress this evening, so I should like to advise the House of the proposed agenda for tomorrow. The first item will be Government Order 107, Bill S-23, an act to deal with the pilotage provisions of the Canada Shipping Act. This will be followed by Government Order 89, the report stage of Bill C-204 with regard to the Fisheries Act. This will be followed by Government Order 47, the report stage of Bill C-163, an act to provide for the establishment of a Standards Council of Canada.

Before resuming my seat may I express my thanks to hon. members for their kind words.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

FISHERIES—MANITOBA GOVERNMENT OFFER OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO ESTABLISH PROCESSING PLANT IN SELKIRK

Mr. Doug Rowland (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week I asked the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) whether he had yet received an offer from the government of Manitoba of additional incentives to encourage the continued location of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation processing plant in Selkirk. At that time the minister indicated that he had not yet received an offer. I assume he now has the offer and that he will be able to give at least a preliminary opinion on it.

• (11:00 p.m.)

In our last encounter on this subject I am afraid that both the minister and myself were guilty of casting more heat than light on the subject of the optimum location. I in no way wish to suggest, in saying this, that I was wrong in asserting that the matter of location of the plant, because of the possible conflict of interest between the 6,000 fishermen whose incomes are being attended to by the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation and the needs of some 20,000 people living in the interlake and coming under an ARDA-FRED agreement, is properly a matter for a specific government policy decision and not for an administrative decision on the part of the corporation.

My remarks provoked the minister to suggest that I was engaged in a special pleading; that I simply wanted the plant in my constituency rather than in someone else's; that I was prepared to sacrifice the best interests of 6,000 fishermen on the altar of 120 to 150 jobs for Selkirk. First of all let me disabuse the minister of the assumption that Selkirk is the largest centre in my riding. As a matter of fact, better than 66 per cent of the voters in the constituency of Selkirk live in metropolitan Winnipeg, the site currently favoured for the location of the plant. Rather, my support for the Selkirk location is based upon the following four considerations. First, 150 new jobs in Winnipeg, while desirable, would have only a marginal effect on that city's economy, whereas the loss of a similar number of jobs in the town of Selkirk through the relocation of the plant would represent an economic disaster of major proportions; second, the relocation of the plant would have a powerfully adverse effect upon the ARDA-FRED development plans for the entire interlake area, based as they are upon agriculture and the fisheries; third, the relocation of the plant would involve the loss of compatible employment for the Indians and Métis of the interlake area. Here it is interesting to note that at any given time 40 per cent to 60 per cent of the employees of the Selkirk plant are of Indian or Métis descent and that the income of at least one entire Indian village is almost totally dependent upon the existence of the plant in Selkirk. Fourth, the movement of the plant to Winnipeg represents one more step in the direction of the concentration of the industry and the population of Manitoba in metropolitan Winnipeg, a step which is socially undesirable both from the point of view of increased urban congestion and from the point of view of a further decline in the vitality and quality of life in the rural and semi-rural regions of the province.

The minister also charged, as I noted earlier, that I was willing to sacrifice the economic well-being of 6,000 fishermen distributed throughout the west and northwest in order to keep 120 to 150 jobs in my constituency. Far from it. My argument was that the economic benefits of the Winnipeg location had not been proved, and that even if there were an economic disadvantage to the Selkirk

site, the Department of Regional Economic Expansion grant which has been offered more than offset it.

Moreover, I argued that it was a case of weighing the certain harm to the economic development potential of the entire interlake region of Manitoba against a largely hypothetical disadvantage to the fishermen. In respect of the economic consideration let me quote from a brief prepared by the Manitoba Department of Industry and Commerce, prepared for presentation to the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation in early June. It states in part as follows:

> The location cost comparison conducted by the Manitoba Department of Industry and Commerce based on information provided by the FFMC, and accepted by the FFMC, concludes that economic factors favour a Selkirk location. Considering the minimum grant differential offered by the federal Department of Regional Economic Expansion the cost saving in Selkirk is $17,752 per year over the optimum Metro Winnipeg site which is St. Boniface. This annual saving is equivalent to an initial amortized capital difference of $151,123.

It continues:

> Within the past week it was revealed by the FFMC that the grant differential offered by DREE may be as much as 40 per cent higher than the figure used in the Dept. of I & C study. This larger grant, equal to $5,000 per job, would result in a total cost advantage to Selkirk of $52,287 per year or an initial saving of $445,123.

Even without considering the Department of Regional Economic Expansion grants, the hypothetical advantage of St. Boniface over Selkirk could only amount to a total of $34,048 per year, the brief indicated. The Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation's case for a Winnipeg as opposed to a Selkirk location for the new plant would now seem to be based upon considerations of cost and speed of transportation vis-à-vis Winnipeg and Selkirk, and upon the hypothetical assumption that the movement of fish will shift from truck to rail. Such an assumption, I suggest, is highly questionable but I do not propose to debate it. Rather, I would refer to the offer from the government of Manitoba in response to the Minister of Fisheries' (Mr. Davis) demand that the government "put up or shut up".

The government of Manitoba has now indicated that in order to assure a Selkirk location it is prepared "to accept the actual costs of transhipping if it exceeds the amount defrayed by DREE." In short, the government of Manitoba is prepared to cover any increased costs of shipping that might be incurred by the corporation through locating in Selkirk. I suggest that this offer removes the last remaining objection to a Selkirk location. I would therefore earnestly entreat the minister to use his power and influence to ensure that the processing plant remains in Selkirk. The social advantages of such a course are manifestly obvious and any potential economic obstacle has now been removed.

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Rowland) has said, there is a lively interest in new fish processing capacity on the Prairies and this is true because that industry is expanding rapidly. My own forecast now is that we will have at least two big processing plants in Manitoba. In other words, we will have one at Transcona and continue to have one at Selkirk. The main reason the Selkirk location has been questioned, in my view, has been the decline in recent years, essentially in the 1960's, of the resource in Lake Winnipeg itself and to a lesser extent in the interlake area. This can be revived, and the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation and the Fish Research Board have planned to utilize other species which, up until now, have not been regarded as commercial. We believe the plant now operating at Selkirk will be operating at or near capacity for a number of years to come.

Hopefully, I expect the Manitoba government will not be called upon to subsidize the plant in Selkirk because its economics are improving all the time in respect of an operation which will utilize fish coming from Lake Winnipeg and the interlake area. At the same time we will look again at Manitoba's offer to equalize costs as between Selkirk and Transcona. But I must remind the hon. member that we do have a competent board of directors appointed by provinces other than Manitoba and including representatives of Manitoba, and their concern is about an optimum location for the main processing plant for fish from all over western Canada including the territories and western Ontario. Their view, after many meetings, is that it should be at Transcona. I will, however, bring the latest submission from the Minister of Industry and Commerce of Manitoba to their attention and ask them to consider it serious-

ly, which I am sure they will. My own forecast is that there will be two plants, an old one and a new one. The old one at Selkirk needs to be rehabilitated and this will take place beginning next year. I also expect employment in Selkirk will probably increase and not decrease in so far as fish processing is concerned.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 11.12 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, June 26, 1970

The House met at 11 a.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

AGRICULTURE

Fourth report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture—Mr. Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean).

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND NATIONAL DEFENCE

Tenth report of Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence—Mr. Wahn.

PROCEDURE AND ORGANIZATION

Second report of Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization—Mr. Blair.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Fifth report of Standing Committee on Public Accounts, in both official languages—Mr. Lefebvre.

INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Ian Watson (Laprairie): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table the seventh and eighth reports of the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development and with the consent of the House, I intend to move later today that they be concurred in.

TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. H.-Pit Lessard (LaSalle): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table the thirteenth report of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, in both official languages.

Mr. Speaker, with the agreement of the House, I intend to move today that the said report be concurred in.

[*Editor's Note: For text of above reports, see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

• (11:10 a.m.)

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the hon. member for Lac-Saint-Jean or of the leader of the House whether consent will be sought to proceed today with the report stage and third reading of Bill C-196 which was reported from the Standing Committee a few moments ago by the hon. member?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I understand there may be at least some measure of consent to take all the remaining stages of Bill C-196 today without debate so that it may pass this House and make further progress. I hope this can be done by general consent either now or at the appropriate time so that it may be put through the House and transferred to the other place.

Mr. Baldwin: I do not think these bright and shining words are as realistic as they might appear to be. We have no objection to this bill being put through today or next week, for that matter, but we do not intend to relinquish our duty as the opposition to make sure that all the amendments introduced by the government or by others receive full and proper treatment.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Could there be discussion through the usual channels this morning to ascertain whether we could get along with this bill?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): All three items down for consideration today are on an equally urgent basis. Moreover, the business has to be interrupted at four o'clock this afternoon for an emergency debate. If it is possible to have Bill C-196 included also on an emergency basis I would be glad to see this done, but if it is suggested that there is to be a prolonged debate on it the discussion will have to be deferred, or else we must defer the emergency debate.

Mr. Baldwin: I suppose it is a question of assessing priorities. There are so many emergencies arising under the government that we have to consider which should take priority.

Indian Affairs Committee Report

HOUSE OF COMMONS

RESUMPTION OF SITTINGS ON OCTOBER 5, 1970, FOLLOWING SUMMER RECESS

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council) moved:

That, when the House adjourns for its summer recess, it shall stand adjourned until October 5, 1970, provided always that if it appears to the satisfaction of Mr. Speaker, after consultation with Her Majesty's Government, that the public interest requires that the House should meet at an earlier time during the adjournment, Mr. Speaker may give notice that he is so satisfied, and thereupon the House shall meet at the time stated in such notice, and shall transact its business as if it had been duly adjourned to that time; and

That, in the event of Mr. Speaker being unable to act owing to illness or other cause, the Deputy Speaker or the Deputy Chairman of Committees shall act in his stead for the purpose of reconvening the House.

Motion agreed to.

INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

CONCURRENCE IN SEVENTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Ian Watson (Laprairie): Mr. Speaker, if the House gives its consent I would move that the seventh report of the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development, presented this day, be concurred in.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

CONCURRENCE IN EIGHTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Ian Watson (Laprairie): Mr. Speaker, if the House gives its consent I would move that the eighth report of the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development, presented this day, be concurred in.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): We are prepared to recommend concurrence in this report, Mr. Speaker, but I should like it to go on record that concurrence is subject to consultation with representatives of all the parties, if and when a detailed timetable and itinerary are proposed, so that it can be generally accepted that what is proposed is reasonable. Subject to this caveat, I am glad to give consent.

Motion agreed to.

[Mr. Baldwin.]

[*Translation*]

OIL

TABLING OF ANNUAL REPORT OF PANARCTIC OILS LIMITED

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the annual report of Panarctic Oils Company Limited, for the year 1969.

[*English*]

INDIAN AFFAIRS

DISTURBANCES, SIX NATIONS RESERVE—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43 TO REFER SUBJECT TO STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. J. E. Brown (Brant): Mr. Speaker, I rise to move a motion under Standing Order 43 of urgent and pressing necessity asking the House to discuss a matter of national importance. I refer to the recent disorders and disturbances that have occurred on the Six Nations Indian reserve in my constituency. I have in my hand a copy of the Brantford *Expositor* of June 24 which carries the headline: "Indian group seizes council house". The elected council, which holds office under and by virtue of an Act of this Parliament, has been locked out of the council chamber and a seizure has been effected of the property occupied until two days ago by the Mohawk Institute, one of the largest Indian educational institutions in Canada.

I raised this matter, Mr. Speaker, in the House on March 10, of this year, when I asked a question of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. An answer was given by his Parliamentary Secretary assuring me that this institution was closed after full and complete consultation with the Indian council. Every member of this House has received a letter from the Six Nations council advising them that at no time did they grant their consent.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Would the hon. member kindly indicate what motion he is proposing?

Mr. Brown: I will gladly do so, Mr. Speaker, especially in view of the long and rather sordid story of our relations with the Indian people over the years.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brown: I am the only representative that the Six Nations Indians have in Parliament, and I could tell a story that would shock all hon. members.

Some hon. Members: Go ahead.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to give unanimous consent to this story being told.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Would the hon. member kindly move his proposed motion.

Mr. Brown: Without further words I will gladly move the following motion:

That the recent disorders on the Six Nations Indian reserve be referred for study to the Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members have heard the motion proposed by the hon. member for Brant. The motion requires the unanimous agreement of the House.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: There appears to be unanimity in the House so I will put the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

AREA DEVELOPMENT INCENTIVES ACT

TABLING OF LIST OF PROJECTS APPROVED TO DECEMBER 31, 1969

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 41(2) I should like to lay on the table of the House, on behalf of my colleague the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, a list of the projects approved under the Area Development Incentives Act to December 31, 1969.

• (11:20 a.m.)

FISHERIES AND FORESTRY

PROPOSED REFERENCE TO STANDING COMMITTEE OF REPORT FOR YEAR ENDED MARCH 31, 1969

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions among representatives of the parties and I gather there would be some disposition to enable the fisheries committee to travel to Eastern Canada during the course of the parliamentary recess. If there is agreement, I wonder whether the following could be made an order of the House, that the report of the Department of Fisheries and Forestry for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1969, tabled in the House June 12, 1970, be referred to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry; and that the committee be empowered to adjourn from place to place within Canada during its consideration of the said report.

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the statement by the President of the Privy Council. I must say to him that there has been no consultation with me as the chairman of the fisheries committee of the official opposition on this matter; hence there has been no agreement reached on the proposal he is now placing before the House.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I was advised that there had been consultation. If there was not I apologize to the hon. gentleman, and on that basis I would withdraw the motion.

[*Translation*]

TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

CONCURRENCE IN THIRTEENTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. H.-Pit Lessard (LaSalle) moves that the thirteenth report of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, presented today, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

[*English*]

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, on Monday last I indicated that we would probably be in a position to respond to some written questions and some Notices of Motions for Production of Papers today. We are now in a position to do so. I wonder whether the House would agree to a special order to permit those items to be called at this point so that my Parliamentary Secretary might call certain questions and motions for disposition.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

RESEARCH, DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

Question No. 615—**Mr. Comeau:**

1. In 1968-69 and 1969-70, what were the estimated sums spent on research in the Department of Regional Economic Expansion and what was the purpose of each research project?

Questions

2. How much money was actually expended according to Dominion Bureau of Statistics figures?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion and the Dominion Bureau of Statistics as follows: 1. See attached schedule.

2. The Dominion Bureau of Statistics does not have "actual" expenditures on research for 1968-69 and 1969-70. A survey requesting information on actual expenditures for 1968-69 and estimates for 1969-70 on research in the natural and engineering sciences is in process.

RESEARCH CONTRACTS

Department of Regional Economic Expansion

Name		Contract Amount	Amount Paid
Giles Beaudet	Study of Parent radar station conversion	$ 4,000	$ 4,000
Benjamin Higgins Lalonde Valois Lamarre Valois	Study of socio-economic problems in Quebec	4,100	4,050
Associates	Transportation study of Gaspé region	225,000	225,000
F. Martin	Study of socio-economic problems Quebec	4,000	4,000
J. C. Wicket	Study of nutritional levels in selected population areas	5,000	5,000
A. Raynaud	Study of socio-economic problems in Quebec	4,000	4,000
G. Bourassa	Study of consultative process at the regional level and its impact on regional planning	17,250	13,000
M. Ray	Study of areas of diminishing population	1,000	500
Total		$264,350	$259,550

INCENTIVE GRANT TO BRIQUES CITADELLE, QUEBEC

Question No. 944—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, under the Regional Incentives Act, authorized or provided an incentive grant to "Briques Citadelle, Quebec" and, if so, what is the amount of the grant?

2. What is the total estimated cost of the project for which the grant was provided and what is the nature of the project and its location?

3. Who are the directors and chief executive officers of "Briques Citadelle, Quebec" and what is the address of each?

4. To what extent is this company non-resident or foreign-owned or controlled?

5. What is the name and country of the known non-resident ownership in this company?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion and the Dominion Bureau of Statistics as follows: 1. and 2. This information was contained in the monthly report, tabled in Parliament on the operation of the Regional Development Act.

3. The directors and chief executive officers of Brique Citadelle Ltée, as of December 31, 1969 were: Cajeton Côté, President, Director, Quebec, Quebec; Fernand Demers, Vice President, Director, Sillery, Quebec; C. H. Gagnon, Secretary-Treasurer, Director, Villeneuve, Quebec; L. O. Morency, Director, Quebec, Quebec; François Nolin, Director, Charlesbourg, Quebec; Stuart Wright, Director, Quebec, Quebec; Amédée Demers, Director, Quebec, Quebec.

4. Non-residents had no interest in the voting shares of the company either directly or through other holdings.

5. None.

MANAGEMENT CONTRACT, NEW MONTREAL INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Question No. 1,032—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Were tenders or bids called for the management contract for physical aspects of the development of the new Montreal International Airport and, if so, who was awarded the contract?

2. (a) Who submitted tenders or bids for this contract (b) what was the amount or terms of the tender or bid?

3. Were tenders or bids called for the architectural work for the first terminal building?

4. What tenders or bids were submitted and what was the amount or terms of each?

5. Who was awarded the contract?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. Tenders were not called.

2. (a) Not applicable; (b) Not applicable.

3. No.

4. Not applicable.

5. Papineau, Gérin-Lajoie, Leblanc and Edwards.

NEWFOUNDLAND—REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION ESTIMATES

Question No. 1,215—**Mr. Marshall:**

1. What amount is allocated for the Province of Newfoundland in the Regional Economic Expansion estimates, Vote L25, Loans in accordance with agreements entered into or to be entered into with the provinces for development of industrial infrastructure of the $39,147,000 proposed for 1970-71?

2. What is the breakdown of advances to each Atlantic Province in the Department's Vote L15, of $33,657.00?

3. What is the breakdown, by province, in the Department's estimates under Grants to Universities and Regional Development Associations to promote Regional Development in an amount of $25,000?

4. What is the breakdown of allocated amounts, by province, in the Department's estimates under contribution in the amount of $1,764,200 for projects and programs under ARDA including Canada Land Inventory—Planning and Administration?

5. What is the breakdown, by province, of the proposed 1970-71 estimates of $124,828,100.00 under contributions, payments to provinces economic expansion and social adjustment?

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): 1. $9,075,000.

2. Newfoundland, $22,474,000; Nova Scotia, $9,225,000; New Brunswick, $1,958,000.

3. This $25,000 will be used as appropriate projects are submitted and there is no advance allocation by provinces.

4. Of the total $808,899 is allocated by province, and these allocations are: Newfoundland, $33,900; New Brunswick, $28,000; Quebec, $90,500; Ontario, $46,000; Manitoba, $224,333; Saskatchewan, $129,833; Alberta, $137,833; British Columbia, $118,500.

5. Newfoundland, $38,104,000; Prince Edward Island, $13,023,000; Nova Scotia, $32,879,000; New Brunswick, $40,677,000; Unallocated, $145,100.

IMPROVEMENTS TO CHARLOTTETOWN AIRPORT

Question No. 1,231—**Mr. MacLean:**

1. What amount is provided in the 1970-71 estimates for improvements to the Charlottetown Airport?

2. What are the improvements planned?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. An amount of $33,500 has been provided in the 1970-71 Estimates for improvements to the Charlottetown Airport.

2. It is planned to instal a permanent non-directional navigation beacon this year at Charlottetown Airport.

*NEW MONTREAL INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Question No. 1,433—**Mr. Beaudoin:**

Does the federal government intend to cancel the expropriation orders or assign the properties to the Government of Quebec in the case of lands expropriated for the Sainte-Scholastique Airport and which will not be used for that project?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the federal government received a request by the previous provincial government to either abandon expropriation procedures on land adjacent to the Ste. Scholastique Airport property, or to transfer title of such land to the government of Quebec. A decision on this matter has not been reached.

[*English*]

PRAIRIE PROVINCES—FRESHWATER FISH MARKETING BOARD SALES

Question No. 1,466—**Mr. Yewchuk:**

1. What percentage of fish handled by the Freshwater Fish Marketing Board in each of the Prairie Provinces, is sold locally and what percentage is exported to other parts of Canada or to the United States?

2. What was the price paid to the fishermen for the various types of freshwater fish caught in the Prairie Provinces in the past three years and what is the average price now being paid to them by the Freshwater Fish Marketing Board?

Mr. E. F. Whelan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): 1. It is not possible statistically to distinguish between that part of each Province's production which is sold in other parts of Canada or sold in the United States. Statistics on the Corporation's sales within Alberta from December 1, 1969, to April 30, 1970, represented 12 per cent of production to a total value of $68,929.

2. Following is a comparison of initial prices paid to fishermen in the summer season since the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation came into production. The figures given for

Questions

the 1963 summer season are indicative of averages of fluctuating prices.

	1970	1969 (cents per lb.)	1968
Jumbo Whites	41½	41	42
Large Whites	33½	31	27
Medium Whites	23½	18	17
Headless Pickerel	46½	27	24
Headless Northern Pike	8½	6	2
Perch	9	7	9

In addition to the initial prices indicated for 1969 there was a final payment of $0.0137 per lb. on all whitefish and $0.0793 per lb. on all pickerel.

DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION RESEARCH STUDIES

Question No. 1,496—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. What research studies have been carried out by, or on behalf of, the Department of Regional Economic Expansion during each year 1960 to 1969 inclusive?

2. What research studies are presently being carried on and/or are contemplated during the next five years?

3. What was the cost of each of the research studies completed in each year 1960 to 1969 inclusive?

4. What is the estimated cost of each of the studies presently in being or contemplated during the next five years?

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The answer for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion since its formation on April 1, 1969, is as follows: 1. Studies carried out by the Department are part of its continuing operations and are not identifiable. Studies carried out on behalf of the Department are listed on the schedule following.

2. See schedule following. Estimates covering the next five years are not available.

3. See schedule following.

4. See following schedule for continuing studies. Estimated costs for the next five years are not available.

RESEARCH CONTRACTS

Department of Regional Economic Expansion

Name		Contract Amount	Amount Paid	Amount Spent: Completed Contracts	Amount Spent: Continuing Contracts
Giles Beaudet	Study of Parent radar station conversion	$ 4,000	$ 4,000	$ 4,000	$
Benjamin Higgins	Study of socio-economic problems in Quebec	4,100	4,050	4,050	
Lalonde Valois Lamarre Valois Associates	Transportation study of Gaspé region	225,000	225,000	225,000	
F. Martin	Study of socio-economic problems Quebec	4,000	4,000	4,000	
J. C. Wicket	Study of nutritional levels in selected population areas	5,000	5,000	5,000	
A. Raynaud	Study of socio-economic Quebec	4,000	4,000	4,000	
G. Bourassa	Study of consultative process at the regional level and its impact on regional planning	17,250	13,000		4,250
M. Ray	Study of areas of diminishing population	1,000	500		500
Total		$254,350	$259,550	$246,050	$ 4,750

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD—SALARIES OF COMMISSIONERS

Question No. 1,500—**Mr. Thompson:**

1. What is the salary of the Chief Commissioner, the Assistant Chief Commissioner and the three other Commissioners of the Canadian Wheat Board?

2. What are the dates of their appointments and terms of appointment?

[Mr. Whelan.]

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): 1. Chief Commissioner, $37,000; Assistant Chief Commissioner, $34,000; Other Commissioners, $32,000.

Subsection (3) of Section 3 of Part I of the Canadian Wheat Board Act provides that: each commissioner holds office during good behaviour but may be removed for cause at any time by the Governor in Council, but no

commissioner shall hold office beyond the age of seventy years.

2. Present Commissioners were appointed as follows: W. C. McNamara, Commissioner—September 15, 1945; Assistant Chief Commissioner—February 1, 1947; Chief Commissioner—January 31, 1961. G. N. Vogel, Commissioner—September 1, 1964; Assistant Chief Commissioner—July 1, 1969. D. H. Treleaven, Commissioner—October 1, 1965. Dr. R. L. Kristjanson, Commissioner—October 1, 1965. C. W. Gibbings, Commissioner—July 1, 1969.

EMPLOYMENT OF INDIANS AND LEASES ON CAUGHNAWAGA RESERVE

Question No. 1,659—**Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse):**

1. Has the Canadian Government recently employed an Indian at a salary of $20,000 or over?

2. On the Caughnawaga Indian Reserve for the past three years, has the Canadian Government (a) renewed leases and, if so, for each of these leases in (i) what year was it signed and by whom (ii) what was the initial rental cost (iii) what was the last rental cost (iv) what was the initial duration (v) what is the duration of the last renewal (b) approved leases and, if so, for each of these leases (i) on what date was it signed and by whom (ii) what was the rental cost (iii) what is the duration?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Prime Minister's and Privy Council Offices and the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development as follows: 1. No.

2. The contents of a lease agreement constitutes a confidential landlord-tenant relationship. It would represent a breach of confidence to provide a reply to this question.

SINKING OF LIBERIAN TANKER *ARROW*

Question No. 1,748—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. What has been the cost to the Canadian government of the grounding and subsequent sinking of the Liberian registered tanker *Arrow* in Chedabucto Bay, Nova Scotia on February 4, 1970?

2. What further cost is estimated?

3. What is the estimated cost of the formal investigation taking place?

4. Will the federal government consider charging the total cost to the owners of the *Arrow*?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the National Research Council of Canada and the Department of Transport as follows:

	National Research Council of Canada	Department of Transport
1.	$39,836.	$1,802,000.
2.	$12,425. (Estimated)	$1,200,000.

3. Not possible to determine, as the investigation has not been completed.

4. This is under investigation.

OTTAWA—COST OF CONVERSION OF UNION STATION TO CONFERENCE CENTRE

Question No. 1,774—**Mr. Coates:**

1. What was the total cost to the government of Canada to convert the Old Union Station into a Conference Centre?

2. What use is made of the Conference Centre?

3. Is the public barred from viewing these facilities and, if so, for what reason?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Prime Minister's and Privy Council Offices and the Department of Public Works as follows: 1. Acquisition of furniture and furnishings amounted to $45,753. Cost of construction, $681,845.32.

2. The Conference Centre is for the use of federal-provincial conferences and meetings, other federal government meetings and interprovincial meetings.

3. The usual rules which apply to government buildings in Ottawa are also applicable to the Government Conference Centre. No public tours have been planned.

CBC—TV APPEARANCE OF CHAIRMAN OF MONARCHIST LEAGUE OF CANADA

Question No. 1,797—**Mr. McIntosh:**

1. How many telephone calls were received by CBC regarding the appearance of John Aimers, Chairman of the Monarchist League of Canada, on Hourglass, April 2, 1970?

2. Of this number, how many expressed (a) favourable (b) unfavourable comments about Mr. Aimers' views?

3. Of this number, how many expressed (a) favourable (b) unfavourable comments about Mr. Desbarats' attitude, or the way in which he conducted the interview?

4. How many letters were received by CBC in relation to the same interview?

5. Of the letters received, how many expressed (a) favourable (b) unfavourable comments about Mr. Aimers' views?

6. How many letters expressed (a) favourable (b) unfavourable comments about Mr. Desbarats' attitude, or the manner in which he conducted the interview?

Questions

7. Was the news story of the formation of the Monarchist League of Canada treated on CBC National News in the same manner as it was on CTV National News and, if not, for what reason?

8. Is it the intention of CBC to provide further opportunities for Mr. Aimers and supporters of the Crown to state their case, in opposition to the many who attack the Crown?

9. How many interviews, news stories, or such similar material, by or about those opposed to the continued presence of the Canadian Monarchy were carried by CBC in (a) 1964 (b) 1965 (c) 1966 (d) 1967 (e) 1968 (f) 1969 (g) 1970, to date?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: 1. Twenty three telephone calls.

2 and 3. Fifteen of the calls expressed general approval of the interview without being specifically favourable to either Mr. Aimers' views or Mr. Desbarats' attitude and the way the interview was conducted. The remaining eight calls were unfavourable to Mr. Desbarats' interviewing style.

4. Three letters, addressed to Peter Desbarats as host of the program.

5 and 6. Two of the three letters were favourable and one was non-committal, with respect to Mr. Aimers' views. All three were unfavourable to Mr. Desbarats' attitude or the manner in which the interview was conducted.

7. The CBC has no record of having carried such a news story and has no details as to the time or nature of CTV coverage although it is believed that CTV carried it as a brief item. If the story had been among the many news items received by CBC news, its news value would have been considered in relation to other news stories of the day and the broadcast time available.

8. The Corporation attempts to cover people and events in the news on the basis of their interest or significance to the public.

9. This information is not available since CBC records are not maintained in such detail.

POLLUTION—BRITISH COLUMBIA PULP MILL EFFLUENT

Question No. 1,825—**Mr. Howard (Skeena):**

1. Does the government have any data concerning the contents of pulp mill effluent from any pulp and/or paper mills in British Columbia and, if so, with respect to each such mill, by name, what is the daily quantity of each chemical, by name, that is contained within the effluent from each such mill?

[Mr. McIntosh.]

2. Into what body of water, or other area, does each such mill pour its effluent?

3. What evaluation exists of the toxicity to (a) fish (b) other animal life (c) plants (d) humans of each such chemical referred to in Part 1?

Mr. E. F. Whelan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): 1. Yes. Data is not available in terms of chemicals contained within the effluents, or the daily quantity of each chemical. Further detail is being obtained in a current survey.

2. Powell River Mill—Malaspina Strait; Crofton Mill—Stuart Channel; Harmac Mill (Nanaimo)—Northumberland Channel; Alpulp Mill (Port Alberni)—Alberni Inlet; Gold River Mill—Muchalat Inlet; Elk Falls Mill (Campbell River)—Discovery Passage; Port Alice—Neroutsos Inlet; Woodfibre Mill—Howe Sound; Port Mellon Mill—Howe Sound; Ocean Falls Mill—Cousins Inlet; Columbia Cellulose and Skeena Kraft Mill—Chatham Sound and Wainwright Basin; Kamloops Pulp and Paper Mill—South Thompson River; Northwood Pulp Mill (Prince George)—Fraser River; Prince George Pulp and Paper —Fraser River; Intercontinental Pulp (Prince George)—Fraser River; Celgar Mill (Castlegar)—Columbia River.

3. (a) Evaluation of the toxicity of kraft pulp mill effluents from all of the inland kraft mills on salmon streams is conducted through regular bioassays of samples of mill effluent. (b) Not known. (c) Not known. (d) Not known.

FEDERAL GRANT TO FRONTIER COLLEGE

Question No. 1,835—**Mr. Nystrom:** (Supplementary)

1. Is it the intention of the government to provide Frontier College with an operating grant of $50,000 for their 1970 program?

2. Has the government made a decision as to the amount of financial assistance Frontier College might expect in future years?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Manpower and Immigration and Labour as follows: 1. No. The federal government decided to double its grant to Frontier College from $5,000 in 1969-70 to $10,000 in 1970-71. The Department of Labour has provision in its 1970-71 Estimates for a grant of $5,000 to the College.

2. No. However, beginning with 1971-72, the Department of Manpower and Immigration will assume sole responsibility within

the federal jurisdiction for federal grants to Frontier College. Some financial support of an indirect nature can also be given in the form of purchases, by the Department, of training and research services under the Adult Occupational Training Act. In this connection, the Department has had many discussions with the provinces and with Frontier College in an attempt to increase such purchases, which under the law require provincial concurrence. Purchases have been relatively small, mainly for the reason that provinces consider that they can supply the training required through provincially operated institutions.

LABOUR GAZETTE ARTICLE BY PROFESSOR E. P. NEUFELD

Question No. 1,870—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Was Professor E. P. Neufeld paid for the article "Inflation and Tight Money: Where Are They Taking Us?" which appeared in the May, 1970 issue of the Labour Gazette and, if so, how much?

2. Was this article written especially for publication in the Labour Gazette or is it in fact in whole or in the main a reprint of the speech given by Professor Neufeld to the Canadian Club in Toronto on December 3, 1969?

3. Is it the intention to provide equivalent space in the Labour Gazette for articles of opposite views to those of Professor Neufeld?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): 1. Yes. $150.

2. The article was commissioned for the *Labour Gazette* but was based on material used in the speech of December 3, 1969.

3. At least one article on the same general subject, by a different author, is planned.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—USE OF CONSULTANTS

Question No. 1,888—**Mr. Robinson:**

How many consultants have been engaged by the Department of Justice during each year 1950 to 1970 inclusive (a) what was the cost of the consultants (b) how were the consultants utilized (c) for what reasons were the consultants necessary?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): This question cannot be answered in its present form unless some definition can be attached to the term consultant. For example, are legal agents retained in specific cases considered to be in this category? Does the term consultant cover the Royal Commission on the Criminal Law Relating to Criminal Sexual Psychopaths, the Special Committee on Hate Propaganda in Canada and the Department of Justice Committee on Juvenile Delinquency? In addition, following enactment of the Government Organization Act 1966, numerous agencies that previously had been responsible to the Minister of Justice became the responsibility of other ministries and the bulk of their records were transferred to the department concerned.

CANADA COUNCIL DOCTORAL FELLOWSHIPS

Question No. 1,890—**Mr. Caouette:**

1. What is the success rate of those applying for Canada Council Doctoral Fellowships?

2. (a) How many Canada Council Doctoral Fellowships were awarded this year (b) how many applications were refused?

3. Of those awarded, how many were to (a) Canadian citizens (b) landed immigrants?

4. Of those refused, how many were (a) Canadian citizens (b) landed immigrants?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canada Council as follows: 1. For fellowships awarded in 1969-70 and tenable in 1970-71, the success rate was 97.8% in the case of renewal applications, 38.6% in the case of first awards, and 56.1% for both combined.

2. (a) 1,203 renewals and 1,138 first awards, or a total of 2,341. (b) 27 renewal applications and 1,810 applications for first awards, or a total of 1,837.

3. (a) 1,789; (b) 552.

4. (a) 1,323; (b) 514.

[*English*]

DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES AND FORESTRY—DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT

Question No. 1,923—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Fisheries and Forestry have data processing equipment (automatic) and, if so, for how long?

2. What was the initial cost of the equipment?

3. What yearly costs are anticipated for data processing in the Department?

Mr. E. F. Whelan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): 1. Yes, since 1969.

2. $53,200.

3. The anticipated cost for data processing computing services for the current fiscal year is $263,500, exclusive of salaries of Departmental staff.

Questions

AIR TRANSPORT—AIR SERVICE FOR GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS AND VIP'S

Question No. 1,925—**Mr. Comeau:**

1. Do the Departments of Transport and National Defence operate similar air services for government officials and VIP's and, if so, for what reason?

2. Is there a difference in operating costs in these services?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Transport and National Defence as follows: 1. The Ministry of Transport is responsible for the provision of short to medium range airlifts of Ministers of the Crown, foreign dignitaries visiting Canada and, from time to time, high-ranking federal officials on government business. These flight operations are confined principally to the North American continent. The Department of National Defence operates an air service for the transportation of personnel of the Department. However, on occasion, Air Transport Command are called upon to provide special flights for other government departments. This occurs when the demand for such airlifts exceeds the Department of Transport's capacity, or when a transoceanic airlift is required since DOT's airlift is primarily limited to domestic operations.

2. The operating costs of the Ministry of Transport aircraft are determined according to aircraft type by means of a well established cost accounting procedure and are prorated over the expected life cycle of each aircraft type. The direct operating costs are commensurate with those of commercial operators using similar or same type aircraft. When Air Transport Command provide airlift services for other government departments, costs are staffed through Canadian Forces Headquarters. It is not known how such costs would compare to that for a similar DOT operation.

ENERGY, MINES AND RESOURCES—ADVERTISING EXPENDITURES

Question No. 1,928—**Mr. Sulatycky:**

1. Has the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources retained or employed from time-to-time, from outside its own permanent employees, any public relations firm or person, or any advertising firm or person for any purpose in the past five years and, if so, for what purpose?

2. What are the names of such firms or persons so employed in the past two years?

3. What was the total expenditure made for the service of such persons or firms in each of the past five years?

Mr. R. J. Orange (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): 1. Yes. To prepare articles and audio-visual productions on water pollution research.

2 and 3.

Pacesetter Presentations Limited, 135 Railside Road, Don Mills, Ontario.	1965-1968	—
	1968-1969	$ 1,750
	1969-1970	$ 2,750
Hopkins, Hedlin Limited, 95 St. Clair Avenue West, Toronto 7, Ontario.	1965-1968	—
	1968-1969	$ 12,689
	1969-1970	—

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION—OUTSIDE ADVERTISING EXPENDITURES

Question No. 1,929—**Mr. Sulatycky:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion retained or employed from time-to-time, from outside its own permanent employees, and public relations firm or person, or any advertising firm or person for any purpose in the past five years and, if so, for what purpose?

2. What are the names of such firms or persons so employed in the past two years?

3. What was the total expenditure made for the service of such persons or firms in each of the past five years?

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): 1. Yes. (a) for the production and placement of advertisements; (b) for the production of films for display to the public.

2. Inter Canada Advertising Agency Ltd.; Foster Advertising Limited; Cherrz Film Production Ltd.; Film House Limited.

3. 1969-70, $15,582.

[Mr. Whelan.]

CANDU-TYPE ATOMIC ENERGY PLANTS

Question No. 1,945—**Mr. Thomson:**

1. Has the government through Atomic Energy of Canada Limited offered firm bids to build Candu-type atomic energy plants in (a) Roumania (b) Mexico (c) Australia (d) other countries?

2. Have offers been made to build heavy water plants in any of these countries?

3. In any such offers, have firm commitments regarding building time, repair parts or servicing been made?

4. Are offers for sale of any such plants subject to the normal export credit conditions or have special credit arrangements been suggested?

Mr. R. J. Orange (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):

1. (a) and (b) yes; (c) about to bid; (d) no.

2. No.

3. Warranties on construction and plant performance have been offered.

4. Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES AND FORESTRY—USE OF COMPUTERS

Question No. 1,949—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Fisheries and Forestry have the use of a computer in its operations and, if so, to what extent is it utilized?

2. Is the computer programmed 24 hours per day, and, if not for what reason?

3. What is the number of hours planned for utilization of the computer?

4. What has been the annual cost of computer services for each year 1960 to 1970 inclusive?

5. How many programmes are in preparation for the computer at the present time and how will each affect the efficiency of the Department?

Mr. E. F. Whelan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): 1. The Department of Fisheries and Forestry has the use of two small electronic computers; one at Petawawa Forest Experiment Station presently utilized eight to 10 hours per day, the other at British Columbia Regional Office, Victoria, B.C., presently utilized an average of seven hours per day.

2. No. At present there is neither the workload to require full-time operation nor the staff available to operate the equipment on a full-time basis.

3. Petawawa eight to 10 hours per day; Victoria seven to eight hours per day.

4. 1960-1961, nil; 1961-1962, $7,500; 1962-1963, $20,000; 1963-1964, $20,000; 1964-1965, $44,000; 1965-1966, $55,300; 1966-1967, $61,800; 1967-1968, $100,800; 1968-1969, $182,400; 1969-1970, $249,500.

Note: Amounts prior to 1968-69 cover the Canadian Forestry Service only; figures for the Fisheries Service are not available.

5. Petawawa—20; Victoria—19. All but one are intended for summarization and analysis of data required in the research program of the Canadian Forestry Service. The other is being written for local accounting at Victoria and is expected to reduce the staff requirement in the Accounts Section by two clerks.

*AIR CANADA REORGANIZATION

Question No. 1,959—**Mr. Diefenbaker:**

1. (a) How many Vice-Presidents of Air Canada have been compulsorily retired since January 1, 1970 (b) what are the names and ages of each of the said Vice-Presidents?

2. Were any of the Vice-Presidents retained and, if so, what are their names and ages?

3. (a) How many employees have been dismissed or removed at all levels in Air Canada since January 1 (b) how many years had each of said employees served (c) how long had each of them to serve until age 65?

4. How many officials and employees still in the service of Air Canada as of this date will, under the project plan, be removed, dismissed or retired between now and January 1, 1971?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the Management of Air Canada advises as follows: 1, 2, 3, and 4. It has not been the policy or practice of the Management to disclose information from personal files of officers and employees. However, in the process of the current re-organization resulting from consolidation of positions across the System, there will be a limited number of redundancies at various management and support levels although the exact number cannot be determined at this state. Implementation will be phased over a period of months and will involve some normal retirements, some special retirements, some re-assignments and some separations. The Corporation will deal with each situation in a reasonable and equitable manner.

[*English*]

BILINGUAL DISTRICTS ADVISORY BOARD

Question No. 1,963—**Mr. Coates:**

1. Have any meetings of the Bilingual Districts Advisory Board been held to date and, if so, how many meetings and at what location?

2. What are the names of the persons on the Bilingual Districts Advisory Board, what are their addresses and what salary does each receive?

3. Does the Bilingual Districts Advisory Board have a staff and, if so, how many members are there on the staff, what are their names and what is the salary of each?

4. (a) What has been the cost to date of this Board (b) what expenses has it incurred and what expenses have each of the members of the Board incurred?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Bilingual Districts Ad-

Questions

visory Board as follows: 1. Yes. Two general meetings of the Board took place in Ottawa in March and May 1970. Fourteen informal meetings were held in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Ontario. There were also special meetings with provincial authorities in Fredericton and Toronto.

2. Mr. Roger Duhamel, Chairman, 383 Maple Lane, Rockcliffe Park, Ont., $200 for each day of service to the Board; Mr. M. G. Ballantyne, 355 St. James Street East, Montreal 126, Que., $150 for each day of service to the Board; Mr. P. Fox, 54 Turner Road, Toronto, Ont., $150 for each day of service to the Board; Dr. W. H. Hickman, 3011 Foul Bay Road, Victoria, B.C., $150 for each day of service to the Board; Miss M. Joubert, 690 Dunlop Avenue, Montreal 154, Que., $150 for each day of service to the Board; Dr. L. McEwen, Crescent Towers, Apt. 506, Saskatoon, Sask., $150 for each day of service to the Board; Honorable Judge A. M. Monnin, 608 Aulneau Street, Saint Boniface 6, Man. (No Honoraria; only expenses incurred.); Mr. R. Saint-Denis, 50 Riverdale Avenue, Ottawa 1, Ont., $150 for each day of service to the Board; Mr. A. Savoie, 375 Grand Pré, Dieppe, Moncton, N.B., $150 for each day of service to the Board; Dr. H. D. Smith, 25 Whitan Court, Truro, N.S., $150 for each day of service to the Board.

3. Yes. A staff of nine, on contract, includes: Mr. Neil M. Morrison, $19,166.67 (yearly rate); Mr. R. Morency, $12,000 (yearly rate); Mrs. L. Lemieux, 9,430 (yearly rate); Mrs. G. Chartrand, $4,123 (6 months); Miss G. Charette, $5,200 (yearly rate); Miss M. Carrière, $5,632 (yearly rate); Mr. P. Munroe, $972,68 (3½ months); Mr. M. Simoneau, $2,994 (6 months); Miss S. Villeneuve, $3,698 (yearly rate).

4. (a) $84,943.30.

(b) Expenditures by Standard Object

	1969-70	April, May 1970	Total to May 31, 1970
	$	$	$
Professional and Special Services	32,409.92	30,415.71	62,825.63
Travel	1,287.43	3,538.43	4,825.86
Freight & Express	27.35	—	27.35
Telephone & Telegraph	880.42	354.92	1,235.34
Materials & Supplies	13,078.35	335.49	13,413.84
Equipment	2,104.05	—	2,104.05
Rental of Equipment	426.23	—	426.23
Hospitality	—	85.00	85.00
	50,213.75	34,729.55	84,943.30

Expenses of Board Members as at May 31, 1970

	1969-70	April, May 1970	Total to May 31, 1970
	$	$	$
Mr. Roger Duhamel	54.15	611.65	665.80
Mr. M. G. Ballantyne	83.41	—	83.41
Mr. P. Fox	—	220.53	220.53
Dr. H. W. Hickman	324.10	—	324.10
Miss M. Joubert	70.65	75.45	146.10
Dr. L. McEwen	—	240.00	240.00
Honorable Judge A. M. Monnin	195.70	—	195.70
Mr. R. Saint Denis	—	325.17	325.17
Mr. A. Savoie	—	436.84	436.84
Dr. D. H. Smith	198.70	109.36	308.06
	1,276.71	2,546.51	2,823.22

[*English*]

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS—USE OF COMPUTER

Question No. 1,966—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Communications have the use of a computer in its operations and, if so, to what extent is it utilized?

2. Is the computer programmed 24 hours per day and, if not, for what reason?

3. What is the number of hours planned for utilization of the computer?

4. What has been the annual cost of computer services for each year 1960 to 1970 inclusive?

5. How many programmes are in preparation for the computer at the present time and how will each affect the efficiency of the Department?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): 1. The Department of Communications utilizes a number of computers in its operations including 11, of varying capacity, in use at the Communication Research Centre as well as the equipment of the Computer Services Bureau and the Department of Transport which are utilized for administrative and operational programs.

2. Ten of the eleven computers in use at the Communications Research Centre are integral parts of defined research programs. They are operated on an average of 10 hours a day with times varying depending on the research program. The other computer used by CRC is operated on a two shift sixteen hours a day basis to accommodate existing programs. It is programmed and available through remote terminals 24 hours a day.

3. Twenty-four hours of utilization are planned per day for the large time sharing system recently installed at CRC.

4. The annual cost for purchase and rental of computer equipment and facilities since 1969 when the Department of Communications was formed is as follows: 1969-70, $460,000; 1970-71 (planned), $515,000.

5. The computers in operation at CRC are being used as research tools. Programs for utilizing the computers are being revised, modified, added and deleted to the system daily. On inter-active systems each person has the opportunity to program computers for his own research needs. With respect to the administrative and regulatory responsibilities of DOC computer programs are now being developed for applications in information retrieval, financial management and personnel administration.

Questions

MANPOWER AND IMMIGRATION—USE OF DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT

Question No. 1,970—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Manpower and Immigration have data processing equipment (automatic) and, if so, for how long?

2. What was the initial cost of the equipment?

3. What yearly costs are anticipated for data processing in the Department?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. Yes. Since the establishment of the Department in January 1966.

2. All equipment utilized is on a rental basis.

3. Anticipated costs for fiscal year 1970-71 are $700,000. Other data processing applications are under development with respect to the operations of Canada Manpower Centres. The successful implementation of this process will substantially increase data processing costs in fiscal year 1971-72.

MANPOWER AND IMMIGRATION—USE OF COMPUTER

Question No. 1,974—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Manpower and Immigration have the use of a computer in its operations and, if so, to what extent is it utilized?

2. Is the computer programmed 24 hours per day and, if not, for what reason?

3. What is the number of hours planned for utilization of the computer?

4. What has been the annual cost of computer services for each year 1960 to 1970 inclusive?

5. How many programmes are in preparation for the computer at the present time and how will each affect the efficiency of the Department?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. The Department of Manpower and Immigration utilizes the services of various commercial and government computer service bureaus. Approximately 1,400 hours of computer service time was used during the fiscal year 1969-70.

2. Not the responsibility of this Department.

3. 1,700 hours for the fiscal year 1970-71.

4. Costs incurred since the Department of Manpower and Immigration was established in January 1966: 1966-67, $39,456; 1967-68, $41,661; 1968-69, $310,926; 1969-70, $250,218.

5. Sixty-seven programs are in preparation. These programs are designed to provide information for the evaluation of the effectiveness and efficiency of the Department's major programs. It is expected that the information derived from the systems will facilitate the management decision-making processes and through improved knowledge of the many

facets of our programs make a significant contribution to more efficient use of resources allocated to the Department.

FEDERAL SUBSIDIES ON FISHING VESSEL CONSTRUCTION

Question No. 1,978—**Mr. Crouse:**

What was the amount of federal subsidy paid by the Department of Fisheries and Forestry and the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce on all fishing vessels constructed from June 25, 1968 to May 14, 1970 in the Provinces of (a) Quebec (b) New Brunswick (c) Prince Edward Island (d) Nova Scotia (e) Newfoundland?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): In so far as the Department of Fisheries and Forestry is concerned:

	April 1, 1968-March 31, 1969	April 1,1969-March 31, 1970	April 1, 1970-May 14, 1970
(a) Quebec	$ 353,924	$ 49,040	Nil
(b) New Brunswick	468,399	127,599	Nil
(c) Prince Edward Island	8,327	1,616	Nil
(d) Nova Scotia	377,772	Nil	Nil
(e) Newfoundland	431,578	396,745	Nil
	$ 1,750,000	$ 565,000	

In so far as the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce is concerned: Ship construction subsidy on fishing vessels during the period June 25, 1968 to May 14, 1970 is as follows:

(a) Quebec	Nil
(b) New Brunswick	$ 576,616.50
(c) Prince Edward Island	915,000.00
(d) Nova Scotia	469,420.00
(e) Newfoundland	Nil
	$ 1,961,036.50

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION—USE OF COMPUTER

Question No. 1,996—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Regional Economic Expansion have the use of a computer in its operations and, if so, to what extent is it utilized?

2. Is the computer programmed 24 hours per day and, if not, for what reason?

3. What is the number of hours planned for utilization of the computer?

4. What has been the amount cost of computer services for each year 1960 to 1970 inclusive?

5. How many programmes are in preparation for the computer at the present time and how will each affect the efficiency of the Department?

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): 1 and 2. Computer and peripheral equipment time is rented at a cost which averages $35,000 per month.

[Mr. MacEachen.]

3. An average of $40,000 per month for computer and peripheral equipment time is planned for 1970-71. The number of hours cannot be precisely estimated.

4. 1969-70, $417,590.

5. Approximately 100 programmes which will improve the efficiency of the Department by providing data records, etc. required for its work.

AIR REGULATIONS, SECTION 529

Question No. 2,000—**Mr. Forrestall:**

As it concerns section 529 of the Air Regulations, under what circumstances will the Minister of Transport consider authorizing aircraft to land and take-off from unlicenced aerodromes?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): For occasional and special purposes such as at air shows, exhibitions or in emergencies; and then only for very limited periods in time and with special precautions for public safety. Emergency includes medical flights into hospital grounds, mercy flights to carry serum, plasma, etc., evacuation of accident victims, fire fighting.

CBC—"ENCOUNTER"

Question No. 2,005—**Mr. Rose:**

1. Who were guests on CBC program "Encounter" since its first show this season up to and including Sunday, April 26?

2. How many were of the federal government?

3. How many were employees of the federal government or of government agencies?

4. How many were of opposition parties?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: 1. Jan. 3, 1970, Hon. Charles M. Drury, President of the Treasury Board; Jan. 10, 1970, Pierre Juneau, Chairman, Canadian Radio-Television Commission; Jan. 17, 1970, Philip Givens, M.P. (Lib. York West); Jan. 24, 1970, Donald MacDonald, President, Canadian Labour Congress; Jan. 31, 1970, John H. Young, Chairman, Prices and Incomes Commission; Feb. 7, 1970, Hon. Robert Andras, Minister without Portfolio; Feb. 14, 1970; Hon. Robert Stanbury, Minister without Portfolio; Feb. 21, 1970, Hon. Robert Stanfield, Leader of the Opposition; Feb. 28, 1970, U.S. Senator Frank Moss, Democrat from Utah; Mar. 7, 1970, Hon. Don Jamieson, Minister of Transport; Mar. 14, 1970, Hon. Mitchell Sharp, Secretary of State for External Affairs; Mar. 21, 1970, T. C. Douglas, M.P., Leader of the New Democratic Party; Mar. 28, 1970, Hon. George Hees, M.P. (P.C.—Prince Edward-Hastings); Apr. 4, 1970, Panel Discussion with Ed Broadbent, M.P. (NDP—Oshawa-Whitby); Wilfred List, labour reporter for the *Globe and Mail* and John Gray, parliamentary correspondent for the *Montreal Star*; Apr. 11, 1970, Hon. Charles M. Drury, President of the Treasury Board; Apr. 18, 1970, Hon. Jean Chrétien, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development; Apr. 25, 1970, Pierre Juneau, Chairman, Canadian Radio-Television Commission.

2. Seven.

3. Two (Commission chairmen).

4. Four.

[*English*]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE—RESEARCH STUDIES

Question No. 1,185—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. What research studies have been carried out by, or on behalf of, the Department of National Health and Welfare during each of the years 1960 to 1969 inclusive?

2. What research studies are presently being carried on and/or are contemplated during the next five years?

3. What was the cost of each of the research studies completed in each of the years 1960 to 1969 inclusive?

4. What is the estimated cost of each of the studies presently in being or contemplated during the next five years?

Return tabled.

LEASE ARRANGEMENTS ENTERED INTO BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Question No. 1,605—**Mr. Coates:**

How many leasing arrangements have been entered into by the federal government since January 1, 1970, with private firms or individuals and, in each instance (a) what was the name of the firm or individual involved in the leasing arrangement (b) what was the term of the lease (c) what was the annual cost (d) what was the amount of space leased (e) for what period of time?

Return tabled.

SEAL FISHERY

Question No. 1,681—**Mr. Lundrigan:**

1. How many ships prosecuted the Seal Fishery during 1970 (a) in the Gulf (b) at the Front?

2. What were the names of these ships?

3. What was the nationality of each ship?

4. How many men manned each ship?

5. How many seals were taken by each ship?

6. What is the statistical breakdown of the seals taken by age and classification?

7. What was the average earning of the sealers (a) in the Gulf (b) at the Front (c) on each ship?

8. How many seals were taken by landsmen in Atlantic Canada?

9. What was the average earning of the landsmen and the number of landsmen from (a) Newfoundland (b) Magdalen Islands (c) Prince Edward Island?

10. How many aviation hours were used in seal spotting?

11. What was the estimated seal population (a) in the Gulf (b) at the Front?

12. What will be the Sealing Regulations governing the hunt in 1971 (a) in the Gulf (b) at the Front?

Return tabled.

FEDERAL AID TO MARITIME PROVINCES

Question No. 1,746—**Mr. Mather:**

What, in dollars, has been the total approximate amount of federal aid to New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland in the form of loans, grants or other contributions, including capital cost expenditures, but excluding federal welfare, pension, medicare and other available aids during the period 1965-1970?

Return tabled.

Orders for Returns

DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION—ENGAGEMENT OF CONSULTANTS

Question No. 1,747—**Mr. Robinson:**

How many consultants have been engaged by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion since its establishment (a) what was the cost of the consultants (b) how were the consultants utilized (c) for what reasons were the consultants necessary?

Return tabled.

DEPARTMENT OF SOLICITOR GENERAL—ENGAGEMENT OF CONSULTANTS

Question No. 1,778—**Mr. Robinson:**

How many consultants have been engaged by the Department of the Solicitor General during each year 1950 to 1970 inclusive (a) what was the cost of the consultants (b) how were the consultants utilized (c) for what reasons were the consultants necessary?

Return tabled.

CANADA COUNCIL GRANTS

Question No. 1,867—**Mr. Rodrigue:**

1. During 1967, 1968 and 1969, what grants were awarded to various organizations or individuals by the Canada Council (a) for all of Canada (b) by province?

2. What persons or groups in the Province of Quebec were awarded grants and what were the amounts?

Return tabled.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, with regard to question No. 163 I gather that the very extensive information in response to that question will be available later this day. I wonder if the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby would be agreeable that it be made an order for return and the information be tabled later this day.

Mr. Broadbent: I will be only too pleased to co-operate.

Mr. Speaker: It is so ordered.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I gather the same would apply to question No. 770.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: It is so ordered.

DESIGNATED AREA INCENTIVES—GRANTS TO FIRMS

Question No. 163—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. For the years 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968 and 1969 (a) how many and which non-resident owned or controlled firms have been awarded financial grants under the designated area incentive program, formerly administered by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce but now administered by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion (b) in each case, what was the total financial grant or incentive allotted?

2. For the same years (a) which and how many Canadian owned or controlled firms have been awarded financial grants under the designated area incentive program, and (b) in each case, what was the total financial grant or incentive allotted?

Return tabled.

EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS OF CROWN CORPORATIONS

Question No. 770—**Mr. Orlikow:**

For each Crown corporation and agency since their establishment (a) who are the chief executive officers and the Board of Directors (b) when were each of the officers and directors first appointed and for what length of time (c) which officers and directors were reappointed and for what length of time (d) what annual salary or remuneration was given to each executive officer and director (e) what *criteria* was used in the appointment of the chief executive officers and the Board of Directors?

Return tabled.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions stand?

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I should like to refer to starred question No. 1907 which has some urgency to it. It seeks from the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development the name of each Indian band with whom the minister discussed the question of the age of electors pursuant to the Indian Act. An interim reply might assist if the minister would tell us whether he has discussed this matter with any bands.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I apologize for not having answered this question earlier. I had prepared a reply which was to be read in the House. There must have been a misunderstanding about this matter, but I can tell the hon. member that I had a few meetings with certain Indian chiefs, and officials of my department had discussions with others. Unfortunately, I do not have the information readily available. We had meetings with five or six chiefs, and I have decided to submit this question to the national Indian advisory board. Officials of my department have met with representatives of the board this week in this connection.

[*Later:*]

[*English*]

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege and extend through you my apology to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development for having raised the matter about starred question 1907. It had not come to my attention because I did not receive a typed copy of the question, which is usual, but the question was answered on Monday, a fact which was brought to my attention by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni. I therefore apologize to the minister for the inconvenience.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions stand?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, the answer that was given to starred question No. 1,959 by the representative of the government is one which constitutes an affront to the House and in refusing to give information represents a course of action that can only lead to the setting up of supreme groups above the law of this country. The question had to do with vice-presidents of Air Canada compulsorily retired. What possible reason can there be for not furnishing this information? A host of them who were experienced were let out. I asked whether any of the vice-presidents were retained and, if so, what are their names and ages? I understand that in the wholesale removal of vice-presidents only one of some 20 survived. Yet we cannot obtain this information. Then I asked how many employees have been dismissed or removed at all levels in Air Canada since January 1, how many years each of said employees had served and how long each of them had to serve until age 65.

If we are to be denied this kind of information, which in no way constitutes an invasion of the rights of Crown corporations and cannot be beneficial to competitors then the House might as well close down and the motion that was made by an hon. member the other day that there should be representation by Members of Parliament on the boards of various Crown corporations would have further justification. Finally, I asked how many officials and employees still in the service of Air Canada as of this date will, under the project plan, be removed, dismissed or retired between now and January 1? These employees stand in continued jeopardy. They ask Parliament to preserve their rights. They are being let out with cavalier disregard of service.

I summarize by saying that the attempt at an answer of a moment ago is contrary to the rights of Members of Parliament and the people of this country to have information, however disagreeable it may be for the government to furnish it.

Mr. Orlikow: On January 28 of this year, five months ago, I placed on the Order Paper question No. 1002 in which I asked for information with regard to the consultants hired by the Privy Council and the Prime Minister's office, what they were doing and what remuneration they received since July 1, 1968. It may be that the amounts they received are so large that it will embarrass the government in view of its 6 per cent guideline policy, but I do think that five months is long enough to prepare an answer and I hope that when the House meets on October 5 I will not have to wait longer.

Mr. Baldwin: Maybe you will get a white paper on it.

Mr. Crouse: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. On November 19 I placed question No. 513 on the Order Paper. It deals with a simple procedure concerning government actions. It asks for the official status of one Harold Huskilson of Lockeport and Shelburne, Nova Scotia, who seems to be empowered with the right to announce federal government contracts in that province. I ask about his official status and the reasons for the government's action. Apparently from November 19 to the present date it has not been possible for the government to give a reason for the method it is following in announcing federal government contracts. Through you, sir, I ask the President of the Privy Council when I may expect an answer to question No. 513 placed on the Order Paper on November 19.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I regret it but I do not think we will have the information during the course of the day.

[*Translation*]

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, would you please call notices of motions Nos. 213, 253, 311, 468, 476, 480, 482, 484, 485, 486, 488, 489, 490 and 491?

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

[*English*]

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND THE ARTS

Motion No. 213—**Mr. Skoberg:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study on the federal government and the arts undertaken in the fiscal year 1966-67 for the Secretary of State as mentioned in answer to Question Number 1,323 of the past Session.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): The study on the federal government and the arts was a confidential report to the Secretary of State and as such is considered to be a privileged document. I therefore ask that the hon. member withdraw his motion.

Mr. Skoberg: I do not think it should be a privileged document and I therefore call for the question.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

COMMUNICATION SATELLITE BIDS

Motion No. 253—**Mr. Gilbert:**

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

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): On behalf of the Minister of Communications I wish to report as follows: RCA Victor Limited and Northern Electric did not submit contractor bids on the communications satellite to the government. Contract studies were undertaken by them in connection with preliminary work on the domestic satellite system.

The study reports contain commercial information of a proprietary nature which was provided on the understanding that it would remain confidential. I therefore hope that the hon. member will consent to withdraw this motion.

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO DEUTERIUM OF CANADA LIMITED

Motion No. 311—**Mr. Burton:**

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House copies of all correspondence between the Government of Canada and the Government of Nova Scotia regarding financial assistance for the Deuterium of Canada Limited heavy water plant at Glace Bay, Nova Scotia.

[Mr. Forest.]

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): The documents related to the subject matter of this motion which are in the possession of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources are considered by him to be privileged documents. Therefore it would not be in the public interest to disclose this correspondence, and I would ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Burton: Question.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

ABT STUDY OF EVALUATION OF N.B. FRED PLAN

Motion No. 468—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study by ABT Associates undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding the evaluation of N.B. FRED Plan as mentioned in answer to Question Number 897 and reported in *Hansard* of March 18, 1970 at page 5163.

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): This study was requested in notice of motion No. 380 which was accepted by the government with the provision that the consent of the province concerned be obtained. I would therefore ask that the hon. member withdraw his motion.

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

ERNST AND ERNST CONSULTANT REVIEW OF PLANNING STUDY

Motion No. 476—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study by Ernst and Ernst undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding planning study as mentioned in answer to Question Number 897 and reported in *Hansard* of March 18, 1970 at page 5163.

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): This is a continuing study and there is as yet no final report. Before I ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion may I indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, that four

subsequent motions of the hon. member will receive substantially the same answer if they are dealt with separately. They are Nos. 480, 486, 488 and 491. They are all continuing studies and there is no suitable report available for tabling. May I therefore ask the hon. member to withdraw those five motions?

Mr. Burton: I ask that they stand until October in the hope that some of them might be finished at that time.

Mr. Speaker: The motion stands.

Motion stands.

LALONDE VALOIS REVIEW OF TRANSPORTATION STUDY OF GASPÉ REGION

Motion No. 480—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study by Lalonde Valois undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding the transportation study of the Gaspé region as mentioned in answer to Question Number 897 and reported in *Hansard* of March 18, 1970 at page 5163.

Motion stands.

EASTERN DESIGNERS LIMITED REVIEW OF SAINT JOHN WATER SUPPLY STUDY

Motion No. 486—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study by Eastern Designers Limited undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding the Saint John Water Supply Study as mentioned in answer to Question Number 897 and reported in *Hansard* of March 18, 1970 at page 5163.

Motion stands.

J. PARIKHAL REVIEW OF REGIONAL MIGRATION STUDY

Motion No. 488—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study by J. Parikhal undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding the regional migration study as mentioned in answer to Question Number 897 and reported in *Hansard* of March 18, 1970 at page 5163.

Motion stands.

SHAWINIGAN ENGINEERING LTD. REVIEW OF SAINT JOHN WATER SUPPLY STUDY

Motion No. 491—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study by Shawinigan Engineering Ltd. undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding the Saint John Water Supply Study as mentioned in answer to Question Number 897 and reported in *Hansard* of March 18, 1970 at page 5163.

Motion stands.

M. W. MACKENZIE STUDY OF FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL COMMITTEE FOR SAINT JOHN INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

Motion No. 482—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study M. W. Mackenzie undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding the federal provincial committee for Saint John industrial complex as mentioned in answer to Question Number 897 and reported in *Hansard* of March 18, 1970 at page 5163.

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): This contract is for services performed by Mr. Mackenzie as chairman of the Canada-New Brunswick Growth Centre Committee. I would ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Burton: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

LA SOCIÉTÉ SOTAR REVIEW OF CANTONS DE L'EST TOURISM STUDY

Motion No. 484—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study by La Société Sotar undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding the Cantons de l'Est tourism study as mentioned in answer to Question Number 897 and reported in *Hansard* of March 18, 1970 at page 5163.

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): This was a service contract to these consultants for briefing senior management. As there is no report which could be tabled, I would ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Burton: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

J. C. WICKET REVIEW OF STUDY OF NUTRITIONAL LEVELS

Motion No. 485—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study by J. C. Wickett undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding the study of nutritional levels in selected population areas as mentioned in answer to Question Number 897 and reported in *Hansard* of March 18, 1970 at page 5163.

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): This study was commissioned for

the use of a number of interdepartmental officials in planning future action. Until the result of the study has been evaluated, it is considered to be a privileged document, and I would ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Burton: Question.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

McGILL COMPUTING SCIENCES STUDY OF SYSTEM FOR GENERATING TARGET POPULATIONS

Motion No. 489—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study by McGill Computing Science Centre undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding a system for generating target populations as mentioned in answer to Question Number 897 and reported in *Hansard* of March 18, 1970 at page 5163.

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): This contract was awarded for computer programming. As there is no report which could be tabled, I would ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion. I would like to include in the same answer the next motion, No. 490 because the answer is the same.

Mr. Burton: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

ALPHATEX SYSTEMS LIMITED STUDY OF COMPUTER ADDRESSING SYSTEM

Motion No. 490—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study by Alphatex Systems Limited undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding the computer addressing system as mentioned in answer to Question Number 897 and reported in *Hansard* of March 18, 1970 at page 5163.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

Mr. Skoberg: Mr. Speaker, with regard to notices of motions Nos. 218, 282 and 322, could there be some indication why they have not been answered, particularly motion No. 218 regarding the consultant report on data on subsidiaries in Canada. Since this motion was filed in November of last year, surely the information must be available by now. The other two motions have to do with transportation questions. It appears to me that all three motions could have been answered, particularly in view of the importance of transportation in this country.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few comments on notice of motion for production of papers No. 263 which reads as follows:

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all correspondence, reports, briefs and other documents submitted to the Government af Canada regarding the construction and equipping of a federal building in Victoriaville, Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, this notice of motion has been on the order paper since November 25, 1969 and since then, my fellow-citizens have been clamouring for the construction of that federal building.

On many occasions, I wrote to the minister, but I never received a reply. This notice of motion is still on the order paper and the federal building promised since 1957 has not yet been constructed.

I strongly urge that this notice of motion be dealt with, in order to give satisfaction to the citizens of the Lotbinière constituency, especially those of Victoriaville.

[*English*]

Mr. Thomson: Mr. Speaker, I notice that No. 60 is the only original notice of motion standing from October 23, and I wonder whether I have not shown a fairly considerable amount of patience in waiting this long. It would be nice to have some indication of what will happen to it.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining notices of motions stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

PRIVILEGE

MR. DIEFENBAKER—REFERENCE TO DOMINION DAY AS "CANADA" DAY

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. It has to do with July 1 which is still Dominion Day under the laws and statutes of this country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: Last evening on the CBC, between the national news and the local news, there was a reference to a celebration on July 1, called to take place at the National

Arts Centre, under the name of Bon Jour, and in it July 1 was referred to as Canada Day.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: The widespread applause from the Liberal party indicates that while they did not have the backbone to go ahead with the bill that was introduced in this Chamber and which was withdrawn because they were afraid to face the consequences—

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): It wasn't withdrawn.

Mr. Diefenbaker: —they now applaud action that is a denial of Parliament and its rights.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: This is another indication of the way in which those supporting the government undermine the law, remove our rights, our heritage, not by statute of Parliament but by action outside Parliament.

The CBC was communicated with, and the head of the news department advised that the reason this was done was that specific orders were received from the Secretary of State's Department—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Diefenbaker: —to call July 1 Canada Day.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I would not have thought that members of the House of Commons, almost wholly in the Liberal party, would approve of the fact that the Secretary of State placed himself above the CBC and their directions. First, I object that this is an indication of a course of action on the part of the government of undermining and diminishing our heritage. Second, it indicates that the Secretary of State has become a kind of self-glorified Caesar who interferes with the CBC an independent body. Now, applaud!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

LABOUR CONDITIONS

FORECAST UNEMPLOYMENT LEVEL FOR OCTOBER AND NOVEMBER—AID TO STUDENTS FAILING TO OBTAIN SUMMER EMPLOYMENT

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance what his forecast is of the level of unemployment in Canada for the autumn, say October and November, seasonally adjusted?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I do not have such a forecast.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, it is almost incredible that the Minister of Finance does not have such a forecast.

Mr. Forrestall: It is typical.

Mr. Stanfield: As a supplementary question I ask the Minister of Finance whether he will undertake to publish a forecast of the anticipated rate of unemployment for October and November immediately, because it is inconceivable, Mr. Speaker, that his department would not have made such a forecast and—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition should ask the question.

Mr. Stanfield: I asked the question, Mr. Speaker. I asked the minister whether he will publish this figure. I particularly ask the question because when I pressed him in the past on the necessity of establishing some institution for publishing short-term forecasts the minister told me that he has such an arrangement in his own department. Therefore I say to the minister, let him publish this information.

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, what the Leader of the Opposition is really asking is that we publish our guesses so that he can compare them with his own guesses. I do not see the purpose in this.

Mr. Speaker: The President of the Privy Council on a point of order.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether we could revert to motions so that a statement could be made with respect to the 25th anniversary of the United Nations. During the course of this morning's business we apparently got beyond that point.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I will agree to that on the assumption that I can come back with one more supplementary when we return to the question period.

Mr. Speaker: Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

United Nations Charter

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps we might allow the Leader of the Opposition his supplementary question and then revert to motions.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the right hon. Prime Minister. In view of the answer given to me yesterday by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, will the Prime Minister see to it that a conference is called promptly to discuss with the appropriate provincial authorities the extent to which additional student aid will be necessary in the autumn and the methods by which this can be accomplished, in view of the small percentage of students being employed this summer and consequently the alarming number of prospective drop-outs that there will be in the fall?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the answer given by the minister yesterday was to the effect that he was not contemplating such a conference.

Mr. Stanfield: That is precisely why I am asking the Prime Minister whether he will see to it that the matter is not only considered but that measures are taken to do something about this impending crisis?

And the House having reverted to Motions:

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

UNITED NATIONS

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF SIGNING OF CHARTER

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, today is the 25th anniversary of the signing of the United Nations Charter at a historic meeting in San Francisco. Canada, represented by a delegation led by Prime Minister Mackenzie King, was an active participant at that meeting.

[*Translation*]

Not all the promises of 1945 have been realized. The world continues to experience conflict of every intensity short of global war. But if those who gathered in San Francisco in 1945 were full of hope, they were also realists. They clearly accepted that no multinational organization could keep the peace if major powers were wilful enough to resort to force. Although the United Nations has not succeeded in preventing such occurrences? Its facilities for patient negotiations have often helped to hold the line against chaos.

While political crises clamour for our attention, we tend to lose sight of the fact that over 80 per cent of the resources at the disposal of the UN family support a multinational co-operative effort to relieve hunger, care for children, foster economic and social development and assist the developing countries to participate more fully in international trade. These are among the most encouraging developments since 1945 and are a reminder to us of another remarkable achievement—the rapid attainment of independence by the millions of peoples whose new nations have swelled UN membership to 126 countries from an original 51 members.

In recent years, a new dimension has been added to UN preoccupations. The world is at last hurrying to preserve for peaceful purposes not only the new frontier of space but also the newly appreciated last frontiers of earth—the seabed and the ocean floor. It is becoming more evident every day that international co-operation is vital if science and technology are to be made to serve the interests of all mankind and contribute to the preservation of the common environment.

• (11:50 a.m.)

[*English*]

I have been using the words "the United Nations" and "the Organization", but we must always remember that the UN is an association of independent states and membership in it is based on the principle of sovereign equality. As such, the sum of UN potential will not likely be greater than the political will of its individual parts. Although incorporated to attain ends desired by all peoples, including Canadians, the UN can employ only the means agreed upon by the member governments.

Canada has consistently sought, within the measure of her resources and influence, to strengthen the UN institutions in the service of peace and the improvement of quality of life for all. On this 25th anniversary, it is timely to pledge this government and the people of Canada to continuing support for the UN as the best hope we have that the grave challenges facing Canada and the world can be met.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to rise to pay tribute to the United Nations on the 25th anniversary of its birth. We all know it was

born as a consequence of a horrible war. It was born with high hopes, all of which have not been realized. Yet the United Nations has many accomplishments to its credit. Indeed, sir, I suppose it is something for the United Nations to have survived for 25 years, a longer period than its predecessor, the League of Nations, survived.

We have no right to assume that the United Nations will continue to survive and continue to be an effective instrument in the search for international peace and international understanding. Indeed, sir, we have received many warnings about the prospects of the United Nations and about the need for reform and rejuvenation. This is certainly not easy because the United Nations is not, on the one hand, fully representative of the nations of the world while, on the other hand, it has been hamstrung in a number of respects which include the use of the veto. Nevertheless, I think we can all agree that we must make a determined effort to rejuvenate the United Nations and to do all we can to ensure that it will play an effective part in our future.

I notice, Mr. Speaker, that there is a tendency—it is not new and it continues—for those involved in international diplomacy and affairs to appear to be busier in developing arguments as to why something cannot be done than in developing solutions to problems.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: Those of us who were growing up prior to the second world war had the universal feeling that everybody was busy putting forward reasons why nothing could be done; the consequences in part was that the world slipped into that terrible catastrophe. I say that we must be determined to overcome our difficulties. I hope, sir, that the government of Canada is more determined to play a vigorous and constructive part in the rejuvenation and reform of the United Nations than it would appear to be from the white paper presented yesterday.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of this party I should like to join with the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition in expressing our pleasure that we have the United Nations and our earnest hope that it will yet play an even greater part in maintaining the peace of the world.

In rising to say these few words I should like not only to speak on behalf of our party but also to associate with us at this time the name of our honorary president, Hon. M. J. Coldwell, who is perhaps the only surviving member of the official Canadian delegation which was at San Francisco in 1945. As everyone knows, over the years Mr. Coldwell has been a strong advocate of the policies of the United Nations and a strong advocate of the rule of law as the only way in which we can cope with our world problems.

I might be pardoned for adding that I, personally, had the privilege of being a member of the Canadian delegation at the first session of the United Nations General Assembly which met in London, England, over the year end of 1945-46. I witnessed then some of the pitfalls that were in front of us. I witnessed a number of the difficulties. I saw some of the frustrations as we were unable to achieve all of the things that had been hoped for in the founding of the United Nations. Many of them are still to be achieved.

I believe that the position that some of us took in those years and have taken across the years still stands: if we are to hold our world together and be able to count on decades and centuries of peace ahead of us, the United Nations must become a body that has world authority. We must move on to the concept of world government or world sovereignty even as we have moved from the concept of local authority to national sovereignty.

I also support the position taken by the Prime Minister, namely, that there are problems today we did not even think about 25 years ago, problems such as our total environment. We must cope with these if we are to save the peace of the world and avoid conflict. But, Mr. Speaker, I should like to underline what the Leader of the Opposition has just said: if we are going to pay this kind of tribute we must make the United Nations a much more central feature of this country's foreign policy than seems to be the case in light of the documents that were tabled yesterday. However, this is a time to be grateful for the 25 years of such success as the United Nations has had. We earnestly hope that its future will be bright, but this depends on nations such as Canada giving it full and active support.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, we are pleased to endorse the Prime Minister's remarks on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the United Nations.

He mentioned that the objectives proposed by this organization had not all been attained. One only has to look at the situation which prevails in the world now and has prevailed over the past 25 years to realize that the Organization has failed in many fields, for instance, in the case of Lebanon, Israel, Jordan, Vietnam, Cambodia, and at the time of the Russian interventions in Czechoslovakia and in Hungary a few years ago.

Mr. Speaker, we have a right to question whether this organization has really achieved the purpose for which it was created, which is to bring peace to the world.

Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to bring peace to the world if we do not start by establishing law and order, which would make for a just and lasting peace instead of what we have experienced up to now. I think this is the main objective to be pursued by the United Nations.

I noticed, like everybody else in fact, that thanks to its objectivity, Canada has played a very important role in the United Nations through our willingness to co-operate in order to settle the conflicts opposing certain nations. I think that our country is to be commended by other nations of the world, since, as was said earlier, 126 nations make up the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, some of the more powerful among the member states of the Organization seek to dominate the others. For instance, certain nations have a veto right and use it in a haphazard way. They are not concerned with smaller countries who wish to live in peace.

On behalf of my colleagues and in my own name, I express the hope that the United Nations will become an efficient and living body which will ensure the promotion of law and order so that the just and lasting peace we all long for may prevail in the world.

• (12:00 noon)

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: We will now revert to oral questions.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—SIX PER CENT WAGE INCREASE GUIDELINE—CONTINUED APPLICATION TO PUBLIC SERVICE IN LIGHT OF ONTARIO POSITION

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): I have a question for the Minister of Finance.

[Mr. Caouette.]

On Monday of this week the hon. member for York South directed the following question to the Prime Minister:

> In view of the report of a telegram sent by the provincial treasurer of Ontario to the Civil Service Association of that province that the government of Ontario does not intend to apply the 6 per cent guideline to negotiations with provincial civil servants, I should like to ask the Prime Minister if it is still the government's intention to insist on such guidelines for the federal public service?

The Prime Minister stated that the Minister of Finance would answer the question.

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, we accepted the guideline at the Winnipeg conference. The Minister of Finance of the province of Ontario indicated at that conference that the commission's proposals should receive careful consideration not only by all governments but by all the Canadian people. While he could not commit his government, he indicated he would lend his support. If such a telegram was issued, obviously he has changed his mind.

Mr. Orlikow: In view of the statement yesterday by Premier Robarts that he felt that because of the problem of inflation the federal government should introduce legislation making wage and price guidelines mandatory and that the province of Ontario would co-operate, and in view of the statement of the Minister of Finance of Manitoba at the conference which the—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will the hon. member kindly come to the question? It seems to be a little too long.

Mr. Orlikow: In view of the fact the government of Manitoba expressed reservations at that conference, is the government giving consideration to relaxing the guideline policy?

Mr. Benson: No, Mr. Speaker.

INFLATION—ADHERENCE TO SIX PER CENT WAGE INCREASE GUIDELINE BY PUBLIC SERVICE STAFF RELATIONS ARBITRATORS

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): I wish to direct a supplementary question to the President of the Treasury Board. In light of his correspondence with the Professional Institute in the last few days, is it the intention of the federal government to instruct arbitrators who act under the provisions of the Public Service Staff Relations Act that they must abide by the 6 per cent guideline announced unilaterally by the government?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): I think the hon. member is aware that it does not lie within the power of the government to instruct arbitrators as to the decisions they will render.

[*Translation*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CYPRUS—WITHDRAWAL OF CANADIAN TROOPS

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I wanted to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs, but in his absence, I should like to put it to the Minister of National Defence.

Can he tell us if there is any easing of the tension in the conflict opposing Greeks and Turks in Cyprus, and also if Canada intends to withdraw its forces there in the near future?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I believe the decision taken recently to accept a six-month extension of the mandate clearly indicates that the situation would not warrant as yet the withdrawal of Canadian forces.

[*English*]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—SUGGESTED MEETING BETWEEN PRIME MINISTER AND LEADERS OF ORGANIZED LABOUR

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): I have a question for the Prime Minister. In view of the negative result achieved at the meeting ten days ago between the chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission and the leaders of organized labour, is it the intention of the Prime Minister to hold a private meeting with the leaders of organized labour well in advance of the general meeting which has been called for next fall in order to discuss with these labour leaders the part that the government is asking them to play in the fight against inflation, so that the general meeting will have some chance of success?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I generally agree with the estimation of the hon. member that it would be fruitless to have a general meeting if we did not think it had much chance of success. I am engaged now in ways of ensuring that this general meeting, if it is to be held, will have a chance of success. One way of doing this is by appraising the position of the important labour leaders in this country.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Hees: As it has become clear that this meeting has very little chance of success unless a preliminary meeting is held, I ask the Prime Minister if he will give consideration to putting his duty to his country ahead of his fear of a rebuff and give the country some leadership for a change?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

ARGUS AIRCRAFT—TIME OF ANNOUNCEMENT OF DECISION ON REPLACEMENT

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpeque): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence. Is it the intention of the government to announce a decision during the parliamentary recess with regard to the type and number of aircraft to be procured by the government as eventual successors to the Argus aircraft used in Maritime Command?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, this is a very involved question, more involved than would appear at first sight. We have conducted an evaluation of prototypes of new aircraft that could eventually replace the Argus aircraft, if the government so authorizes the Department of National Defence. However, there are a lot of comparisons and studies to be made within the department. National Defence Council meetings have to be held. It will be later than October when these studies are completed. The simplest way to answer the question is to say that an announcement will not be made during the recess.

Mr. MacLean: I assume from the minister's reply that due to the long lead time required to procure new aircraft study, and all other preliminary work, is proceeding as actively as possible with a view to being able to make an announcement as early as possible?

Mr. Cadieux (Labelle): Yes, Mr. Speaker. There are many considerations involved. The fundamental decision is as to whether we will make a replacement at this time. As is to be expected, the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce is involved as well as the Department of Supply and Services. There are many consultations going on at present. As far as the evaluation itself is concerned, we have already done our part.

Mr. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce): Before the minister makes a decision with regard to the Argus, will he give the House a commitment to examine the

recommendations of the report of the External Affairs Committee on Maritime Command which was tabled in the House today?

Mr. Cadieux (Labelle): This decision will not be a decision of the Minister of National Defence; it will be a decision by the government, and no doubt all the relevant factors pertaining to it will be considered.

METHOD OF DISPOSAL OF FIGHTER AIRCRAFT

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Can the minister indicate, on a related matter, whether or not the government and the department have made a decision regarding the disposition of fighter aircraft used by the Canadian Armed Forces? Once the retirement program has started, will they be sold, scrapped or placed in storage?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): As a general rule, I believe negotiations are carried on between governments in connection with the disposal of aircraft of this type and the disposition of such aircraft is subject to many restrictions, as the hon. member knows. We have not yet decided which way to proceed. No doubt this question will arise some time in the fall.

Mr. Forrestall: Can the minister tell us whether, in its contingency planning, the government has given consideration to selling these aircraft to foreign countries?

Mr. Cadieux (Labelle): There are no contingency plans. I believe there are precedents for disposal of aircraft of this type. As far as the Department of National Defence is concerned, we would turn them over to Crown Assets; then again, there is an agency within the Department of Trade and Commerce which specializes in these matters. But the fundamental requirement for security will be observed.

DEVELOPMENT OF CANADIAN AIRCRAFT TO REPLACE ARGUS

Mr. Doug Rowland (Selkirk): In his study of a possible replacement for the Argus maritime patrol aircraft, is the minister giving consideration to the possible development of such an aircraft in Canada, as well as to the purchase of off-the-shelf aircraft such as the Nimrod or the Orion?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): No, Mr. Speaker.

[Mr. Allmand.]

REPLACEMENT OF ALBATROSS SEARCH AND RESCUE AIRCRAFT

Mr. David Anderson (Esquimalt-Saanich): Can the minister inform the House whether a decision has been made concerning the replacement of the search and rescue aircraft, the Albatross, and, if so, can he assure the House that the replacement aircraft will have amphibious capability?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): This is a matter upon which no decision has been made yet. There are a few considerations to be entertained before we can do so. It would be premature at this time for me to indicate what they are.

GRAIN

WHEAT—ACREAGE REDUCTION PROGRAM—NUMBER OF ACRES SEEDED

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): I would direct my question to the Minister without Portfolio, the hon. member for Saskatoon-Humboldt. Some weeks ago I asked him to give us an estimate of the number of acres by which land under production would be reduced as a result of the Lift program. We are now near the end of June. Seeding is over, and the government has this information. Can he advise us approximately, within 500,000 acres one way or the other, what has been the amount of reduction?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): It has not been possible to obtain as yet a full assessment of the acreage seeded. However, we have been able to carry out some analysis of the first returns under the Lift program. It is difficult to project the first 10,000 returns into the total situation, and it may therefore be misleading to attempt to use those figures.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Would the minister not furnish the House with them? Or does he need to hold another champagne party before he can give information?

Mr. Lang: If it is any consolation to the House, I am content to give the analysis based on the sampling of the first 10,000 returns. It shows a wheat acreage reduction of two-thirds.

INCLUSION OF U.S.S.R. IN NEW INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT—PRODUCTION CONTROL

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): My question is also directed to the Minister with-

out Portfolio. In view of reports that preparatory talks are under way to establish a new wheat pact, this time under the auspices of the United Nations, is it the intention of the Canadian government to make every attempt to have the U.S.S.R. brought in as a full participant in any pact which might be arranged?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): We believe this would be an extremely useful move. Those engaged in the discussions which are now taking place between the participating nations have the point very much in mind.

Mr. Gleave: A supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will be allowed a supplementary but we have to get on to other questions.

Mr. Gleave: I should like to ask the minister whether in connection with such a pact an attempt will be made to devise a system of acreage control or to agree on a production control program? Will this be the intention of the Canadian government?

Mr. Lang: I do not believe it would be very useful for me to set out in any detail the total position the Canadian government is taking, but this issue will certainly be discussed by the representatives of the nations meeting to consider the price and supply situation.

UNITED NATIONS

UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS —ADOPTION BY CANADA

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister. In view of the words of support for the principles of the United Nations forthcoming from representatives of all parties in the House today, would the government consider expressing this support by joining with 55 other nations in adopting the universal declaration of human rights?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I am not aware that Canada has not indicated its support for this universal declaration. The hon. member knows that before being in a position to ratify or implement it we need, for constitutional reasons, the consent of the provinces. The hon. member also knows that more than two years ago we asked the provinces to go along with this by agreeing to the introduction into the constitution of a declaration on this subject which would bind all the governments, federal and provincial. The federal government has, therefore, done as much as it can at this stage; it cannot bind the provinces without their consent.

Mr. Brewin: Would the Prime Minister consider asking the provinces specifically, rather than adopting the full charter of human rights to which he has referred, whether they would not approve of the government of Canada formally adopting the universal charter of human rights? Would he put that specific question to them?

Mr. Trudeau: I believe that is a rhetorical question. To ask them to accept this position without giving the federal government the power to implement it would be purely a sham. I do not know whether this is what the hon. member is suggesting.

[*Translation*]

AIRPORTS

REQUEST FOR BILINGUAL PASSES TO SPECIAL WAITING ROOMS

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport.

To begin with, I wish to tell him that I deeply appreciate his having reserved rooms in terminal buildings for the use of members of Parliament and having provided us with passes—

Mr. Speaker: Could the hon. member please formulate his question?

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to ask the minister if it would be possible to have such passes printed in both languages?

[*English*]

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, it took me three years to get them out in one language. I hope it will take me a little less to get them out bilingually. I will look into it.

GRAIN

INITIAL PRICES FOR WHEAT, OATS AND BARLEY, 1970-71

Mr. A. B. Douglas (Assiniboia): I have a question for the Minister without Portfolio

responsible for the Wheat Board. Has a decision been reached in connection with the initial Wheat Board prices for wheat, oats and barley for 1970-71? If so, what are those prices?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): No decision has been taken as yet, although the matter is under active consideration.

Mr. Douglas (Assiniboia): Can the minister assure the House that he will endeavour to keep these initial prices at a level no lower than the present rate?

Mr. Diefenbaker: The answer is silence.

THE MINISTRY

INQUIRY AS TO POSSIBLE CHANGES

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): My question is for the Prime Minister. In the interest of the House and of the country, is it the intention of the Prime Minister to change any members of the ministry between now and the reconvening of Parliament, and, if so, when does he expect to announce such changes?

Mr. Bell: Don't change them, fire them.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I have not given the matter any consideration, but I will take the representation of the hon. member into account.

COMMUNICATIONS

TELESAT CANADA—BIDS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF SATELLITE—EFFECT OF POSSIBLE AWARD TO U.S. FIRM

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, as a result of the ambiguity of the reply provided by the Minister of Communications with regard to the bidding on the Telesat satellite, I hope I will get a better answer from the President of the Treasury Board. May I ask the minister whether the cabinet is considering the bids at the present time and, if so, whether the bid from Hughes Aircraft Company of the United States is being given more consideration than the bid from the Canadian company, RCA Limited of Montreal?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. gentleman is aware that the minister having administrative responsibility for this matter is the Minister of Communications. However, in answer to the hon. member's question may I say that all bids will receive fair and equal consideration.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): I thank the minister for his reply and I understand he is also very interested. May I ask the minister whether the president of the Telesat Corporation recommended that the government accept the Hughes bid, and is he aware that hundreds of jobs in the Canadian aerospace industry would be placed in jeopardy if the Telesat contract were awarded to a United States firm?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to ask the Minister of Communications for this information.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

EARLY RELEASE BY PAROLE BOARD OF PRISONER SUBSEQUENTLY INVOLVED IN BANK ROBBERY

Mr. A. D. Alkenbrack (Frontenac-Lennox and Addington): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Solicitor General or his Parliamentary Secretary and arises from the all too frequent failure of our system to govern and also from an account in the Montreal *Gazette* this morning of a bank robbery that was foiled by the police yesterday in Montreal. One of the bandits who participated in the robbery had been released from prison on June 1, after serving a minor part of a sentence for a series of armed holds-ups. He was released on parole—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member should ask his question.

Mr. Alkenbrack: My question is: Will the Solicitor General investigate the reasons for this man's early parole, and at the same time lodge a strong protest with the parole board pointing out the utter folly of their decision?

CRIMINAL CODE

EARLY REIMPLEMENTATION OF BREATHALYZER PROVISIONS FOLLOWING FAVOURABLE COURT DECISION

Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey): Mr. Speaker, I had a question that I wanted to ask the Minister of Justice, but in his absence I direct it to the attention of the Prime Minister. Having in mind the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada this morning upholding the breathalyzer legislation, and also the fact that every day this law is not in effect adds to the death

toll on our highways, can we look for encouragement from the government for the early reimplementation of the breathalyzer provisions of the Criminal Code?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would suspect that this is what the Minister of Justice is planning now, but I will discuss the matter with him.

PUBLIC SERVICE

REQUEST FOR EARLY TERMINATION OF CONTRACT NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the President of the Treasury Board. In light of the fact that, for almost two years now, large numbers of employees of the government have been without the benefit of a contract, I wonder whether the minister would indicate when current negotiations are going to be completed so that these employees can be brought up to date with their fellow workers?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, as I think the hon. gentleman knows, it is not the government that determines the date at which an agreement will be reached.

BROADCASTING

MEASURES TO MAKE IMPORTANT NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AVAILABLE TO CERTAIN PROVINCES

Mr. E. B. Osler (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to address my question to the Secretary of State, but since I was not able to put it yesterday when he was in the House may I now address it to the Prime Minister. The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has announced its intention to make a charge for all direct costs of national educational broadcasts that it might make in the future. In light of the fact that the provinces of Quebec, Ontario and Alberta have announced they are not interested in national educational broadcasts, this leaves the other provinces in the position where they cannot afford to buy—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I have to bring to the attention of the hon. member who now has the floor, and to all hon. members, that questions should be asked more succinctly. The hon. member cannot make a speech. This applies particularly to the question now being asked, and other questions have tended in the same direction. The hon. member should ask a question.

Mr. Osler: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is this: Would the federal government consider taking steps to make available educational broadcasts of national importance that would not otherwise be purchased by the poorer provinces for their educational programs?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I will bring these representations to the attention of the Secretary of State.

URBAN AFFAIRS

INQUIRY AS TO REPORT AND PRESENTATION OF WHITE PAPER

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister without Portfolio in charge of housing. In view of the fact that the minister recently indicated his agreement with regard to an urban council, can we now assume that the minister is in receipt of the report on urban affairs which we are all anxiously waiting to read?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure to which specific report the hon. member is referring, but I am in receipt of a great deal of advice resulting from a deep analysis of urban problems in Canada, and I have been communicating some of the findings through comments I have been making in this House and across the country.

Mr. Alexander: I am sorry my question was so vague but I thought the minister was aware of the report I am particularly interested in by Lithwick—I think that is the name. It is a report on urban development and the role that the federal government should play. Since the minister recently made that announcement, is he now in receipt of this report and is he going to recommend to cabinet that a white paper be prepared and referred to a standing committee on urban affairs for study? I am referring specifically to the Lithwick report, if I have the correct name.

Mr. Andras: Mr. Speaker, I have received that report but the subsequent use or release of it in those terms has not yet been decided.

Inquiries of the Ministry

FILMS

CANADIAN POLICY—PRESENTATION OF WHITE PAPER

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Secretary of State. Has the government considered the Secretary of State's policy paper on a film policy for Canada, and will there be an announcement over the summer recess or will the policy be tabled in the form of a white paper in the fall?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the Secretary of State's policy on films. I will ask him to report to me on this.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

GOVERNMENT POLICY REGARDING FOREIGN OWNERSHIP

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. Following the report in today's press of the takeover of another potash firm in Nova Scotia—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Broadbent: I mean, in Saskatchewan—by an American concern and also—

An hon. Member: Are you sure about that?

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, would you please call the House to order.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member would assist the Chair in maintaining order if his question were a little briefer.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: I am only following Liberal precedent. My question concerns the number of takeovers, and figures released by the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs indicate that the number in 1969 was the highest in Canadian history. My question to the Minister of Finance is: Will the minister be announcing soon in the House when the government policy on foreign ownership will be ready?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the study with respect to foreign ownership is presently continuing and we hope to have information to announce about the policy perhaps this fall, though I would not like to set a specific time.

[Mr. Andras.]

BRIDGES

OTTAWA-HULL—CONSULTATION BETWEEN FEDERAL AND CIVIC AUTHORITIES ON NEW STRUCTURE

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Prime Minister a question in the absence of the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, this probably being the last day of the session. In view of word from City Hall in Ottawa that there has been no agreement by civic officials to the proposed bridge, could the Prime Minister give the House the assurance that the government of Canada will not go ahead with the project without adequate consultation? Obviously the decision of the federal government to go ahead in the matter would affect expenditures that would be made by the city, and presumably affect the whole concept of civic planning. Can the Prime Minister give the House an assurance that there will be meaningful consultation between federal and civic authorities in regard to this bridge?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I heard the minister say in the House the other day that there had been consultation but perhaps not enough. I will discuss with him the possibility of making it enough.

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the Prime Minister received representations from the Minister of Justice and Solicitor General in regard to this important matter, in view of their responsibilities in the Ottawa area?

Mr. Trudeau: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have received some representations from ministers in the Ottawa area as well as from the Members of Parliament in the Ottawa area in the Liberal caucus.

TRANSPORT

NORTH SYDNEY-PORT AUX BASQUES FERRY SERVICE—USE OF BRITISH CREW ON VESSEL REPLACING "PATRICK MORRIS"

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport and draw to his attention a question that was directed to his Parliamentary Secretary yesterday regarding a dispute in respect of the chartering of a British vessel for the CN ferry service operating between Newfoundland and Nova

Scotia. Is he now prepared to answer the question and assure the House there will be no disruption of this very essential service? Can he indicate whether he is preparing plans to apply new technology to this service next year to avert the backlog of traffic which we face every summer?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Yes, Mr. Speaker, that would be the ideal. It was with the hope of improving the service this year that the steps taken by the CNR in fact were taken. I understand that talks are going on with the unions concerned to explain the situation. Briefly, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, they are these. The only way to get a ship into service immediately for the summer is to charter one with a crew. This has been, however, confined to a three-month charter. The unions are being advised that a more permanent replacement, which cannot come until October, will be on what is known as a bare-boat basis and will be manned by Canadian crews. This is strictly a limited three-months operation designed expressly to ensure that there is no back-up of passenger traffic on the gulf services.

BRITISH COLUMBIA CENTENNIAL

RESTRICTIONS ON GRANT TO PROVINCE

Mr. Robert Borrie (Prince George-Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the right hon. Prime Minister. In making a $10 million centennial grant to the province of British Columbia, has the government placed any restrictions on the manner in which it may be used?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): There are no specific restrictions, Mr. Speaker. This $10 million is an amount which the government of Canada wants to grant to the people and the government of British Columbia. It is, of course, in a sense a gift of the people of Canada to the people of British Columbia. I have asked the Secretary of State, who is responsible for such matters as the celebration of centennials, to discuss the ways in which this allocation will be spent with his opposite number in the government of British Columbia. We have made no conditions but we do intend to make sure that the taxpayer of Canada, who is paying the bill, will get proper credit for it.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, would the Prime Minister discuss with the Premier of British Columbia the possibility of using part of this money in respect of the Bennett Dam to allow more water through the Peace River?

AIRPORTS

TORONTO—OPPORTUNITY FOR REPRESENTATIONS AGAINST ESTABLISHMENT AT MOUNT HOPE

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the able and fair-minded Minister of Transport. In view of the growing opposition to the proposed establishment of a major airport at Mount Hope, Ontario, will the minister make no final decision until he has received the representations of all the opposed groups?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Yes, I can give that undertaking, Mr. Speaker. In addition, I can add what I have said on previous occasions, that no final decision will be taken on any establishment, and the ultimate resolution of where the airport is going to be in Toronto, until various alternatives have been placed before the public and there has been ample time to comment.

COMMUNICATIONS

TELESAT CANADA—BIDS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF SATELLITE—EFFECT OF POSSIBLE AWARD TO U.S. FIRM

Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the right hon. Prime Minister. In respect of the tender bids for the provision of equipment for the Canadian domestic satellite communications system, has he received representations from Canadian industries that the awarding of the contract to a United States firm could have a disastrous effect on Canadian telecommunications and aerospace industries and, if so, what action does the government intend to take in this respect?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I have had no representations made to me personally, Mr. Speaker. I do know that this matter is being looked at and I believe the President of the Treasury Board is informed along these lines.

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether he will give assurance that the Telesat contract will not be awarded to a foreign firm and, if it is decided that the contract will be awarded outside the

country, that the House will be given an opportunity to debate the issue before the contract is let?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I do not think the hon. member would want me to give him that assurance without any reservation. It is obvious that the matter of the amount of differential in bidding, the consequences upon our economy, the technological and scientific consequences which might flow from a decision, will all have to be considered by the government. These are indeed being considered by the government and I cannot in advance say what decision will be taken. I cannot say, either, that it will not be taken before the House reconvenes again. There is provision in the law for an Order in Council to be made within a certain delay. I understand that the board of Telesat is indulgent, but I do not know that it would be indulgent to the point of permitting us to wait until next October.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

ARGENTIA, NFLD.—ACTION TO ALLEVIATE SERIOUS SITUATION

Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport. It relates to a question I asked him on June 23 concerning the recommendations of the task force to help alleviate the serious economic situation which now faces the people of the Argentia area. At the time the minister said the report was being considered and that steps were going to be taken. Can he say what steps have been taken and when we can expect a full report as to what will be done by the government to help alleviate this situation?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I cannot give an actual date, but I would hope and expect that it will be within the next week at the outside.

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, would the minister use his influence with his colleague, the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, to have the government accede to one of the requests of the task force, namely, that a trades school be built in that area?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member's question is a representation and he must assume it has been noted.

[Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys).]

PENSIONS

OLD AGE SECURITY—PROVISION OF INCREASE IN FALL

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister. In view of the fact that we are just about at the end of the second session of the Parliament that was elected two years ago last night, without anything having been done to meet the plight of our old age pensioners, can he assure us that there will be legislation respecting an increase in old age pensions when we meet in the fall?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I cannot give that assurance but I can assure the hon. member that the plight would not be as serious if we had the support of his party in combating inflation.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, does the Prime Minister not know that that is a reprehensible canard?

[*Later:*]

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Finance a question following the answer given by the Prime Minister a moment ago regarding the degree of inflation and who is responsible for it. Will the Minister of Finance bear in mind that unemployment in Canada need not be nearly as high as it is were it not for the policies he insists on following?

AIRPORTS

USE OF MAJOR FACILITIES BY GENERAL AVIATION AIRCRAFT

Mr. Jerry Pringle (Fraser Valley East): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport. In view of the excellent support he has given all phases of general aviation, both in private life and as Minister of Transport, throughout the years, can he clarify his position as outlined in a press report, which was to the effect that the Canadian government might have to banish general aviation aircraft from major Canadian airports?

Mr. Speaker: The question as asked is not in order.

[*Later:*]

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, my question is supple-

mentary to the question of my colleague from British Columbia. Can the minister tell the House whether the department is giving any consideration to the banning of general aviation flights in and out of major international airports?

Mr. Jamieson: No, Mr. Speaker, not in the specific sense that the question suggests. There are, of course, certain changes that may be necessary from time to time because, obviously, we have to reduce the hazards to an absolute minimum. There is no general policy in this regard. We are working with a number of general aviation groups to provide alternative services, but generally we do not impose these until they are acceptable to the parties concerned.

Mr. Forrestall: I have a further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry to insist, but I am sure the minister did not want to leave the impression that general aviation is a hazard to flying in Canada.

Mr. Jamieson: That certainly was not my intention. I can assure the House of that. It is simply that there is a bit of conflict, as the hon. member knows, between commercial aviation per se and the unscheduled operations of general aviation.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

STUDENT MILITIA TRAINING—INCREASE IN QUOTAS IN AREAS OF ACUTE UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence and has to do with that part of the student employment program which comes under his department. In view of the fact that applications for student militia training in some parts of Canada are already oversubscribed, would the minister investigate, consider and direct that quotas for those regions where unemployment is acute be increased?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): That is a good suggestion, Mr. Speaker. I do not know whether it can be implemented this year because the program is well under way, but I will certainly take this into consideration.

HARBOURS

VANCOUVER—REQUEST FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF PORT AUTHORITY

Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Transport when he plans to establish a port authority for the Vancouver harbour region as indicated in his public statement of February 17?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, two statements with regard to port policy should certainly be ready within the month of July. One statement will have to do with national policy, but there will certainly be one which will have express proposals with regard to the port of Vancouver which we will then discuss with the parties in that area, I hope during the summer.

POLLUTION

SUPERVISION BY PRIME MINISTER OF IMPLEMENTATION OF CANADA WATER ACT

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. As the Canada Water Act in all probability will receive Royal Assent today and as it gives the government the power it has requested to start on the worthwhile job of cleaning up the pollution existing in Canada, is it the intention of the Prime Minister, during the next three months when Parliament is not in session, to personally supervise the operation of this Act to see that a worth-while job is done on our waters and report to the House when we reconvene on October 5?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I personally supervise the work of all ministers, but I do not supervise the details. I might consider putting a canoe in the Ottawa River to supervise at close hand what is happening there.

LAKE HURON—PAYMENT OF COMPENSATION TO FISHERMEN

Mr. Jack Cullen (Sarnia): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. In view of the serious financial hardship being faced by members of the South Lake Huron Fisherman's Association, has the federal government now decided to participate in compensation to be paid to these fishermen? Has a letter to this effect been sent to the Minister of Lands and Forests of the province of Ontario?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have written to the Hon. René Brunelle, Minister of Lands and Forests for Ontario, confirming that this is the case.

Inquiries of the Ministry

FINANCE

MEASURES TO ASSIST GRAIN INDUSTRY FOLLOWING FREEING OF DOLLAR EXCHANGE RATE

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. In view of the fact that the minister indicated in answer to a question from myself on June 2 that the grains industry is an example of an industry adversely affected by the move to a floating exchange rate, could the minister inform the House if any policy decision has been taken on offsetting measures or whether any steps have been taken to deal with this matter?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): No, not to this point, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Burton: Mr. Speaker, could the minister inform the House whether he intends to take any steps to deal with this matter and establish any ways and means whereby those interested in this matter could make representations to the government?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, people who have been interested have been making representations, mainly to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I know the question period has dragged on for a long time but because we are perhaps at the end of this part of the session I should like to ask a question of the House Leader in view of the fact that the election bill passed yesterday and a certain problem is involved.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is there agreement that the hon. member may ask a question?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

CANADA ELECTIONS ACT

ALLEGED DISENFRANCHISEMENT OF CERTAIN PERSONS BY NEW LEGISLATION

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the election bill which was passed by this House will probably receive Royal Assent today, I should like to ask the President of the Privy Council whether it is the intention of the government to give any specific instructions to all those residents of Canada, between 230,000 and 940,000, who were disenfranchised by an amendment to the bill when it was in Committee of the Whole? Will the government advise them that they should take steps to become Canadian citizens within the five-year period?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's understanding of the bill is wrong. No one is disenfranchised.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CANADA SHIPPING ACT

AMENDMENT TO POSTPONE EXPIRATION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS

On the order:

Second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications of Bill S-23, An Act to postpone the expiration of certain provisions of An Act to amend the Canada Shipping Act.—The Minister of Transport.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this bill probably will go through without too much discussion, I wonder whether the government would consider having it dealt with in Committee of the Whole. This is just a suggestion because if the bill were referred to the standing committee the purpose sought by trying to get it through and receive royal assent today would be defeated.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Yes Mr. Speaker, it was our intention to make such a request. Perhaps the House would be prepared to accept an amendment that on second reading the bill would be referred to the Committee of the Whole rather than to the standing committee.

Mr. Baldwin: That is all right, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to co-operate in this suggestion. We hope there will be similar co-operation in respect of Bill C-196.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to co-operate but we express the wish that the committee to which this bill will be referred may be able at the same time to study carefully the conclusions of

the inquiry report on pilotage so that we do not make a giant step in one direction and lose ground in another.

We would like the whole problem of shipping to be studied by this committee.

[*English*]

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport) moved that Bill S-23, to postpone the expiration of certain provisions of an act to amend the Canada Shipping Act, be read the second time and be referred to the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of Bill S-23 is to provide that section 7 of the act to amend the Canada Shipping Act, chapter 53 of the 1969 statutes, which would otherwise expire at the end of this month shall continue in force. Section 7 was included in the 1969 Act in order to remove doubt about the validity of certain pilotage by-laws and licences issued under the Canada Shipping Act. The royal commission on pilotage had suggested that some of the by-laws were *ultra vires,* and the licences issued under them invalid.

The minister had hoped to bring in a new pilotage bill at this session, but this has not been possible. Early this year officers of the ministry consulted with pilots and the users of the pilotage service concerning the possibility of a new approach to the pilotage problem. They were asked to consider a system under which the government would regulate only in respect of such safety matters as the qualifications of pilots and the areas where pilotage would be compulsory. Other matters, such as the fees to be paid for the service, the arrangements for pilots to be available, the provision of pilot boats and so on would be left to be worked out by the pilots and the users of their services. This was put forward, not as a firm proposal, but simply as a possible solution concerning which we wished to have their reaction. We had hoped to receive their views in time for policy decisions to be taken before now but some of the replies were received only during the past few weeks.

As a result, the legislation arising out of the report of the royal commission on pilotage will not be ready for submission to Parliament until later in 1970 or early in 1971 and therefore, unless the provisions of section 7 of chapter 53 are permitted to continue in force after June 30, the administration of the pilotage provisions of the Canada Shipping Act will no longer be possible. Bill S-23 provides that the said provisions of chapter 53 will continue in force until the end of this year or by proclamation for a further six months to June 30, 1971.

This is just a matter of postponing the time of the expiration of section 7 in order to give an opportunity to the royal commission on pilotage to report to the minister so that the minister can bring in a new bill on pilotage. This would take care of the suggestion of the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) that the whole problem in respect of pilotage be brought to the attention of the Committee on Transport. When the bill on pilotage is presented, it will be referred to the Committee on Transport of the House of Commons so that all the problems and suggestions may be discussed. We are now just asking that the date be postponed for six months in order to give the department an opportunity to bring in the new legislation.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, we will not take very long with this bill, but certainly I do not think the government can be left off the hook as easily as the Parliamentary Secretary would like. This bill, which is before us today for consideration, clearly illustrates the sloppy way in which the government has mishandled this whole situation. The first volume of the Pilotage Commission report was brought in two years ago. At that time a question was asked in the House by the Leader of the Opposition of the then minister of transport with regard to the intentions of the government. The answer was as follows:

• (12:50 p.m.)

The government has not yet made a decision on whether to implement recommendation 39 of the report of the Royal Commission on Pilotage. It is anticipated that revised legislation to replace the present provisions of part VI of the Canada Shipping Act will be introduced late in 1969 or early in 1970.

But the government did not stop there. At that time the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), freshly minted, and with all kinds of ideas as to what was going to be done in the new, brisk, just society, issued the following statement in July, 1968. He was a brand new Prime Minister, not the battered and worn Prime Minister we see today. Here is what he had to say in his statement:

A small task force—

Famous words—task force! How many task forces has this unfortunate government inflicted upon the country since then?

—under the direction of the Department of Transport will be set up to launch an early review of the report—

He is speaking of the report of the Royal Commission on Pilotage.

—with a view to expediting implementation and recommendation. The government intends to proceed quickly with the preparation of appropriate legislation, and the majority of the recommendations of the Commission appear acceptable in broad terms.

Two years have passed and we are right back where we were at that time. It is rather odd that this is the same department—and I am not attaching any blame to the minister because he was not the minister then—which a short time ago was compelled to come to this House hat in hand to ask for remedial legislation to legalize invalid regulations passed under the Aeronautics Act. These regulations had been in operation for a number of years and had been declared by the Supreme Court to be invalid. Here is the same department of the same government coming to us with exactly the same facts. The Royal Commission on Pilotage said very definitely that the by-laws passed by the pilotage authority under the provisions of the Canada Shipping Act were invalide. Two years have gone by and the same situation is prevailing.

The government came to us last year and legislation was enacted to deal with the situation. In spite of the fact that the government has in this session given us the most pedestrian kind of legislation—they have not tackled any of the real problems of this country such as inflation, unemployment, the divisions in the country and constitutional problems—the government comes in on the last day of the session and says: "please, we want to continue the system for one more year". Of course, we have to give them that right, but I think it is a sad illustration of the manner in which the government conducts itself, particularly when we consider this government's attempts to commit an indecent assault on the parliamentary system.

I think this time I will limit myself to simply calling it an indecent assault. The government has attempted to take away all the rights which the parliamentary process has made available over the generations to the House of Commons, and in their place in every bill which is brought before us they seek more and more authoritarian power. Never has any government in peace time sought for and obtained more authoritarian and dictatorial rights. Here, we see an example of what happens when these rights are exercised by a government which is contemptuous of Parliament and of parliamentary traditions.

There are those people who say that the only kind of government which is effective and efficient is one which acts dictatorially and arrogantly, and without regard for the rights of the people. This is an example which proves that is not the case. Those people who languish in that belief have a lot to learn. Governments, merely because they are strong, powerful and have the authority which has been given to them by the House of Commons, are not necessarily efficient. No better proof of that can be found than in the fact that here, within a period of one month, this government has had to come to this House to ask the House to make good illegalities in respect of regulations and Orders in Council that were passed.

I am glad that after prodding, pushing and shoving by members of this party, the President of the Privy Council in particular was persuaded to bring down proposals implementing the suggestions of the Special Committee on Statutory Instruments to safeguard against this very thing. It shows how necessary it was. We sometimes wonder how we have survived this long without that safeguard, and I hope as I resume my seat that this will be a lesson to the government to bring forward those proposals immediately. Let us not be put in a position where we have to come back and validate illegal, improper and retroactive regulations which are *ultra vires* and have not the legal effect which they should have. I hope the government will recognize this. I hope it will be a lesson to them, and I hope we will not find the government coming back here next year saying: "Please pass this act again for another year."

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): I will only speak for a moment or two, not nearly as long as my friend, the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), although I do not mean to detract in any way from the force of what he said.

First, I want to extend congratulations to the Parliamentary Secretary for being able to present to the House word for word an identical speech to that which was presented to the Senate when the bill was dealt with over there. I want to say that there is some efficiency in the department in that respect in the

way they got the word across to both the Senator and the parliamentary secretary as to what to say in support of the bill.

The purport of the bill is to regularize by statute the by-laws which were made by the Department of Transport improperly and without legislative authority, as was the case with the Aeronautics Act, as pointed out by the hon. member for Peace River. With respect to the invalid regulations made under the Aeronautics Act, which extended back some years, and the by-laws relating to pilotage, which also extend back some years, I am really amazed that these things were not uncovered, corrected and changed when the brilliant Hon. George Hees was at the head of the Department of Transport.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, about the debate on second reading, I will reserve my remarks for our work in committee so as to allow the House to speed up its business.

[*English*]

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I hope you will allow me two or three minutes to refer to some of the remarks of the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin). He said the bill was illegal and improper. That is not so. Indeed, I could remind him of the fact that Bill C-218, which we passed the other day, had to be redrafted because it was badly written or the words in the Order in Council were not correct. May I remind him that there were five or six such Orders in Council during the time the Conservative government was in office between 1958 and 1962. The reason in this case was bad drafting of those orders.

When the hon. member for Peace River says we are right back where we were two years ago, may I remind him that we are much closer to the formulation of a new bill on pilotage than we were two years ago. The minister said that before the end of this year or the beginning of 1971, a new bill will be brought in which will correct all the mistakes that might have been made.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion.

• (1:00 p.m.)

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Béchard in the chair.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. It being one o'clock I do now leave the chair.

At one o'clock the committee took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed at 2 p.m.

On Clause 1—*Expiry.*

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask one question to which clause 1 of this bill opens the door. In view of the fact that on second reading the Parliamentary Secretary made reference to the fact that amendments to the Canada Shipping Act are pending, I ask the minister whether consideration is being given to the question of expanded pilotage arrangements for the Canadian Arctic. I ask the question particularly in view of the possibility of surface transportation using those waters, and the very interesting possibility outlined to one of the parliamentary committees a while ago of transportation underwater by submarine? Will the new act make provision for pilotage services to underwater commercial craft across the Arctic?

• (2:10 p.m.)

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Chairman, my remarks will be brief, although the point I wish to make involves a most serious underlying principle. I hope that members of the committee will consider it to be as serious as I consider it.

As the Parliamentary Secretary has indicated, we are considering a bill that is to guard against the lapsing of certain regulations so that the government may have an opportunity to bring in full amending regulations. It is to the point that I wish to address my brief remarks this afternoon. Let us be clear that we, on this side of the House, understand the objections of the industry to that portion of the report which is now before the people of Canada and the government. We do not need to elaborate arguments which may have been advanced in the other place in connection with this bill to make that clear.

I hope I am not inadequate to the task and that I do not misrepresent my thoughts and intentions. I intend this afternoon to leave a clear indication of the direction in which I, as an individual, should like the government to go, not only in connection with this bill but with other, related bills. I hope the House and the people of Canada will support me. I am talking of the area of the conflict of interest that arises when a regulatory authority, such

as the Department of Transport, is also the repository of investigative power.

May I explain briefly what I am getting at? It is clear, I think, that for some time there has been in this country the conflict of interest to which I referred. In recent years, as a result of such unfortunate air accidents as the one at Wabush—and I regret that I have had to refer to it—the matter of conflict of interest in this area has become of prime importance. We saw the spectacle in 1970 of a regulatory body investigating this accident that occurred at Wabush. I must be careful, because I do not want to say that the accident occurred as a direct result of procedures flowing from the regulations, but the implication is clear, certainly. It seems to me that in the case of shipping accidents, whether or not pilots are on board, as in the case of accidents involving trains, aircrafts and all other public conveyances which in any way come under the jurisdiction of the dominion Parliament, the investigation should not be conducted by the body making the regulations.

I need not explain to hon. members the problems that arise when there are clear cases of conflict of interest. For example, one could ask the Prime Minister to describe the just society. We may not agree with the description. I am not necessarily saying that his argument is wrong; it is just that I happen to think it is wrong, as do many other Canadians. In other words, when there is a conflict of interest you remove totally and completely the ability of a body or person to arrive at an objective conclusion. In my brief experience, I have seen no exceptions to this rule.

May I tell the parliamentary secretary, through you, Mr. Chairman, that it is our wish on this side of the House, and particularly my wish that, prior to bringing in legislation to amend the Canada Shipping Act, the government should give consideration to taking from the Department of Transport any vestige of right to investigate accidents arising out of situations in which that department is involved as a regulatory body. May I cite the very wise example to be found in the country to our south, because they have taken away from their executive department level the responsibility for investigating accidents of the type to which I referred.

In Canada, we ought to appoint an independent investigative council which cannot be charged with conflict of interest. The people of Canada want the administrative arm of government to take an objective view, not only of shipping accidents but also of air and rail accidents, and all those accidents which come under the authority of the federal departments.

Mr. Baldwin: That includes cabinet accidents.

Mr. Forrestall: And cabinet accidents. I understand that there are to be many in the next few weeks. I wish all those fellows on the government side well, because this is probably the last time I shall speak prior to the summer recess.

The urgency of the matter I am raising has been highlighted during the past few weeks by the disastrous air accident at Wabush. It was clearly admitted that the department charged with administration as well as with investigating the circumstances and probable cause of the accident, had some responsibility in the matter. I would be greatly surprised if the government of Canada, in the right of the people of Canada, does not within the next year face one of the largest lawsuits ever brought as a direct result of this accident. I do not know whether such action is being contemplated, but I should be surprised if it is not, because I suggest that here was a prime and clear example of conflict of interest. This conflict of interest must be removed. I suggest that Bill S-23 is delaying legislation, and will give the government and the Department of Transport ample opportunity to consider the full ramifications of allowing a regulatory body to investigate accidents which have arisen directly or indirectly as a result of regulations it has passed to govern that particular segment of industry.

I will not say much more. I must give the Minister of Transport and the government a very clear warning that they must take the opportunity provided under this bill—and this is 1970, and not 1850—to protect not only departments of government but, as well, the people of Canada, by making sure that the people of Canada hear objective conclusions about accidents which involve shipping, aircraft or trains. I hope that all accidents involving public conveyances will not be investigated by the authority issuing the regulations.

• (2:20 p.m.)

I am not suggesting for one moment that investigations carried out in the past by officers of the Department of Transport have not been honest or have not reflected their best professional judgment. What I am suggesting

is that it is damned hard for any of us to ask our wife whether she really wants to get her hair done today or whether she can let it go until next week. Of course she can let it go until next week, but does she really want to? We all appreciate the difficulty caused by a conflict of interest. I urge the government to do something about this situation by announcing its intention to remove from the Department of Transport responsibility in this area and to vest it in some such body as a national transportation council, using the services, the expertise and the professionalism of those who are presently employed in the corresponding division of the Department of Transport. Let it be made absolutely clear to all Canadians that from now on Parliament will not tolerate the situation which presently exists.

Mr. Loiselle: Before I turn to the substance of the observations which have been made by members opposite, I should like to point out that there is no direct relationship between some of the suggestions they have put forward and the contents of the bill which is before us.

The hon. member for Comox-Alberni talked about pilotage arrangements in the Arctic, both on the surface and under water. This is a subject which will be dealt with when new legislation is brought down this fall or early next year.

Mr. Barnett: I simply asked whether the points I raised would be dealt with during the preparation of this legislation.

Mr. Loiselle: I am unable to give the hon. member a complete assurance about this, but he will have an excellent opportunity to bring this matter up, and, later on, I may be in a position to give him personally a reply with regard to it. As I was saying at one o'clock, a number of questions affecting pilotage, the responsibility of pilots and so on will be dealt with in the course of that bill. The measure will go before the Transport Committee and members of the committee will have the leisure in which to pursue any questions which they think are pertinent.

Considerable time has been spent in the preparation of that legislation and, as a result, it was not possible to bring it in earlier. Officers of the department have contacted those engaged in pilotage services, as well as the various interests which use those services. It is only within the last few weeks that we have received the final comments of some pilots and companies concerned.

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Mr. Loiselle: Please, gentlemen. It is not often that I have a chance like this. Allow me to have the pleasure.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Loiselle: I shall not take too long. I want to go home, too.

The hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East has put forward a good recommendation, and we should surely think about it.

Mr. Forrestall: Better still, act upon it.

Mr. Loiselle: He suggested setting up an independent board to inquire into every accident, whether it involved rail, air, or navigation at sea. His point is well taken. I was glad to note at the end of his remarks he made it clear he was not inferring that the Department of Transport, in its investigations of these accidents in the past, had been biased or dishonest. The hon. member did not doubt the honesty of the department and I am glad he made this qualification at the end of his remarks. I agree it would be a relief for the department if, after an accident had occurred, some independent department or board were responsible for carrying out an investigation. Maybe we could respond, and further work could be carried out in the field of accident prevention.

Mr. Forrestall: That is the responsibility of the department. In order that there may be no misunderstanding about what I was saying, may I ask whether the Parliamentary Secretary is indicating that he will accept the principle that I was advancing? He implied that I had qualified my remarks. I in no way did so. Would he inform me whether it is his understanding that I want the department to give up its efforts in terms of the prevention of accidents? I was not saying this at all. I was attempting to make it clear that in my view investigative authority and responsibility should be removed from the department as swiftly as time will permit.

Mr. Loiselle: My mind is quite clear about that. I did not intend to imply that the hon. member had qualified his opinion about that. What I intended to say was this. Even if we made an effort to create a new board with responsibility for investigating accidents it seems to me we should react in some way by carrying out additional work in the field of accident prevention. I understood the hon. member very clearly and he may be sure that

his recommendations will be brought to the attention of the minister and considered when this new bill of which I spoke at one o'clock comes up in the fall.

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Clause agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported.

• (2:30 p.m.)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): When shall the said bill be read the third time? By leave, now?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Davis (for Mr. Jamieson) moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

FISHERIES ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING "CLOSE TIME" DEPOSITING OF WASTE, MARINE PLANTS, ETC.

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-204, to amend the Fisheries Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry.

Mr. Louis-Roland Comeau (South Western Nova) moved:

That Bill C-204, an act to amend the Fisheries Act, be amended by deleting clause 2 thereof, line 14, page 1.

He said: Mr. Speaker, finally we are down to the Fisheries Act and I had to leave at three o'clock this morning to come here to speak to this amendment. The amendment calls for the deletion of a clause, which simply provides for the repeal of section 31 of the Act. It looks very simple, and in fact for quite a while no one paid too much attention to this clause. All of a sudden, the question flared up and we now find ourselves in quite a situation in the sense that the fishermen of Nova Scotia, particularly those in my riding, are about 95 per cent opposed to this provision. I also understand the fishermen in New Brunswick are opposed to the repeal of this section.

Although this clause is the shortest in the whole bill, to the lobster fishermen of the Atlantic provinces it means a lot. If the bill passes with this clause unamended, according to my understanding the minister will have the right to enact legislation to permit the harvesting of off-shore lobsters on a yearly basis, and the fishermen are concerned about this. The only information we have had on this subject since the bill was introduced last April was given by the deputy minister of fisheries under questioning in the standing committee. Information from the department has certainly been lacking, which perhaps is one reason the fishermen are upset about it. They do not understand what it means. They have had one interpretation, but they think they are right and that the minister will not go along with their views.

Only two weeks ago a report on the subject issued by the Fisheries Research Board was made available to me and to the fishermen. I questioned Dr. Martin on the subject in the committee last April and was told that the offshore lobster fishery was a separate resource from the inshore lobster fishery. Under further questioning, he told me there was no danger to the lobster inshore fishery markets even if offshore lobsters were harvested.

One wonders why this very simple provision to which I referred was included in the bill. According to a press report, not very long ago the department stated that no company or organization brought any pressure to bear in support of this proposal. The only reason given by the department was that this resource was being tapped by the vessels of two nations, the United States and Russia, which were fishing on the banks, and since they were engaging in this type of fishing, Canada should do the same.

As it happens, those two nations fish for lobsters only on the banks and do not come close to Canadian shores. However, I am wondering what would happen if Canadian lobster boats were permitted to fish offshore for lobsters, and how we would prevent these boats from getting close to the banks just outside the 12-mile limit. Why would these boats be permitted to trap or to drag—I understand that dragging is pretty well out of the question, but they could trap—just outside the 12-mile limit where our inshore fishermen are engaged in fishing?

Just because the Russians and the Americans do this sort of thing is no reason why we should do the same. Can Canada benefit only by grabbing all she can, like other nations? Is this what we mean by conservation of the fisheries? This is something the minister is quite concerned about, and is this what he means by conservation? The fishermen contend that this sort of activity will eventually destroy the inshore lobster fishery

of Nova Scotia which is closer to the banks. I want to make it quite clear that I have attended a couple of fishermen's meetings and they know what they are talking about. After all, they have been fishing for many years.

I realize that the Fisheries Research Board has done a tremendous amount of research, and I think we need even more research in other branches of the fishery which must be looked at more closely. For example, we need research into the harvesting of sea urchins. Although these have nothing to do with lobsters, sea urchins are considered a delicacy by Europeans while Canadian fishermen consider them a nuisance. I do not want to criticize the Fisheries Research Board; in fact, I would praise them for the fine work they have done. At the same time, some of their findings are open to challenge. Perhaps the evidence is not conclusive enough. At least, it is not conclusive enough to convince the fishermen.

• (2:40 p.m.)

It is a different matter to experiment with bottles floating on the water or several inches under the surface. We are here dealing with lobster. These people know from experience what they are talking about. They have been fishing for many years, some for as long as 20 and 30 years. Let us suppose these fishermen are right. It is not enough for us to say that we must participate in this fishery. What happens if this fishery is depleted? Can we then say; oh well, it was good while it lasted? We took our share, but now it is all gone. Then, everybody would be out of work. This is the thing that bothers the fishermen and this is why they are concerned. They feel that present research is not conclusive.

Let us consider the herring industry. That industry is very often referred to as an example. The fishermen suggest that if the same research people involved in the herring fishery are making these recommendations they do not want any part of them. Last week the Bay of Fundy was closed to seiners and trawlers because there were not enough fish for everybody. This area lies between my riding and the New Brunswick shore. These fishermen continually ask me what will happen if the research people who are making these recommendations are the same ones who studied the herring fishery.

I was talking to a fellow yesterday who lost $20,000 on his boat recently. He had to let it go because of the lack of fish. One might say that we have been talking about the herring industry but that these boats could be used for offshore lobstering. If we use these boats for offshore lobstering we might face the same situation in a few years that we faced in connection the Herring industry. We may deplete this fishery as the herring fishery has been depleted.

If the department is concerned that other nations are going to reap the benefits of our fisheries, then these problems have to be ironed out with the nations concerned. They must not be allowed to deplete our fisheries. The department must make sure that these nations do not fish close to our shores. The fishermen are willing to accept the idea that perhaps lobsters 200 miles away are not a part of their fishery, but they certainly cannot be sure that only those lobsters and not those on their shores will be taken.

The fishermen, through an impressive effort of their own and out of their own pockets, are responsible for a full-page open letter to the Minister of Fisheries which appeared in the leading newspapers of the province of Nova Scotia. In this open letter they have protested certain policies. The letter is addressed to the Hon. Jack Davis, Minister of Fisheries. I am sure no one has seen fishermen undertake such a project for many years, either in the province of Nova Scotia or anywhere else. They are so concerned they have taken the trouble to spend their own money in order to publish this open letter. Let me take a few moments to read part of it. It reads:

> Dear Sir: On May 18th, 1970, 910 fishermen, and other interested persons, attended a meeting of the Lobster Bay Fishermen's Association, held at Barrington Passage, Nova Scotia.
>
> The accompanying resolution was passed with no dissenting vote.
>
> On June 1st, 1970, 450 fishermen, and other interested persons, attended a meeting in Wedgeport, Nova Scotia, under the auspices of the Wedgeport Fishermen's Association. The same resolution was adopted, unanimously.

We have never seen so many fishermen get together for a cause as in this particular case. That is why I am so concerned about this. The letter then reads:

> Both resolutions were immediately forwarded to your office, at the close of each respective meeting. Since no direct reply from your office has ever been received, we therefore take this means of again calling your attention to a most serious situation resulting from an announcement from your office on May 11th, 1970, giving notice of intent to enact legislation to allow the harvest of lobsters on George's Bank, and other areas, after the closure of the season in District No. 4, on May 31st.
>
> Would you not also agree, Sir, that fishermen everywhere have every right to be concerned, since

in their opinion, the net result of such legislation would mean complete disaster to the lobster industry?

Would you not also agree, Sir, that since you are an elected representative of the people, that you should represent, and hear, all of the people involved?

I will not read the rest of the letter. I have tried to get the fisheries committee to meet to discuss this problem. I have done everything I can under the rules, but I have been prevented because the committee will not go back to this bill unless it has a reference from the House of Commons.

I have an assurance in a letter from the minister that he will not do anything to change the regulations before he has heard from the fishermen. I hope the minister will meet with the fishermen as soon as possible. I hope the fishermen will be able to come before the committee next fall to air their views. The minister wrote a letter to me on June 17 in which he stated:

—we certainly do not intend to introduce any amendments to permit the new fishery.

Later on, in a letter he wrote on June 22, the minister said:

—I would propose that no action be taken by the Department of Fisheries, either to draw up regulations or consider licences for a possible far offshore lobster fishery until meetings are held with fishermen, either with myself in Ottawa or with senior members of the departmental staff in the fishing communities.

I know the minister is an honourable man, and I am sure he will not do anything until that has been done. The only difference between what the minister is saying, and what I am saying, is that right now there is a law which protects the fishermen. Perhaps the minister can correct me if I am wrong. The minister is suggesting now that he or his department will decide on regulations and Parliament will have no say in this whatsoever. He suggests the law will be changed because this is just a matter of passing new regulations. The fishermen are protected at this time by the law.

Perhaps the minister will say that there was another meeting held by the fishermen at which some of them disagreed. They did not disagree in respect of this particular problem. They did disagree about some of the regulations the department is putting out. They disagreed with the suggestion that the same lobster regulations should apply to one area of my riding as apply to the rest of Nova Scotia in district no. 4. This is a particular problem in respect of which I think they all agreed. I do not wish to go into the whole subject, but the fishing industry is the backbone of the Atlantic provinces, particularly the lobster industry. This is tremendously important to my part of the country. It involves millions of dollars. The government must be very careful when changing the regulations in the lobster fishery as many problems must be ironed out.

There is a limited number of boats now available to this industry. This is another problem that must be ironed out. It must be approached in the same way as the problem of boats for the salmon fishery on the west coast was approached. These things must be considered by the committee, and it is imperative that the government be careful in respect of these regulations. Every time someone mentions the word "fish" someone else hollers that it is a dirty, smelly word. It is time this industry was recognized as something other than a dirty, smelly industry in Canada. If people in the rest of Canada, other than the Atlantic provinces, were as concerned about fish as they are about other problems we might today have policies which would accomplish exactly what the fishermen want. We might then not have the people in Upper Canada referring to the fishermen in the Atlantic provinces as dirty, smelly people.

• (2:50 p.m.)

This is the main thing. If we could get the people in the rest of Canada to accept the word "fish" this problem would be solved. This matter does not bother them. They say that a great deal of money is being poured into eastern Canada and then ask what the people are doing with it. The fishermen are trying to feed the rest of the country. They are not causing any harm. They provide food also for the people of other nations. This is an honourable profession, although it is one in which none of us would like to be involved. Many things involve the Canadian fisherman.

One example is the problem in connection with getting wharves built. Last week a wharf collapsed and a fellow fell through to the bottom of the harbour. Now, this wharf is sealed off and there is no activity there, although it is located in an export Port. These are the types of things the fishermen have trouble getting through to the rest of the people. If this could be done, then I believe the government would act. Perhaps it is because there are two ministers concerned about these problems, the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry and the Minister of Public

Works (Mr. Laing), both from the West Coast. They appear to be more concerned about the problems of the fisheries on the west coast. One of these ministers should be changed, and probably it should be the Minister of Public Works.

I have mentioned some of the problems we face. I hope the minister has seen the light in respect of these problems. There has been much correspondence. I know this minister is not as stubborn as some of the other ministers, particularly the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) and the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene). I know that if he were aware of the situation, he would want to correct it. I hope he will accept my amendment.

[*Translation*]

I hope I have convinced hon. members that the fishing industry is a very important and viable one in my riding and must be supported by all Canadians.

[*English*]

I hope my amendment receives support, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in support of the amendment moved by the hon. member for South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau), I do so because of the genuine fear which this government's action has created in the hearts and minds of the inshore lobster fishermen in Atlantic Canada, especially in the provinces of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, through amendments to the Fisheries Act as proposed in Bill C-204. This bill received first reading on April 10 and came up for second reading on April 20. At that time, when speaking on the bill, the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) outlined his views at some depth on the pollution of Canadian waters and indicated it was the government's intention to try to control pollution through the Fisheries Act, the Canada Water Act, the Northern Inland Waters Act and the Canada Shipping Act. However, throughout this interesting speech he made no mention of the effect on the inshore lobster fishermen if one of the clauses of this bill should receive approval by the House. In fact, he never mentioned the inshore lobster fishery at any time.

The clause to which I refer is clause 2 which simply states that section 31 of the said Act is repealed. Section 31 reads as follows:

> No one shall leave any port or place in Canada to fish outside the territorial waters of Canada for fish the catching of which is at such time prohibited in the territorial waters of Canada opposite to or nearest the place where such person proposes to fish, and no one shall bring into Canada any fish caught outside the territorial waters of Canada when fishing for such fish is prohibited inside the territorial waters of Canada opposite or nearest to the place where such fish was caught, or shall bring into Canada any vessels, boats, nets, fishing gear, implements or appliances used in such fishing.

The bill states that the purposes originally served by section 31 are now served by section 76 of the Fisheries Act and the Coastal fisheries Protection Act. When we look at section 76 of the Fisheries Act we find the following words:

> The provisions of this Act and the regulations that apply to any or all of the waters or territorial waters of Canada, without anything in the context of such provisions indicating that they apply to any specified area of the waters or territorial waters of Canada, shall, in relation to any fishing vessel on the High Seas that is subject to the jurisdiction of Canada, or any act or thing done or omitted to be done on, from or by means of any such fishing vessel, be deemed to extend and apply to the High Seas.

In other words, any vessel that comes under the jurisdiction of the Canadian government and Canadian laws, is subject to the controls exercised under the Fisheries Act whether they be vessels operating within our territorial waters or on the high seas. This is quite definite. It would appear to make section 31 redundant. However, I contend that section 31 of the Fisheries Act is more descriptive than section 76 for it states, without any reservations, that fish are not to be caught outside the territorial waters, which are now 12 miles from shore, when the catching of such fish is forbidden in our territorial waters.

The section states that no one shall bring into Canada any vessel, boats, nets, fishing gear, implements or appliances used in fishing on the high seas when the season for such fishing in our territorial waters is closed. It is this exact wording which provides the inshore lobster fisherman with the protection he feels he requires so that his inshore lobster resources will not be further depleted. Bill C-204 received second reading without an adequate explanation from the government concerning its reason for repealing section 31 of the Act. It was only when the bill came up before the Committee on Fisheries and Forestry on Thursday May 7 that the Deputy Minister of Fisheries, in reply to questions from the official opposition, gave an indication of the effect this innocuous-looking amendment would have on inshore lobster fishermen and their industry. By the repeal of section 31 of the Fisheries

Act, it will be possible for the minister to grant a licence for the catching of lobsters on the high seas by the use of regular lobster traps as spelled out in section 6 of the Lobster Fishery Regulations.

It was this information that brought consternation and fear into the hearts of our inshore lobster fishermen. Up and down the coast of Nova Scotia, meetings were held, some of which were attended by a provincial Liberal candidate who obviously is having second thoughts about the party he is pledged to support since he is reported in the press as stating he is opposed to the amendments in this bill. Members of all parties have received resolutions and telegrams from these worried fishermen. These resolutions and telegrams come from Sable River, West Shelburne County, the Barrington municipal council, Port Joli, Queen's County, and the Lobster Bay Fisherman's Association of Lower Woods Harbour. In fact, the Prince Edward Island legislature also approved unanimously a resolution asking that section 31 of the Fisheries Act be not repealed. I am informed that a copy of this resolution was forwarded to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry.

Listen to the plea of the fishermen in their resolution, as printed in an open letter to the Hon. Jack Davis, Minister of Fisheries, in the Halifax *Chronicle Herald* of Tuesday, June 23. The hon. member for South Western Nova has read some of the contents of the letter, so I shall not burden the House with it again.

I should like, however, to place on the record, so that all hon. members will know of this, the concern of the hundreds of inshore fishermen in Atlantic Canada. These are the views of these men as expressed in this advertisement, which is the first advertisement of this type I have seen in my 13 years in the House of Commons. I am referring to the resolution which appears alongside the open letter as printed from the Lobster Bay Fishermen's Association. It reads as follows:

Whereas lobster fishermen on the South Shore of Nova Scotia depend entirely on the harvest of lobsters by the use or traps, said system having proved over a period of 100 years or more the most efficient from the standpoint of total catch and enforcement of present regulations;

Whereas approximately 40 per cent of the lobster fishermen in this area now operate beyond the 12-mile limit during the present lobster season;

Whereas the lobsters placed on the market obtained by the use of drags would reduce the price of said product, therefore creating economic chaos in the affected areas;

Whereas it will be physically impossible to enforce the 12-mile limit due to weather conditions and the lack of patrol craft;

Whereas the adoption of a program such as this would on the surface seem very unfair to all fishermen and within a very short time result in the complete destruction of the industry as it presently applies to the small craft fishermen;

The Lobster Bay Fishermen's Association strongly oppose any change whatsoever in the present regulations;

Be it therefore resolved that the federal Minister of Fisheries, the Hon. Jack Davis, strongly oppose this bill.

This is to certify that the resolution of which the foregoing is a true copy was duly passed at a duly called meeting of the Lobster Bay Fishermen's Association duly held on the 18th day of May, A.D., 1970.

Given under the hands of the president and secretary of the said association this 19th day of May, A.D., 1970.

• (3:00 p.m.)

This is a plea from the citizens of this country who are worried about their future, the future of their wives and children and the future of their industry. They know that any adverse economic effect as a result of the repeal of section 31 of the Fisheries Act would be very harmful to thousands of inshore lobster fishermen as well as to the economy of Atlantic Canada, especially Nova Scotia. The amazing thing about all this is that we have a government which promised on the election platform a just society, confrontation with the people and participatory democracy. Obviously, this government does not know the meaning of the words for they have proceeded with the repeal of section 31 of the Fisheries Act without any discussion, without any prior meetings with the people concerned, namely, the inshore lobster fishermen. This was done because the attitude of the present government seems to be that they know what is best for everyone whether it be fisheries, finance, forestry or farming. They say, "We make the laws. You had better accept them without complaint and without a murmur, because we know what we want to do with you". Well, the people of Canada are having second thoughts and they are getting some very firm ideas about what they would like to do with this government.

Mr. Pilon: Wrong!

Mr. Crouse: Hon. members opposite disagree with that statement. All I ask them to do is read some of the briefs that have been submitted in respect of the white paper on taxation. The Minister of Fisheries and Fores-

try (Mr. Davis) has indicated that he does not plan to license any ships for deep sea lobster operations at the present time. He has indicated this in a letter to me. But he still maintains in that letter that the repeal of section 31 of the Fisheries Act would have no immediate effect on the lobster fisheries. I submit that his stated intentions are not good enough. I submit that the protection required and requested by the inshore lobster fishermen is embodied in section 31 of the Fisheries Act. The Minister of Fisheries and Forestry, for whom I have a high personal regard, looks quite healthy but he may well not survive the rigours of this Parliament and he may well be replaced by another Minister of Fisheries and Forestry with entirely different views.

For this reason, the protection that is required by our inshore lobster fishermen must be guaranteed by statute, by Canadian law. Quite frankly, I find it hard to understand the reasoning which prompted this action by the minister who seeks to repeal section 31. I say this because of the strong objections that have been raised by the lobster fishermen to his proposed action.

The inshore lobster fishermen have every reason to be concerned. Many of these fishermen, during the period when the inshore lobster season is open, fish or set their traps within Canadian territorial waters. However, others set their traps outside our territorial waters, outside the 12-mile limit, on shoals or ledges that may be five to twenty miles beyond our territorial waters and are therefore classed as high seas areas. Under section 31 they are prohibited from landing lobsters from these ledges and shoals outside our territorial waters when the season for catching lobsters in our territorial waters is closed. But they have always accepted this regulation in the hope that the closed period would help improve the quantity of lobsters on the ledges and shoals outside the 12-mile limit and thereby give them a fair living over the years.

Now, however, without any explanation from the government or from the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry, this section of the Fisheries Act which protected their resource is to be repealed. Licensed deep sea lobster fishermen could fish on these ledges and shoals that are just beyond the 12-mile limit and while doing so they would be depleting lobster stocks which for years have been considered to be the resource of the inshore lobster fishermen. The Minister of Fisheries may well say that this would not be done. I believe that in his heart he is convinced that it would not be done. He may well say that any deep sea lobster operation would have the area clearly spelled out in which the deep sea operator can set his traps, namely, George's Bank. But I ask him, "How is the inshore lobster fishermen supposed to know what the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry is thinking or, for that matter, whether there is any thinking-minister in the government these days?"

How would the minister know, if he licensed a deep sea lobster operation, whether the lobsters on the ship, when it landed its catch, all came from George's Bank or if some of them came from ledges and shoals 25 or 30 miles from shore? He has made no announcement about plans to improve the protection service, and the present staff is inadequate and ill equipped to carry out this type of patrol, control or law enforcement. Is it any wonder that the inshore lobster fishermen are worried? I submit that the minister would be worried also if he saw his livelihood threatened in this manner.

What effect will a licensed deep sea lobster operation have on the price paid for lobsters to the inshore lobster fishermen? What marketing studies did the minister carry out before he unilaterally decided, without any obvious discussion with the parties most interested, to encourage deep sea lobster fishing? These are questions that the fishermen want answered. Will the price of lobsters go down or will it go up when the lobster pounds are assured of a steady supply of offshore lobsters on a year-round basis, or will it remain at its present level due to new markets which the minister may have discovered in some other country? These are just some of the questions that are posed to me by disturbed fishermen.

In view of the many uncertainties brought about by the minister's unilateral action, I urge him and the members of his party to retain section 31 of the Fisheries Act at least until he has had an opportunity to study the matter more thoroughly and until he has had consultations with the people who really understand the lobster industry, namely, the inshore lobster fishermen. For all these reasons I hope that the amendment moved by the hon. member for South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau) will receive the support of the House.

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to say that in my experience the bill before us, to amend

the Fisheries Act, has had as careful a scrutiny in the Standing Committee as any other bill. But I think it is also fair to say that the attention of the members of the committee was largely concentrated on some rather important new elements that by this bill are being introduced into the Fisheries Act. Certainly, at the initial stage of our proceedings on this bill the impression I received was that the other amendments in the bill were largely of a housekeeping nature. By and large I think that is true. The explanatory note with reference to section 31 states:

• (3:10 p.m.)

> The purposes originally served by section 31 are now served by section 76 of the Fisheries Act and the Coastal Fisheries Protection Act.

That does not in any way indicate the area of concern that has been mentioned by the hon. member for South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau) and the hon. member for South Shore (Mr. Crouse), and certainly this aspect of the matter did not receive much consideration in the Standing Committee. The implications of the bill, which these hon. members have outlined, were not carefully scrutinized by the Standing Committee before the bill was reported back to the House. There has been some discussion of the lobster fishery on the Atlantic coast. I understand that in many respects we are still in the exploratory research stage with respect to understanding the nature and extent of the lobster fishery, the reproduction habits of the lobster and the maintenance and management of lobster stocks.

Having regard to the obvious concern indicated by the fishermen involved, as reported by two hon. members from the province of Nova Scotia, I agree with the suggestion that action to repeal section 31 should be deferred until members of the House, particularly those who have shown an interest in the welfare and development of our fisheries, are more fully satisfied that the proposed repeal will not in any way adversely affect that particular fishery. For the time being, section 31 should remain in force. I cannot see how it will interfere with the exercise of the minister's functions as Minister of Fisheries. We know there are many areas with respect to the management of the fisheries which can only be properly dealt with through regulation, but in this instance we were left with the impression that the repeal of section 31 merely dealt with the question of Canadian jurisdiction over Canadian vessels moving out of and into Canadian ports, to and from the high seas. Now it is obvious that there is much more involved, and I believe the amendment should receive the support of the House.

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, I believe that section 31 of the act must be repealed, and therefore that this amendment must be defeated. In essence, section 31 provides that if there is closure of an inshore fishery anywhere in Canada, there cannot be an offshore fishery with respect to the same species of fish. No long-distance fishing nation could possibly tolerate a provision of that character in its legislation. The amendment which we propose in the bill would allow a Canadian offshore operation to take place when there was an inshore closure somewhere in Canada.

Unfortunately, an example was given in the Standing Committee with respect to lobsters on the east coast. It was unfortunate in the sense. We have no intention of issuing regulations permitting an offshore lobster fishery. I have said this in a number of letters, not only to hon. members opposite but also to fishermen and their representatives in Nova Scotia. In other words, Mr. Speaker, we have no intention of upsetting the inshore lobster fishery in the Maritimes. I guarantee it.

I have also said that we would welcome submissions by the industry and a full-scale debate by the House of Commons all-party committee on Fisheries and Forestry when the House reconvenes in the fall.

I contend that to prohibit any long-distance offshore fishery because of a closed inshore fishery is short-sighted. From time to time hon. members ask, "Why doesn't Canada have an effective long distance fishing fleet?" Section 31 provides:

> No one shall leave any port or place in Canada to fish outside Canadian fisheries waters...and no one shall bring into Canada any fish caught outside Canadian fisheries waters when fishing for such fish is prohibited inside the Canadian fisheries waters—

Clearly, if section 31 were to continue in effect we could not have a long-distance fleet carrying on an offshore operation when an inshore operation was closed. It is an anomaly in the Fisheries Act. If we have any idea of creating a long-distance fishery we get rid of section 31.

Mr. Comeau: Mr. Speaker, could the minister give an example of where the repeal of the section might have application other than

with respect to lobsters? Where else could the repeal of the section have any effect?

Mr. Davis: This course applies to any kind of fish, not just to lobsters. As I have said, an unfortunate example was given in the committee as result of which attention was focused on lobsters. Take the example of herring on the west coast where the inshore herring fishery is closed. If section 31 remained in force any herring operation based on Canada's west coast that went far afield, say to take herring off the coast of Alaska, could neither depart from nor return to British Columbia. It is unfortunate that we have a blanket provision to that effect in the Fisheries Act.

Section 31 was geared to meet a particular situation years ago when it was very difficult to police inshore closures. As a result, the authorities picked up everybody who came to land. If they said they had been fishing far off, that could be true or not. Hence the unfortunate consequences of section 31. We need much greater mobility and should be able to range far away from any closed area along our coast.

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

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Some hon. Members: On division.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion negatived on division.

Motion No. 1 (Mr. Comeau) negatived.

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry) moved:

That Bill C-204, an act to amend the Fisheries Act, be amended by striking out lines 21 and 22 on page 1 and substituting the following:

"in waters frequented by fish or in any place under"

Motion No. 2 (Mr. Davis) agreed to.

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West) moved:

That Bill C-204, an act to amend the Fisheries Act, be amended by deleting in line 10 on page 2 the following words:

"or any other".

• (3:20 p.m.)

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is an extremely important amendment. It will give the Fisheries Act control in those areas that are now exempted because of jurisdiction exercised under other legislation. To be specific, I am trying to prevent the fisheries regulations from not applying in the water quality management areas which will be set up under the new Canada Water Act. In my opinion the government is being extremely foolish in not allowing the fisheries regulations to apply to all Canadian waters.

It could be disastrous if some water quality management areas in Canada set standards that were so low that they affected adversely some portions of our water resources that are vital to the fisheries. There are several areas in Canada where such problems could arise, one being the Fraser River in my province of British Columbia. There are similar areas in eastern Canada. If a water quality management area were set up on the lower Fraser, it would make no sense if the fisheries regulations did not apply to that section of the river.

There is no guarantee that industry in any water quality management area will be able to meet the standards set out in this act or, indeed, that industry will be able to ensure a safe and healthy water environment for fish. The standards in these areas will vary from province to province because of the government's failure under the Canada Water Act to endorse national standards. This amendment, Mr. Speaker, would ensure that the Department of Fisheries has full jurisdiction in these vital areas. I urge the minister to accept it. I point out that we cannot take any chances in this respect. Industry-oriented boards in our water quality management areas may turn a deaf ear to the need to properly conserve our valuable fisheries resources. Too much has already been lost and another backward step in the field of conservation should not be condoned.

I urge the minister to accept what I consider to be a major amendment which will give to the Department of Fisheries regulatory control in those areas which should be under its control, including the water quality management areas which will be set up under the Canada Water Act.

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, I should like to answer the hon. member in this way. We have in this session passed several pieces of

legislation dealing with water quality. One is the Canada Water Act. The others are the Northern Inland Waters Act and the one we are considering, amendments to the Fisheries Act. The citizen is faced with regulations which will be written under all of these acts. These regulations must be brought together at some point and made compatible. The citizen must not be permitted to do under one piece of federal legislation something for which he may be brought to court under another. Therefore, we have introduced the clause in the bill which provides that these regulations must be compatible with those made under other acts.

I understand the hon. member's concern. His concern is that the Fisheries Act regulations would stand down, so to speak, relative to those made under the Canada Water Act. Presumably, he is viewing situations wherein the Fisheries Act regulations might be more exacting or more stringent than those proposed under the Canada Water Act. We shall write into the Fisheries Act regulations that will apply to all the waters of Canada, so that we shall not have the situation where some waters will be subject to the regulations and others will be above them.

I cannot conceive of water quality management areas introducing new regulations which would be less stringent than the Fisheries Act regulations which would be already in effect in those waters. If regulations were drafted and put forward by the officials of a water quality management area, they would still have to be considered by the federal cabinet, and I would do my utmost, as Minister of Fisheries, to make sure that there would be no downgrading of our water quality standards.

Speaking about the Fraser River in British Columbia, we shall have within weeks, if we pass this legislation by four o'clock, regulations which will apply throughout the Fraser River system. I cannot conceive of any water quality management authority which was set up to deal with the lower Fraser, for example, venturing to put forward standards which are less stringent than those already in effect in with respect to fisheries. However, there is a final court of resolution in any conflict. At the moment it is the cabinet. It is up to the Minister of Fisheries to carry the battle there.

There has been talk about the protection of our fishermen. Protection of the fisherman is found in the act. It also protects any individual in Canada by making sure that he will not be brought to court under one piece of legislation when under another piece of legislation he is not guilty if he does the same thing.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion? All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Harding: On division.

Motion No. 3 (Mr. Harding) negatived.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The House will now consider Motion No. 4 in the name of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Davis).

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry) moved:

That Bill C-204, an act to amend the Fisheries Act, be amended by striking out lines 4 to 10 on page 2 and substituting the following:

Application of subsection (2)

"(4) Subsection (2) does not apply

(a) to the deposit of waste of a type, in a quantity and under conditions authorized by regulations made by the Governor in Council under any other act in any waters with respect to which those regulations are applicable, or in any place under any conditions where such waste or any other waste that results from the deposit of such waste may enter any such waters; or

(b) to the deposit of a deleterious substance of a type, in a quantity and under conditions authorized by any regulations made by the Governor in Council under this act for the purposes of this subsection in any water with respect to which those regulations are applicable, or in any place under any conditions where such deleterious substances or any other deleterious substance that results from the deposit of such deleterious substance may enter any such water."

Motion No. 4 (Mr. Davis) agreed to.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The House will now consider Motion No. 5, in the name of the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry.

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry moved:

That Bill C-204, an act to amend the Fisheries Act, be amended by striking out lines 35 to 43 on page 3 and lines 1 to 35 on page 4 and substituting the following:

"Deleterious substance"

"(a) "deleterious substance" means

(i) any substance that, if added to any water, would degrade or alter

or form part of a process of degradation or alteration of the quality of that water so that it is rendered deleterious to fish or to the use by man of fish that frequent that water, or

(ii) any water that contains a substance in such quantity or concentration or that has been so treated, processed or changed, by heat or other means, from a natural state that it would, if added to any other water, degrade or alter or form part of a process of degradation or alteration of the quality of that water so that it is rendered deleterious to fish or to the use by man of fish that frequent that water,

and without limiting the generality of the foregoing includes

(iii) any substance or any substance that is part of a class of substances prescribed pursuant to paragraph (a) of subsection (12),

(iv) any water that contains any substance or any substance that is part of a class of substances in a quantity or concentration that is equal to or in excess of a quantity or concentration prescribed in respect of that substance or class of substances pursuant to paragraph (b) of subsection (12), and

(v) any water that has been subjected to a treatment, process or change prescribed pursuant to paragraph (c) of subsection (12); and

"Water frequented by fish" (b) "water frequented by fish" includes all waters in the fishing zones of Canada."

Motion No. 5 (Mr. Davis) agreed to.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The House will now consider Motion No. 6, in the name of the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry.

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry) moved:

That Bill C-204, an act to amend the Fisheries Act, be amended by striking out lines 1 to 18 on page 6 and substituting the following:

Information to be provided to Minister "(3) Any person who operates any undertaking the operation of which the minister has reasonable grounds to believe may be resulting in the deposit of a deleterious substance of any kind in water frequented by fish or in any place under any conditions where such deleterious substance or any other deleterious substance that results from the deposit of such a substance may enter any water frequented by fish, shall, at the request of the minister, provide to him such information relating to the operation of the undertaking, including samples of any materials used in or resulting from the operation, as will enable the minister to cause an analysis to be made of the nature, quantity and quality of any effluent resulting from the operation."

Motion No. 6 (Mr. Davis) agreed to.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The House will now consider Motion No. 7, in the name of the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry.

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry) moved:

That Bill C-204, an act to amend the Fisheries Act, be amended

(a) by striking out line 24 on page 7 and substituting the following:

"section 33A,"

(b) by striking out line 40 on page 7 and substituting the following:

"construction, alteration or extension, or

(c) fails to provide the minister with any information and samples requested of him pursuant to subsection 3 of section 33A within a reasonable time after the making of the request,"

Motion No. 7 (Mr. Davis) agreed to.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The House will now consider Motion No. 8, in the name of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett).

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni) moved:

That Bill C-204, an act to amend the Fisheries Act, be amended by adding thereto on page 11, immediately after clause 8, the following:

"9. The said act is further amended by adding thereto, immediately after section 77 thereof the following section:

'78. This act is binding on Her Majesty in right of Canada or a province and any agent thereof' "

and by renumbering the present clause 9 as clause 10.

Motion No. 8 (Mr. Barnett) agreed to.

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry) moved that Bill C-204, to amend the Fisheries Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: When shall the said bill be read the third time?

Mr. Baldwin: By leave, now.

Mr. Davis moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to speak at great length on this bill or to delay it unduly. Hon. members have been asked today to consider a number of important changes to the Fisheries Act, and the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry has moved amendments to the bill which have been accepted. I should like,

therefore, to make some general remarks on the Fisheries Act in the context of the amendments moved by the minister.

The Fisheries Act is almost as old as Confederation. It has served Canada and Canadians well in the century that has passed, since it has seldom required amendment. On the other hand, by reason of the amendments made in the 1960-61 session the Fisheries Act is unique among the laws on our statute books. Those amendments brought the act into conformity with the Canadian Bill of Rights by removing the provisions which violated human rights and fundamental freedoms. The Fisheries Act can be said to be the "Drybones" of the Revised Statutes of Canada. We have paid tribute to this distinction of the Fisheries Act in the several statutes since passed which incorporate, by reference, a certain section of the Fisheries Act relating to confiscations.

We in the official opposition had hoped—as I believe the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry did—by this amending bill to enact a modernized version of the Fisheries Act so it could play its rightful role. We had hoped to make the Fisheries Act the sovereign legislative speardhead against pollution of Canada's waters, including seacoast and inland, salt and fresh water. The Fisheries Act has everything going for it to carry out this role effectively. I say this because the constitutional power of this Parliament to control water pollution under the seacoast and inland fisheries provisions and the provisions of the British North America Act is exclusive and cannot be challenged.

• (3:30 p.m.)

If we had the Fisheries Act alone, the power to control water pollution throughout Canada and in its territorial and fishing waters would be vested in one sovereign authority. I have said that the Fisheries Act has everything going for it. This is true, with one exception. That exception is the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene) and his lust for publicity. That minister has spawned a bill, the Canada Water Act, which has already been questioned in several of its constitutional aspects. That minister has spawned a bill that fragments and splits control of water pollution among several federal ministers, ten provinces, a multitude of provincial departments and a host of agencies.

The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources by doubtful and devious methods has persuaded the government to accept his polluted abortion of an act in place of the Fisheries Act. Not content with producing this malformed conglomerate, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources has so projected himself into the graces of the cabinet that he has managed to author about two-thirds of Bill C-204 and, by these amendments, to make the Fisheries Act subservient to the Canada Water Act with regard to pollution. For example, the prohibition in the Fisheries Act against contaminating Canadian waters by deleterious substances, which has existed for more than 100 years under the jurisdiction of ministers of fisheries, has been made subject to the licence to pollute that exists in the Canada Water Act under the administration of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources.

So much for two-thirds of the amendments to the Fisheries Act, amendments that were contained in the original Bill C-204 introduced by the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis). The voice was the voice of the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry but the hand was the hand of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. In this shape, Bill C-204 went to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry.

Mr. McGrath: What a mess that was.

Mr. Crouse: As my colleague the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) has stated, what a mess that was. All members of the committee worked hard at many meetings in an effort to improve the bill. The Minister of Fisheries and Forestry worked with the committee, and the committee worked diligently with the minister. The minister was instrumental in suggesting amendments which the committee approved. In fact, these amendments were extensive enough to require a reprint of the original bill. One of them restored the time-tested words "deleterious substance" in place of the word "waste" which is not a suitable word to be used in this type of bill. If anyone doubts that statement, I ask him to look up the meaning of the word "waste" in the dictionary. It is very interesting to follow that exercise of looking up the meaning of the word "waste".

Other amendments deleted the invidious and subject references to the Canada Water Act and the Northern Inland Waters Act. The committee was satisfied that if it did not have a whole loaf, at least it had a crumb or two. The committee was satisfied that the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry had an improved weapon with which to conserve the fishery

resources of Canada against the wasting effects of pollution. However, the ubiquitous and malevolent Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources has again reached out his tentacles. This time he has done so at a stage of the proceedings when the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) and the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) have lectured this House that amendments, once proposed in committee, should not be proposed again.

We now have before the committee a series of amendments moved by the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry which in effect completely alter the work of the committee. We did not oppose these amendments, Mr. Speaker, because we were endeavouring to co-operate with the government in speeding up the business of the House. The amendments put the word "waste" back into the bill in order to keep it in tune with and subservient to the Canada Water Act. During the discussions in committee we pointed out that the word "waste" was inadequate. We suggested that the word "pollutant" be used because the government obviously did not like the words "deleterious substance" which were in the original bill. It was subsequently suggested by a government supporter that the words "injurious substance" would be better than the words "pollutant" or "waste."

We then went one step further. We went full circle in playing our game of ring-around-the-rosey; we went right back to the words "deleterious substance." In other words, we are back to the words used in the original bill, namely, "deleterious substance" words which have stood the test of time for over 100 years. We said in committee that these words should be retained, with one exception—the use of the word "waste" in some of the amendments that have been approved by the House this afternoon. We have been sailing around in circles on this bill and its amendments. I repeat my original claim that it is unfortunate that the government has so fragmented and divided its pollution control authority. It will be most difficult, if not impossible, to enforce proper pollution control in this country. These are not my views alone, Mr. Speaker. I could give many examples. I will quote just one from the June 29 edition of *Time* magazine which reads as follows:

> Says zoologist Donald Chant, the mentor of Toronto's Pollution Probe: "The public is at last aware of the dangers of pollution. What I am afraid of now is that they will become so appalled by reading one story after another that, in self-protection, they will turn themselves off."

Further on in the article we read these words:

> Says Chant: "There was a very adequate bill passed in 1843 which prohibited putting anything in the waters of Canada that is harmful to fish. It would have done the job very well if we had chosen to make it effective."

That is the answer, Mr. Speaker. That bill was the Fisheries Act. We did not choose to enforce it; we did not choose to make it effective. As a result, our rivers and lakes have become polluted. We do not have to look too far to see this; all we have to do is look out of our window and see what has happened to the Ottawa River because we did not have the intestinal fortitude to enforce the Fisheries Act in its entirety.

I noted with interest the minister's stand as indicated in a letter to me about clause 2 of this bill and the repeal of section 31 of the act, which relates to the catching of fish outside Canadian fisheries' waters when the catching of such fish is prohibited inside our territorial seas. This matter has been resolved by the vote this afternoon as it relates to catching of offshore lobsters. What has not been spelled out is the effect of some of the amendments in the bill as they relate to other types of fishing. For example, on page 9, clause 6 of the bill, we note that subsection 2 of section 55 of the Fisheries Act is repealed, together with subsections 3 and 3a of section 55. The clause provides that the following be substituted therefor:

> No such vessel shall carry on fishing operations from or to any Canadian port or ports, unless it restricts its fishing operations to waters that are at least 12 miles distant from the nearest shore on the Atlantic coast of Canada; the proof that such fishing operations are so restricted at all times lies on the captain of the vessel; but this subsection does not apply to small draggers operated by inshore fishermen if exempted from the provisions of this subsection by special permit, which the minister is hereby authorized to issue for that purpose.

We may ask, "What is wrong with that regulation?" Nothing would be wrong with it if we had a party in power which did not believe it was ordained by the Almighty to rule. Nothing would be wrong with it if we had a Minister of Fisheries and Forestry who consulted with the fishing industry before making major changes. Quite frankly, this section gives the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry almost dictatorial powers over the fishermen on the Atlantic coast—or perhaps I should say dictorial powers over our Canadian fishermen. Under these powers the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry can make uni-

lateral amendments, like the one he made on May 11, without consultation with and participation by the Canadian fishermen concerned, and they must obey his dictatorial edict. That is part of the announcement made by the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry on May 11, 1970. The news communiqué states:

• (3:40 p.m.)

An immediate freeze on the catching capacity of Canada's Atlantic herring fishing fleet was announced today by Fisheries and Forestry Minister Jack Davis.

The purpose of this freeze is to prevent any further increase in fishing capacity to occur before more is known about the size of our herring stocks and the fishing pressures which they can withstand.

Mr. McGrath: That is like locking the stable door after the horse has been stolen.

Mr. St. Pierre: That is an original phrase!

Mr. Crouse: The new release continues:

Canadian landings of herring off the east coast were valued at $12 million in 1969. Landings have increased five-fold over the past seven years. It is expected that more than 500,000 tons of herring will be caught in this area in 1970.

I could go on. I find no fault with the minister's announcement as it relates to the Bay of Fundy, but he makes no mention of controls in another large herring fishing area, namely, the Gulf of St. Lawrence. One would think that before making an announcement which affects the investment of so many companies and the livelihood of so many fishermen in Atlantic Canada, he would have discussed the situation with the fishermen and the processers, but such has not been the case. True to form, the Minister of Fisheries barged ahead making decisions and statements unilaterally without consulting anyone in the fishing industry.

Like his leader he is great at telling people what he intends to do, and it is always for their own good. But now that he and his friends are in power there is no need to consult with anyone. You can imagine the surprise felt by representatives of the fishing industry when they met on May 11 in St. John's, Newfoundland, and heard for the first time the minister's plan to freeze east coast herring licences, to place an upper limit on the tonnage of boats engaged in this industry through licence limitation. The minister certainly rocked the boat of the fishing industry on May 11. I would again refer hon. members to the statement in the second paragraph of the news release:

The purpose of this freeze is to prevent any further increase in fishing capacity to occur before more is known about the size of our herring stocks and the fishing pressures which they can withstand.

How bombastic can the minister become in displaying his arrogant attitude toward Canadian fishermen? Under the Fisheries Act he can control our fishermen and dictate to them until there is no industry left but only a small group of people subservient to the minister. I ask him to tell this House now whether he has received any agreement from Russia, Poland, France, Norway, Denmark, Iceland, Portugal, Spain, Italy, the United Kingdom or the United States that these nations with their large fishing fleets on our Atlantic coast will refrain from catching herring. While these nations continue to plunder and pillage our fisheries resources, the minister complains in his announcement of May 11 that Canadian landings of herring have increased five-fold in the last seven years, so in his opinion the government must put a stop to this enterprise. His attitude is: We won't bother to consult with the industry before taking dictatorial action; we will go ahead and confine the catch arbitrarily to its present eve.

What bureaucratic nonsense is this? How does the minister propose to learn more about the size of the herring stocks? Will the nations which are raping our offshore stocks let him know the number of pounds they have landed; or will the figures come from Information Canada? Mr. Speaker, I fear for this country. I fear for the future of our fishing industry since it is obvious that the minister and the government have lost their powers of reason.

Obviously, the only way in which some control can be exercised over the size of our herring stocks or, in fact, in connection with the conservation of our entire fishery, is by way of international consultation and agreement. If the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) had spent as much time consulting his counterparts in the great fishing nations of the world on fisheries conservation as he has spent chasing after officials to get Red China to recognize Canada, we would, hopefully, have been able to announce an international fisheries consultation policy by now.

It is obvious to fishermen that the fishing industry is not one of paramount concern to the government and that it means nothing to the minister of external affairs, who cannot seem to reach agreement with France on our 12-mile limit legislation and who failed mis-

erably in his attempt to reach agreement with Denmark whereby that country would curtail its deep sea operations—operations which result in the annual taking of some 4.5 million pounds of partially grown Atlantic salmon off Greenland.

I urge the government to try to convene a third Law of the Sea Conference in order to discuss at the international level our territorial seas legislation, our fishing regulations, pollution control and the desirability of establishing sound international conservation practices. I warn members of this government. If they procrastinate, if they delay much longer, it may well be too late to do anything of importance on behalf of a group of patient and long-suffering people, our Atlantic coast fishermen.

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, in order to ensure that the hon. members of the other place have adequate time in which to consider this piece of legislation, I shall confine my observations to saying "Amen" to the remarks which have been made by the hon. member for South Shore (Mr. Crouse).

Mr. McGrath: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to forego my remarks if the minister would take a few minutes to comment on the observations of my hon. friend from South Shore.

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): I will try to do so, Mr. Speaker. First, the hon. member accused me of failing to stand up to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene). Then later on he charged me with trampling on the rights of fishermen and fishing interests on both coasts. As to the amendments to the Fisheries Act, I should like to say I appreciate all the co-operation which I and my staff have received from both sides of the House. The act has been improved a great deal, especially in committee as a result of the amendments made there. I believe it is now a much more workable measure. Since it is a better federal instrument we shall be able to deal much more effectively and quickly with pollution than we could before. Also I will guarantee that as long as I am Minister of Fisheries and Forestry I shall do my utmost to make sure that the standards we set up under the Fisheries Act do not give way to standards set up under any other piece of legislation whether federal or provincial.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

STANDARDS COUNCIL OF CANADA

ESTABLISHMENT, OBJECTS AND POWERS, ORGANIZATION, ETC.

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-163, to provide for the establishment of a Standards Council of Canada, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Mr. Doug Rowland (Selkirk) moved:

That Bill C-163, to provide for the establishment of a Standards Council of Canada, be amended by adding the following words to clause 3, subclause (c) thereof immediately following the word "members", in line 2 on page 2:

"no less than ten of whom shall be appointed by, or in consultation with, the Consumers Association of Canada."

He said: During the course of the discussion of this amendment in committee the minister indicated that he objected to it because it would impose a certain rigidity upon the ability of the Governor in Council to select persons for membership on the council. Upon reflection, that objection makes sense to me. I therefore ask the unanimous consent of the House to alter the wording of the amendment in order to broaden it by changing the words "The Consumers Association of Canada" to "bona fide Canadian consumers organizations". The purpose would be the same; it would simply allow more flexibility on the part of the Governor in Council.

• (3:50 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Hon. members have heard the suggestion made by the hon. member for Selkirk. The hon. member requires, of course, unanimous consent of the House to amend his amendment. Is there such unanimity?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The amendment would therefore read:

"no less than ten of whom shall be appointed by, or in consultation with, bona fide Canadian consumers organizations."

Mr. Rowland: Mr. Speaker, I shall be brief. I am suggesting that the bill be amended to

include this specific instruction in respect of the minimum number of members of the council representing consumers groups, for a number of reasons. Canada's consumers organizations are voluntary organizations whose memberships are devoted to furthering the cause of meeting the needs of consumers and of securing their protection. During the course of their existence—this is especially true of the Consumers Association of Canada—they have managed to accumulate a fair amount of expertise about desirable standards for consumer goods. They also carry out, in conjunction with other organizations, research into the effectiveness of consumer goods. Moreover, they have established relationships with similar groups in other parts of the world and have thereby gained access to considerable information about the performance of products and desirable standards.

When this bill was before the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs, I was impressed, during the course of the testimony of several witnesses, with the need to ensure that people appointed to the council for the purpose of representing the interests of consumers be conversant with the technical problems associated with the establishment of standards. It therefore appeared to me that established consumers organizations, such as the Consumers Association of Canada, with their access to information and expertise, would provide an excellent medium through which such qualified people could be obtained.

During the course of the committee's hearings it became apparent that the existing standards organizations, many of which will supply members to the new Standards Council of Canada, are very much business-oriented. I do not mean this as a criticism; there is no reason why they should not be. I am simply stating a fact. In view of this fact it appeared to me that the interests of the consumer might well be overlooked unless the bill stipulated that a set number of consumers' representatives be appointed to the council. The figure of 10 consumers' representatives will obviously leave 31 other members to be appointed from existing standards organizations and other interested groups.

During the course of the discussion of this amendment in the committee two points were raised in opposition to it. The first argument against the amendment was to the effect that each of us is a consumer; therefore, each person appointed to the council will, in a sense, be representing the interests of consumers. In response to such argument I can only say that the real question is one of the primary interest of persons on the council and the major brief which they hold. An industrialist may be a consumer, but he is primarily an industrialist. Therefore, I suggest that there should be people on the council who are primarily concerned with representing consumers.

The second point raised in opposition to this amendment was that the cabinet, in whose hands the selection of the council members will be placed, will obviously see to it that the consumer is adequately represented without specific instructions from Parliament. Whether or not one finds this argument to be convincing, I suppose, depends upon one's assessment of the reliability of the cabinet's judgment. Obviously, if I were convinced that the present government's judgment was always good, I would be sitting on the other side of the House. But beyond that, I do not think that it is good legislation to leave the nature and character to be assumed by such bodies as the proposed Standards Council of Canada vague and ill-defined when they have such considerable potential to affect key areas of Canadian life. It is to ensure that the proposed council always remembers the consumer that I urge acceptance of this amendment.

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I will take only a moment to support the amendment that has just been moved. During our consideration of the Canada Water Act I had reason to make a somewhat similar suggestion to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene), namely, that consultations should take place between government departments, citizens groups and others interested in legislation and regulations, before they are passed. My amendment was very much along the lines of the one now proposed. The minister did not accept my amendment, on principle, saying that he did not feel he ought to be obliged to consult anybody on this question. I hope that the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) will have better judgment.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder whether there would be a disposition on the part of the House to adjust slightly the program. I believe that at four o'clock there is to be a motion under Standing Order 26. I also understand that we have to make a trip to the other place. Rather than interrupt an

important debate to make that little journey, I wonder whether we could not postpone the Standing Order 26 debate until 4.30. This will give the House time to deal a little more fully with the bill now before us. I would also give the Senators time to finish the fisheries bill and allow for the House to go to the other place for Royal Assent. I suggest that rather than stop what we are doing at four o'clock, the debate on the Post Office be fixed for 4.30.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, could the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre tell me when he plans to take his trip, so that we would be able to plan accordingly?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The trip that I am talking about is a round trip—over to the Senate for Royal Assent, and back.

Mr. Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I must say that the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Rowland) is being very smart in recommending greater stringency in order to obtain greater flexibility! I believe, however, that my arguments against the original proposal are equally applicable to the amended motion.

According to the original motion, there were to be ten representatives of the consumers, whose appointment would have been suggested or recommended by the Consumers Association of Canada. To that, I would have answered: Why not also have ten suggested by the Canadian Standards Association, ten recommended by labour unions and ten proposed by other groups. Then, I would be faced with the impossible task of reconciling all those recommendations.

The hon. member now amends his proposal to state that the recommendations would come from the consumers generally. I say that the previous argument is still relevant, because if we agree to appoint ten representatives of the consumers to the Council, will producers generally not be entitled to ask for ten also, as well as the distributors and the labour unions? And then it is easy to visualize the problems that would arise. In fact, who would speak of behalf of the consumers, the producers, the distributors and the labour unions?

I feel therefore that the motion, the first as well as the second, would give rise to insuperable difficulties in the setting up of such a Council.

• (4:00 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion? All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it. I declare the said motion lost.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On division.

Motion No. 1 (Mr. Rowland) negatived.

Hon. Jean Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce) moved:

That Bill C-163, An Act to provide for the establishment of a Standards Council of Canada, be amended

(a) by striking out all that portion of clause 4 preceding paragraph (h) of subclause (2) thereof and substituting the following:

Objects

"4. (1) The objects of the Council are to foster and promote voluntary standardization in fields relating to the construction, manufacture, production, quality, performance and safety of buildings, structures, manufactured articles and products and other goods, including components thereof, not expressly provided for by law, as a means of advancing the national economy, benefiting the health, safety and welfare of the public, assisting and protecting consumers, facilitating domestic and international trade and furthering international cooperation in the field of standards.

Powers

(2) The Council, in carrying out its objects in the fields referred to in subsection (1), may

(a) promote cooperation among organizations concerned with voluntary standardization in Canada in those fields to coordinate standardization activities and develop common standards and codes;

(b) promote cooperation between organizations concerned with voluntary standardization in Canada in those fields and departments and agencies of government at all levels in Canada with a view to achieving compatability and maximum common usage of standards and codes in those fields;

(c) recommend criteria and procedures relating to the preparation, approval acceptance and designation of voluntary standards in Canada in those fields;

(d) accredit, in accordance with criteria and procedures adopted by the Council, organizations in Canada engaged in standards formulation, testing and certification in those fields, and maintain a register of such organizations and of their standards mark;

(e) approve standards in those fields submitted by organizations accredited by the Council as national standards where appropriate, and maintain an index of approved standards;

(f) provide for the identification and evaluation of the need for new standards, revisions to existing standards and additional testing and certification services in those fields, and arrange for that need to be satisfied

(i) by obtaining the cooperation of organizations accredited by the Council to engage in standards formulation, testing and certification, and

(ii) where that need cannot be satisfied in the manner described in subparagraph (i), by promoting the establishment or utilization of new or other organizations for that purpose;

(g) establish and register under the *Trade Marks Act* its own standards marks in those fields and, subject to that Act and in accordance with any agreement or arrangement between the Council and any organization accredited by it respecting the use of such marks in relation to standards formulated by that organization, authorize and regulate their use;"

(b) by adding thereto the following new subclause:

"(3) In carrying out its objects and exercising its powers under this section, the Council shall, to the greatest extent practicable, make use of the services and facilities of existing organizations in Canada engaged in standards formulation, testing and certification in the fields referred to in subsection

RECOMMENDATION

His Excellency the Governor General recommends to the House of Commons that Bill C-163, An Act to provide for the establishment of a Standards Council of Canada, be amended as follows:

1. By striking out all that portion of clause 4 preceding paragraph (h) of subclause (2) thereof and substituting the following:

Objects "4. (1) The objects of the Council are to foster and promote voluntary standardization in fields relating to the construction, manufacture, production, quality, performance and safety of buildings, structures manufactured articles and products and other goods, including components thereof, not expressly provided for by law, as a means of advancing the national economy, benefiting the health, safety and welfare of the public, assisting and protecting consumers, facilitating domestic and international trade and furthering international cooperation in the field of standards.

Powers (2) The Council, in carrying out its objects in the fields referred to in subsection (1), may

(a) promote cooperation among organizations concerned with voluntary standardization in Canada in those fields to coordinate standardization activities and develop common standards and codes;

(b) promote cooperation between organizations concerned with voluntary standardization in Canada in those fields and departments and agencies of government at all levels in Canada with a view to achieving compatibility and maximum common usage of standards and codes in those fields;

(c) recommend criteria and procedures relating to the preparation, approval, acceptance and designation of voluntary standards in Canada in those fields;

(d) accredit, in accordance with criteria and procedures adopted by the Council, organizations in Canada engaged in standards formulation, testing and certification in those fields, and maintain a register of such organizations and of their standards marks;

(e) approve standards in those fields submitted by organizations accredited by the Council as national standards where appropriate, and maintain and index of approved standards;

(f) provide for the identification and evaluation of the need for new standards, revisions to existing standards and additional testing and certification services in those fields, and arrange for that need to be satisfied

(i) by obtaining the cooperation of organizations accredited by the Council to engage in standards formulation, testing and certification, and

(ii) where that need cannot be satisfied in the manner described in subparagraph (i), by promoting the establishment or utilization of new or other organizations for that purpose;

(g) establish and register under the *Trade Marks Act* its own standards marks in those fields and, subject to that Act and in accordance with any agreement or arrangement between the Council and any organization accredited by it respecting the use of such marks in relation to standards formulated by that organization, authorize and regulate their use;"

2. By adding thereto the following new subclause:

Idem "(3) In carrying out its objects and exercising its powers under this section, the Council shall, to the greatest

[Mr. Pepin.]

extent practicable, make use of the services and facilities of existing organizations in Canada engaged in standards formulation, testing and certification in the fields referred to in subsection (1)."

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Motion No. 2 (Mr. Pepin) agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now proceed to the consideration of the motion in the name of the hon. member for Selkirk.

Mr. Doug Rowland (Selkirk) moved:

—That Bill C-163, An Act to provide for the establishment of a Standards Council of Canada, be amended by adding to Clause 4, subclause (2) thereof a new paragraph (*n*) as follows:

"(*n*) make recommendations to the Minister, such recommendations to be included in the annual report of the Council, in respect of standards which, in the opinion of the Council, should be made compulsory."

He said: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to make any long argument in respect of this suggested amendment. During the course of its consideration in the committee, I believe the minister was substantially in agreement with it. The only thing that prevented it from being adopted at that time was a ruling by the chairman. I would be pleased to defer to the minister at this point to allow him to indicate whether or not he is in agreement, and if he is there is no point in my continuing.

Hon. Jean Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I wish I could be my usual generous self on this occasion but I cannot. The whole bill is based on voluntary standards. This bill is for the establishment of standards voluntarily arrived at and voluntarily implemented. It would be giving a wrong indication to provide for the possibility of this council having a major influence in the making of mandatory standards. We would keep voluntary and mandatory standards cleanly divided.

My hon. friend knows, and I agree, that if the council decided to recommend to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford) or to provincial or municipal authorities, mandatory standards it could do so. It does not have to ask for my permission. It might not be a good idea to put this in the bill, knowing full well that this can be done.

Mr. Rowland: Mr. Speaker, would the minister submit to a question? Would he not agree that it is always handy for legislators to be given a club, such as a recommendation in annual report of the Standards Council, in order to use it on a government that will not act?

Mr. Pepin: That is exactly what I am saying, putting a club in the bill is the wrong thing to do. This bill is about voluntary standards and having a club in a bill on voluntary standards would probably give a bad impression.

Mr. Rowland: What about the recommendations the Standards Council is going to make in respect of the adoption of the metric system?

Mr. Pepin: The metric system will not necessarily be adopted on a mandatory basis. As far as the Standards Council is concerned, what it will do with regard to the metric system is try to foster as great a voluntary consensus as possible.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise to make one of my brief speeches. It seems to me that the answer of the minister is not really very satisfactory. May I point out to him that the amendment proposed by my colleague, the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Rowland), does not seek to turn the legislation itself into something compulsory, but merely gives to the council the right and the opportunity, as a result of its studies, to recommend to the minister that there are areas in which there should be compulsory standards.

The minister, in what I thought was a case of arguing both ways, turned around a moment later and said that the council has the authority to make such recommendations if it wished to do so and, therefore, we do not need to clutter up the Act with these extra words. I point out to the minister that the clause which my hon. friend seeks to amend is the clause which gives the council its terms of reference. Unless those terms of reference include this right, I submit there will be people on the council and people over the council who will say they do not have that right.

Therefore, if I may use language that we sometimes get from the President of the Privy Council, let us exercise an abundance of caution. Let us see to it that we have, as part of the terms of reference of the council, the right which all of us feel it should have,

namely, the right when it believes that certain standards should be made compulsory to recommend to that effect to the minister. That is why we think this amendment ought to be adopted.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Motion No. 3 (Mr. Rowland) agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now proceed to the motion of the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway.

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway) moved:

That Bill C-163, an act to provide for the establishment of a Standards Council of Canada, be amended by striking out clause 18 thereto.

She said: Mr. Speaker, clause 18 as it now stands reads:

The Council shall be deemed to be a charitable organization in Canada as described in paragraph (e) of subsection 35 (1) of section 62 of the Income Tax Act for the purposes of that act.

It seemed to us on examination of that section of the Income Tax Act that it was stretching things rather far to call this council a charitable organization. We do not see how it could possibly fall within that category. There have been times when political organizations, of which I know something, have wished that they also might be classed as charitable organizations within the meaning of the Income Tax Act. I think it would be just as logical to have them in that category as to put this council in the category of a charitable organization.

Some of us in reading this section, and considering its implications were afraid that there might very well be a conflict of interest develop in such a council if it were to fall under the heading of a charitable organization. We were not able to get any satisfactory explanation as to why this should be classed as a charitable organization. It is not an educational or a welfare body. We could not for the life of us understand why this should be. Even those people speaking on behalf of the department were not really able to enlighten us in this regard.

For this reason we decided that, in view of these considerations, it did not seem to fall within that category and that there was a danger of possible conflict of interest in having such a section. We, therefore, have moved that the clause be struck from the bill and that clause 17 be followed by clause 19 renumbered as 18.

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I disagree on that point. In other countries, national standards councils are assisted in this way by the general public. The work they do is truly of public interest and it is normal for the public to be called upon, or rather to be invited to participate financially in it and I also feel it is normal that the contributions of people who do so should be tax exempt.

The same situation exists in Canada, Mr. Speaker. Other Crown corporations, such as the Science Council of Canada, the Economic Council of Canada, are specifically exempt from taxes on outside grants. Other companies set up by the Canadian Parliament, other than Crown corporations, also enjoy this advantage under their incorporation act.

I am thinking in particular of the Company of Young Canadians, the Canada Council, the National Arts Centre, that enjoy the same advantage, that is, of allowing their backers to be exempt from taxes on their contributions to public organizations. Since the Standards Council of Canada is also an organization created in the public interest, the amendment does not seem justified.

• (4:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question is on Motion No. 4 (Mrs. MacInnis). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On division.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it. I declare the motion lost on division.

Motion No. 4 (Mrs. MacInnis) negatived.

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce) moved that Bill C-163, to provide for the establishment of a Standards Council of Canada, as reported (without

amendment) from the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Pepin moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise to suggest there is just about time to put through Bill C-196. The minister from Saskatoon can take it on.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now proceed to the discussion under Standing Order 26 of the matter raised by the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie) and the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis).

Mr. Forrestall: He did not even show up to participate.

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

POST OFFICE

ACCELERATED DISRUPTION OF SERVICE—FAILURE TO NEGOTIATE SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTE

Mr. Speaker: The matter to be debated under this Order is:

The new situation created by the acceleration and spread of the rotational strikes by postal employees, thus creating a new threat of a nationwide postal strike, the failure of the Treasury Board to negotiate a settlement to end the disruption of postal services, and the urgent need to debate the serious situation before the House adjourns for the summer recess.

The hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie).

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough) moved:

That this House do now adjourn.

He said: Mr. Speaker, while I am naturally glad that this debate has been granted I may say, sir, I regret very much that we end this portion of our session dealing with such a matter on such a note. It is regrettable that the country is still faced with a communications crisis following much disruption in a very important part of the public service, namely the Post Office. The Canadian people expect certain things of their government. One of their basic expectations purely and simply is that the mail should go through. Canadians have a right to communicate one with another and their government should ensure that their communications are delivered. Today, the mail is at a standstill in this city and elsewhere in Canada. A war of nerves is being carried out. I read in today's evening paper that the chief negotiaters maintain that there seems to be no prospect of settlement. In a labour dispute, of course, there are two sides. Neither management nor labour is all right or all wrong in their point of view.

Today in this important debate I seek not to speak for labour and not to speak for the government. If I were Demosthenes himself, I would not undertake that case. Rather do I try to speak for the third party, the party which should also, through the government, be represented at the bargaining table but which, alas, I fear seems to have had no voice in these recent troubled times and tangled negotiations. When I speak of the third party, I refer to the people of Canada. Their rights, their legitimate demands, their proper expectations transcend all argument about guidelines, about conciliation reports or about points of negotiation. While the government, through the Treasury Board, is in a narrow sense in the role of the employer, it is in a much more basic and much broader sense the custodian of the general interest, the guarantor of the rights of the people of Canada. In that role and in that function, it has been, I submit, abysmally unsuccessful.

Indeed, in the more narrow function as employer the government has displayed a brittle, bungling brinkmanship which has been calculated to ensure the failure of negotiations. I cannot say that the government wanted the negotiations to fail—I do not know—but I can say that if they did want them to fail they could not have proceeded in any way better calculated to bring about that result. The Postmaster General (Mr. Kierans), widely castigated as the most anti-labour Postmaster General since Confederation, made his immortal contribution when he said in the House on May 19, as recorded at page 7062 of *Hansard:*

People who seek contractual obligations sometimes seek not the work but the pay without the work.

What a contribution to harmonious negotiation! What a contribution to eventual settlement! But the minister whose contributions to worker morale are now well known had help in this latest effort. No more unlikely agent of

goodwill could be found than the hon. member for Westmount, the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury) of *Bonaventure* fame and other interesting records. He and his spokesmen seemed eager to miss no opportunity to inflame the situation and exacerbate the problem. On May 26 a Canadian Press item by a very able reporter, Ian Porter, states:

> Drury comes within a breath of daring postal workers to strike...He said the government would be under less pressure than ever before to settle on union terms.

Four days later, on May 30, David Monk, director of communications for the Treasury Board told reporters that the 24-hour rotating mail strikes are a callous tactic that harasses the innocent public. This was on the very eve of the arrival of the government-chosen mediator, President Carrothers. What an environment for compromise they extended to him; what a scene they set!

After that gentleman withdrew in apparent despair, a spokesman again rushed into print to denounce the unions. Then, the irrepressible Postmaster General, envious perhaps of his colleague's temporary monopoly of ineptitude, held a press conference. This produced one of the most incredible utterances since the days of Baron Munchausen.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Macquarrie: As reported on June 9, he said that the rotating strikes and the continued spread of a national strike and wildcat stoppages are alienating the Canadian public. He went on to say it might even be that the people would lose confidence in the Post Office if this continued! The suggestion was made that the striking workers were responsible for the diminution in the faith the people have in the institution over which he has presided with such great disarray for two years. In speaking of the people losing confidence, and in speaking of the declining use of the service, he knows the story of the declining use of the service by many people in Canada.

• (4:20 p.m.)

If he does not know, I can let him have my files. The Prime Minister, (Mr. Trudeau), the captain of the team, joined the fray and quoted statistics which have been cryptically refuted and publicly denied by the leaders of the unions in the most outspoken terms that I have ever heard applied by public men to the leader of a government. So far as I know, these statements have as yet gone without contradiction. These are contributions to a situation which now faces us. But what appears to be constant in all this is the determination to confine one part of the economy, one group of employees to whom the 6 per cent guidelines shall and will apply come hell or high water, postal strikes or no postal strikes. This, I fear, is part of the problem. Others may get 19 per cent, 10 per cent, and perhaps even 21.9 per cent, but these workers must settle for 6 per cent or else. Even Judge Lippe's suggestion of 6.3 per cent seems an extravagance which a brittle government will not accept even in the face of disruptions of the postal service.

Is this group of public servants to become the scapegoat of a faltering effort to establish a guideline which so few others in the country will respect? Are these workers to be the victims of a squeeze play in a government's last ditch effort to save face, if not the postal service? Is the government really determined to force upon some of its own workers a restriction which it can neither sell nor compel upon the rest of the public? Is this the issue? The government's handling of this whole matter has been a dismal, dreary record of insensitivity, stubbornness and lack of consideration of the public or of their own employees.

We have today a vital national service in suspension, Canadians inconvenienced, business and the economy suffering, and the average citizen denied a service for which he is paying at the highest rate since confederation. Must this go on and on? The minister laughs, but it is the highest rate since confederation. That is one of his great achievements. Must the months and months of inefficient, inferior mail service be followed by a galloping disruption of that service and a continuing deadlock in an effort to bring this to an end? After what the Postmaster General has done as the head of the department, I am not surprised that he can even laugh in the face of this situation. It may be unbecoming, but it is not surprising.

Do the proprietors of the once-designated just society believe that the Canadian public is possessed of endless patience and devoid of any determination to have its rights protected by the group to which it gave its mandate for a time, namely to the government of the day? I say with all seriousness and with great concern that there is grave danger that the wick of public patience is growing short. Let the government know this, and I say also, let the unions know this. My sympathies are, as is

well known, generally with the unions. I want to see their lot improved. I do not deny their desire for better pay because I happen to know that there are some in the country not paid so well. That is a foolish, nonsensical excuse. You do not improve the general lot by dragging down or keeping down some of those who are not at the very bottom.

I say that the unions have handled their case infinitely better than the government which has approached this matter with ineptitude and stubbornness. I recognize the unions' anxiety for job security, but I say to the union leaders: do not, even in the face of outrageous government ineptitude, push public patience too far. I say, with the greatest sympathy and friendship which is well known: do not exhaust the reservoir of goodwill and do not give this government, whose anti-labour bent seems more and more apparent, any justification to move in a manner calculated to hurt the cause of labour, both organized and unorganized, for many years to come.

I ask the unions not to penalize the Canadian public to such a degree that they will lose sympathy for the aims of the unions. These are delicate matters. I ask the union leaders not to spoil a generally good cause, and not to spoil a generally reasonable case, by continued methods of persuasion which are not good, which are not reasonable, and which the Canadian public will not long endure. Above all, I say to them, do not tempt the Canadian public to reconsider the right to strike in the public employee sector. I say to both sides: the public interest is paramount. This is the question here today. There has been enough brittle obstinacy at the negotiating table, enough name calling through the media, enough denunciatory press conferences, and enough rotating strikes.

I urge, I advise, indeed I presume to warn that a national strike must be averted. It can be averted and this continuing, hurtful confrontation must end. Flexibility and reason must take the place of obstinacy, stand patism and a determination to prove a point, no matter how-ill chosen that point was both in time and in mathematics. If the government through any of its spokesmen,—and I fear the spokesman today might be the Postmaster General, not a felicitous choice—have any exceptionally useful measures to propose to bring this agony to an end, we will not be found wanting in our readiness, our willingness to act decisively, whether it be in midsummer, in the next hour, the next day or the next week. We are willing to do what we believe is necessary, not to prove a point for the unions nor, God help us, to prove a point for the incompetent government, but to approve, to sustain, to support and to protect the public interest which for far too long has been ignored.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): My colleague, the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis), yesterday asked leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely, the new situation created by the acceleration and spread of the rotational strikes by postal employees, thus creating a new threat of a nationwide postal strike, the failure of the Treasury Board to negotiate a settlement to end the disruption of postal services, and the urgent need to debate the serious situation before the House adjourns for the summer recess.

I do not think there can be any question that we are facing in this country a real crisis. Press reports in the last few days make it clear that in the last week we have had a third of the postal workers from one end of Canada to the other out of work at one time. That is likely to accelerate rather than to slow down, unless there is an early settlement of the dispute between the postal workers and the government. How much inconvenience, how much difficulty, how much trouble, have the differences between the government and the postal workers created for the ordinary citizens, whether they be old age pensioners, ordinary workers, or small or large businessmen.

• (4:30 p.m.)

What has caused the difficulties, Mr. Speaker? I will come to the issue in a few moments. I think the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie) spoke the truth when he said that the difficulties, in a large part, were caused by the intemperate statements made by the Postmaster General (Mr. Kierans), by the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury), who cannot even bother to be here this afternoon, as well as by representatives of the negotiating committee for the government. I do not want to take the time to put on the record the irresponsible statements made time and time again by the Postmaster General, which could only have the effect of

inviting the postal workers to go out on strike immediately. But, Mr. Speaker, his statements are no different from, nor worse than, the statements of the President of the Treasury Board.

What about the so called negotiators for the government? Mr. Harper held a press conference yesterday, at which he said a fair settlement for the postal workers would be less than the 6 per cent maximum increase which the government has indicated in its wage guidelines. How irresponsible can the government get?

According to the *Globe and Mail* of May 30 Mr. Monk, another great government negotiator, criticized the postal unions for launching what he called a campaign of callous harassment of the innocent public. I quote from the newspaper:

> He combined the accusation with an angry denunciation of the union's bargaining team, which he said had refused to negotiate with representatives of the Treasury Board and the Post Office—
>
> Mr. Monk told reporters that the government negotiators had proposed that the wage negotiations begin with a discussion of the proposals of Keith Campbell, the government's nominee on the conciliation board.
>
> —Mr. Monk conceded that the Treasury Board negotiators have not suggested that the wage negotiations centre around the proposals of Judge Rene Lippe, the chairman of the conciliation board, who proposed a 50 cent an hour increase over the life of a new agreement.

In other words, Mr. Monk, a supposedly competent negotiator, says that unless the postal workers are prepared to negotiate on the basis of what the government representative on the conciliation board recommended, they are not being responsible. If the Postmaster General wants to get this contract settled, I suggest he had better send Mr. Monk off to a different job because he knows nothing about negotiations. He knows even less about them than does the Postmaster General.

And as if that were not bad enough, we had the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) making statements, during his tour last weekend, about the wages of postal workers, statements which were factually incorrect. Let me quote from the letter sent to the Prime Minister by the President of the Letter Carriers Union of Canada and the President of the Canadian Union of Postal Workers on June 25. I will quote just a couple of sentences in which they object to the figures mentioned by the Prime Minister, and which they say are untrue.

> We refer particularly to week end statements quoted widely in Monday's press. You are quoted as having said the average postal worker's wage is $3.30 an hour.

[Mr. Orlikow.]

I do not want to use unparliamentary language, even when I quote somebody else, and so I content myself with saying that the letter indicates the figures used by the Prime Minister are untrue. The letter goes on to say:

> In fact, the range of wage rates is from $2.57 an hour to $3.24 an hour. Only approximately 2,000 of the 27,000 postal workers are eligible to earn the maximum rate of $3.24. The postman who delivers the mail to your door earns $2.99 an hour, provided he has been on this job for at least three years.
>
> In the same statement you are quoted as placing the national average of industrial workers in Canada at $2.65 an hour. This is also not true. According to the latest figures of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics the national average is $3.11 an hour.

In other words, the Prime Minister exaggerated the wages paid to postal workers, and underestimated the average wages paid to industrial workers. Why is this being done? Why are we in these difficulties? I suggest there are two main issues.

The postal workers are worried by the extravagant claims which the Postmaster General made over a period of months about how automation of the Post Office would lead to much greater efficiency and to large savings. What does that mean to the ordinary worker? It means that there will be a reduction in the number of workers required. As a result, in the workers' negotiations with the government, they are asking for guarantees on job security. They would be less than human if they did not ask for this. In fact, they would be downright foolish.

Then, very late in the negotiations, the Postmaster General started saying that there would be so much mail the Post Office would need more workers, and he implied that there would not be lay-offs. If there will not be lay-offs, why doesn't the government offer a job security plan? I am not saying that the government necessarily has to grant the request of the unions, giving a guarantee that no employee will be laid off. Many private industries have job security plans. Why can't the government have such a plan?

The second problem concerns the wage increase which the employees want. It is obvious to me that the postal workers are being asked to be the "patsies" for the unilateral decision made by the government that workers should not get more than a 6 per cent increase in their wages. That guideline has been shattered by virtually all groups of workers in both the public and private sectors who have signed wage agreements in the last couple of months.

I do not have time to put on the record all the wage agreements which have been signed, and which provide for a great deal more than 6 per cent. But let me say that there has been a deliberate and concentrated effort by the government, in particular by the Prime Minister and by the President of the Treasury Board, and which has not been publicly rejected by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey), a friend of labour, to put the blame for inflation on trade unions, particularly on those affiliated with the Canadian Labour Congress and with the Confederation of National Trade Unions. There is no truth in the suggestions by the Prime Minister and the Chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission that only workers belonging to trade unions are getting pay increases of more than 6 per cent. Here are some cases with respect to increases won by groups not affiliated with the CLC, and not usually considered as workers who belong to trade unions, in the accepted definition of those words.

The professors at the University of Toronto got an increase of 10 per cent for the coming year. Professors at York University got an increase of 14 per cent a year. Toronto metropolitan separate school teachers signed an agreement, according to yesterday's Toronto newspapers, which over the next two years will give them an increase of 21.3 per cent, almost twice as much as the government suggests should be the guideline. Last week Toronto metropolitan secondary teachers rejected a one year offer of 11.2 per cent as not being sufficient. So, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious from these examples, and I could give more to the House, that top civil servants, deputy ministers and those carrying on negotiations have received increases which are much greater than 6 per cent in recent years. I have talked about the Deputy Minister of Finance and the Governor of the Bank of Canada. I ask the Postmaster General to tell us, if he speaks in today's debate, the increases given during the last three years to the deputy minister in his department or to Messrs. Harper and Monk, who are carrying on the negotiations. He will not do that, because he wants the public and our workers to know as little as possible. I submit he knows that his top advisers have been able to obtain much more than 6 per cent.

• (4:40 p.m.)

I say that the government has no right to demand of the postal workers, or other civil servants, that they shall be bound by a unilaterally decided arbitrary figure of 6 per cent. I think I may be permitted to use in this House the language that the Prime Minister used over the week end while addressing a group of auto workers. He told them that through their supposed exorbitant wage demands they were "screwing" the ordinary citizens of Canada. Incidentally, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) did not hesistate to approve a wage increase for the tow boat operators in Vancouver of substantially more than 6 per cent. I submit that when the Prime Minister says to the postal workers, or the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury) says to the executive director of the Professional Institute of the Public Service of Canada, as he did in a letter the other day, that workers must be content with a maximum increase of 6 percent, they are in fact "screwing" the Public Servants of this country.

I submit that the policy of the government has led inevitably, as the minister might have known and, as we on this side of the House warned it would, to the present situation, to the rotating strikes that inconvenience the public and to a possible strike of all postal employees. I hope I am wrong, although it seems to me on the basis of the facts, that the Postmaster General and the Prime Minister want a strike of all postal workers. That is the only logical conclusion that one can arrive at in trying to understand why we are in our present difficulties.

I join with the hon. member for Hillsborough in saying, as he said a few minutes ago, that the public does not want a strike and that postal workers do not want to strike. Nobody wants a strike. It is unnecessary and can be avoided. All that inconvenience to the public could be avoided if only the government would drop its arrogant, anti-labour attitude and the formula it has adopted, the guideline saying that wage increases shall not be more than 6 per cent. That guideline has been breached, as I have said today and on other occasions, by workers in the private sector of the economy as well as in the public sector. The provincial treasurer of Ontario, in a telegram to the Civil Service Association of Ontario made it clear that in bargaining with its civil servants the provincial government would not impose any guideline of 6 per cent.

During the conference held in Manitoba recently, the government of Manitoba made it clear that it would not agree to wage guidelines unless the federal government is pre-

pared to adopt guidelines and restraints with respect to other forms of income, that is, on profits, interest rates, rents and professional fees. May I quote from an article in the Winnipeg *Free Press* of June 27, 1970. The headline is, "Man. Liberals Reject Separate Wage Guideline". The article reads in part:

> Delegates to the Manitoba Liberal policy conference during the weekend rallied to the support of the Canadian Labor Congress in opposing a separate guideline of six per cent limit on wage increases advocated by the federal prices and incomes commission.
>
> They adopted, instead, a resolution calling for guidelines on corporation profits, rents, professional fees and consumer products, as well as a "reasonable" wage guideline.
>
> The resolution was moved by E. B. Osler, Liberal member of Parliament for Winnipeg South Centre.

I am glad that the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Osler) has adopted proposals which we, on this side of the House, have been putting forward for months. I say that our present difficilties could be settled easily if the government would get off its high horse and negotiate in good faith, which it has not done up to now.

May I make one last suggestion before sitting down? If the minister wants to stop the rotating strikes and the inconvenience to the public, let him ask himself what alternative have the postal workers to what they are doing? I suggest the government ought to instruct Messrs. Harper and Monk to come off their high horse, meet with the postal workers and say, "Let us discuss a settlement on the basis of proposals made by Judge Lippé." I submit that he is not pro-labour. He is not a member of the NDP. As Chairman of the Conciliation Board, he put forward proposals which, if accepted, would have ended the dispute. He recommended, Mr. Speaker, a wage increase of 50 cents an hour. If the government were to do that, I feel confident that the log jam which has been holding up the settlement of this dispute which has so inconvenienced the public would quickly disappear. I urge the government to get down to business immediately, so that the postal service will operate properly and the mails will move.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, about two years ago,—

[*English*]

Mr. E. B. Osler (Winnipeg South Centre): On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. Since I have been quoted freely, I wish to set the record straight. I am not raising a point in order to disagree with what has been said; I merely wish to emphasize something that is worth emphasizing. The resolution that I sponsored in Winnipeg urges the Canadian Labour Congress to make a serious effort to obtain specific commitments that would constitute reasonable and feasible compensation to its members for participating—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. I think the hon. member is entering the debate. That is not a question of privilege.

• (4:50 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, barely two years ago, the present Postmaster General and Minister of Communications (Mr. Kierans) told us emphatically that he was going to straighten out the Post Office Department. He told us he would apply new administrative concepts. It is probably because of his excellent concept that he had to leave the province of Quebec and its administration to come and make trouble in Ottawa. He made high-flown speeches saying he would completely transform the department into a profitable department, that would meet expenses and give an improved service to the Canadian people, and it, might even become the department of which the Canadian people would be the proudest.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to note as this session comes to an end that that department is precisely the one with which the people are least pleased. The climate of postal administration in Canada, pardon me the expression, is rotten, and the Canadian public, regardless of what the minister may say about it, is not responsible for it.

During the past two years, many bombs have exploded, trucks were demolished or simply overturned, windows were broken, employees were discharged, heads of families lost their income and security because order was restored in the department and because they claimed they were giving the Canadian people an adequate service and Canada-wide communications.

Not so long ago, the minister repeated in this House that he would allow for open negotiations, so as to find a solution to the postal conflict. Opposition members were hoping that the minister would at last assume his responsibilities, moderate his pretensions and find a solution. Today, press releases confirm that at the time Justice René Lippé's

report was tabled, the three negotiators and conciliators could not even agree with each other.

Today, a steady threat plagues the Canadian people: the outbreak of a general postal strike.

The Canadian public cannot be blamed for that either. What are therefore the causes of such a colossal farce, apparently entirely dreamed up by the Postmaster General and Minister of Communications, so as to convince us once and for all that he is a bad administrator?

First, the minister convinced us that there had to be an increase in postal rates, which have become prohibitive for many daily or weekly newspapers throughout Canada, especially in Quebec. Thus, he was undermining the confidence of the Canadian people in the mail service while increasing postal rates and forcing out of business several magazines, dailies and weeklies, due to increased shipping costs. That time, you will recall, he showed contempt for the rights of Parliament and he laughed at the members who were telling him that the rates had become intolerable. We must admit that once more the minister "boobed" when reorganizing the postal system in Canada to such an extent that today we are threatened with a general strike.

The minister who is responsible for streamlining his department, had promised to do so, but today we notice that he alone is responsible for the confusion prevailing in the Post Office Department and the dissatisfaction of 27,000 postal workers.

On several occasions, lately, I met some Post Office employees in Victoriaville, a municipality located in the riding of Lotbinière. I visited their office and I discussed with them, neither politics nor pretty politics, but simply their working conditions so as to know better in what climate they work.

I have not found one single person in that office who was satisfied with the organization. In Victoriaville, the Post Office people work in a damp basement where they suffocate.

In Montreal—

[*English*]

THE ROYAL ASSENT

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following communication:

Royal Assent

Ottawa, June 26, 1970

Sir:

I have the honour to inform you that the Honourable Gérald Fauteux, C.P., Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, acting as Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate chamber on Friday, the 26th June, at 5 p.m. for the purpose of giving the royal assent to certain bills.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,
Brigadier General Louis-Frémont Trudeau,
Assistant Secretary to the Governor General

A message was delivered by the Deputy Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

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

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

And being returned:

• (5:10 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker informed the House that the Deputy Governor General had been pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the royal assent to the following bills:

An act to establish a commission for the reform of the laws of Canada

An act to prevent pollution of areas of the arctic waters adjacent to the mainland and islands of the Canadian arctic

An act to amend the Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act

An act respecting inland water resources in the Yukon Territory and Northwest Territories

An act to provide for the management of the water resources of Canada including research and the planning and implementation of programs relating to the conservation, development and utilization of water resources

An act to amend the Canada Labour (Standards) Code

An act to amend the Excise Act

An act to amend the National Energy Board Act

An act to amend the Bills of Exchange Act

An act to amend the Yukon Act, the Northwest Territories Act and the Territorial Lands Act

An act respecting civil liability for nuclear damage

An act respecting regulations made pursuant to section 4 of the Aeronautics Act

An act respecting the franchise of electors and the election of members to the House of Commons

An act to postpone the expiration of certain provisions of an act to amend the Canada Shipping Act

An act to amend the Fisheries Act

An act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act

An act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act

An act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act

An act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act

An act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act

Post Office

An act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act
An act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act
An act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act
An act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act
An act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending 31st March, 1971.

[*Translation*]

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

POST OFFICE

ACCELERATED DISRUPTION OF SERVICE—FAILURE TO NEGOTIATE SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTE

Mr. Speaker: The House shall now resume proceedings under Standing Order 26. The hon. member for Lotbinière.

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take up the time of the House, but I would like to sum up my views in three points.

Before the interruption, I was saying that I wanted quite honestly to blame the Postmaster General and Minister of Communications (Mr. Kierans) for being mainly responsible for Canada's postal mess.

Despite his promises and his attempts to set the Department in order, not only with regard to finances but most of all with regard to the personnel, it looks as if it will probably be a financial success but a total failure as far as the personnel is concerned.

That was the second point I wanted to deal with, Mr. Speaker. I had talked about it in a previous debate on the postal issue affecting Lapalme employees.

As far as personnel relations are concerned, the Postmaster General and Minister of Communications is—I am sorry to say it so bluntly—incompetent. There is ample evidence of it. The incidents that would prove it would outnumber the fingers of both hands. The ability of the minister as administrator is surely not similar to his ability as director of personnel.

Since the present Postmaster General has been supervising his personnel, problems have been increasing and multiplying. Conflicts are worsening, relations are strained and no solution seems to be in view.

The people are losing hope, they were quite ready to pay for such an essential service, but it must be adequate.

[Mr. Speaker.]

It is high time that the government be changed or that the responsibility of managing the personnel be taken away from the Postmaster General and Minister of Communications.

Mr. Speaker, this step would represent at least 50 per cent of the solution of the postal problem.

Considering the climate prevailing among the manufacturing industry workers and the tensed relations between employees and employers, one can appreciate that there are wrongs on both sides.

The utterances of the Postmaster General and Minister of Communications for the last two years suggest that only the employees and their unions do wrong. I will honestly admit that union leaders too often serve their own interests instead of the organized worker's interests. In fact, they misuse their power, blackmail the public at large to draw attention to themselves, thus spreading disorder in the firms they represent.

I am not one of those who would grovel before union leaders. Contrary to expectations, many cases show that too often the human side of the situation, the basic respect for the human being are forgotten, as well as the fair working conditions. To summarize, the human side of a question should always be considered rather than one's own interests. The Postmaster General and Minister of Communications will admit that many union leaders thus become responsible for numerous conflicts.

• (5:20 p.m.)

I will point out to him that he is precisely one of those who have made matters worse, provoking the union leaders who, in turn, have spread anger among employees, so that today, utter disorder prevails in the Canadian postal service.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat what I have said in a speech on the subject: a key department such as the Post Office and Communications Department ought to set an exemple to other departments in excellent, lively and dynamic human relations between employers and employees.

As long as the present Postmaster General fails to realize it, as long as his personal ideas take precedence over the human element and as long as he continues to trample the rights of the workers in order to get the credit for having put things in order within his department, the Canadian population will no longer enjoy an adequate postal service and the department will be without employees.

It seems to me that the situation is extremely serious at the present time. In fact, previous speakers have said so in most eloquent fashion. They have explained the situation better than I can but it seems to me that it is my duty to insist the minister surround himself with advisers capable of maintaining intelligent human relations within his department. This is one thing he should leave to others, realizing that in this respect, he has not been the least bit successful so far.

That is why I repeat that he is the one who is primarily responsible for that situation. When there is provocation, a reaction inevitably follows.

Before concluding I would like,—and that is my third point,—to submit a proposal that has often been moved in the House. It seems to me that it is still important and advisable to do so today.

As a matter of fact, compulsory arbitration should have been established long ago, with regard to working conditions, and departments should take advantage of this.

With compulsory arbitration, strikes could be avoided in the Public Service and labour and management would be compelled to negotiate in order to find solutions to their disputes. Absolutely nothing is settled with guns or with threats, as the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) tried to do recently with regard to employees, or even where union leaders are concerned because they themselves ar using the same weapons against the Postmaster General and Minister of Communications or against the government.

If like two neighbours who cannot agree on the type of fence to build between their properties, the Postmaster General and Minister of Communications and the union leaders do not stop trading insults as they have been doing for two years now, nothing will be solved and once more the people will suffer.

Should there be compulsory arbitration in Canada, the minister would have to stop being arrogant because he would no longer be able to insult everybody instead of solving problems. Like the union members, he would have to sit at the bargaining table. In Priceville last year a labour dispute lasted over six months. Employees were waiting for the employer who was conspicuous by his absence. Thus the strike lasted more than six months and it will now take the workers two, three or four years with the small wage increase they obtained to recover what they have lost during the strike.

A postal strike in Canada is a luxury that we cannot afford. As members of this House, we should resort to every means at our disposal to prevent such a disaster because we have no right to allow a strike especially in the postal service which is most essential.

Compulsory arbitration is not a dictatorship, but it must not be characterized by arrogance, threats and blackmailing, as has been the case for the last two years in the Post Office Department. True arbitration means that sensible people meet together and discuss a problem and, if necessary, agree to a compromise.

In conclusion, I ask the minister to seriously consider entrusting someone else in his department with the care of ensuring a sound management of staff and more human relations, which would help settle a great many things.

The second solution would be to remove from all post offices in Canada the photograph of the Postmaster General and to resort to compulsory arbitration.

I see I am making you smile, Mr. Speaker, but I wanted to do so at the end of the session. Thank you for your kindness to me and I hope that in spite of the the present serious situation, the minister will seriously consider the possibility of compulsory arbitration in order to spare the Canadian people, who pay for the postal service, the inconvenience of being deprived of it.

Today, Canadians are paying much more for that service. It is up to the minister to see that they get it since it is his responsibility.

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the member for Lotbinière. At least, he has spoken honestly and has made concrete recommendations. Even though I cannot accept his recommendation for compulsory arbitration, I congratulate him since he has made a suggestion instead of contenting himself with making at large comments as did the members of the other two parties.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, I think we can leave the musical maestro of the Conservative party to one side for the moment, because again he has conducted a rehearsal. Some day he will come to the performance and say something that will be a real recommendation instead of a resumé of irrelevant facts which he constantly drags out of what must be a very volumi-

nous dossier. I think the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) must surely be aware of the expression or proverb in French "qui s'excuse s'accuse", although in his case when he accuses me of wanting to force the postal workers into a general strike he is probably thinking of the kind of political advantage this step might give him and his party.

There is nobody in the Post Office or in this government who wants to force the postal workers into a general strike. I will go further and say to the hon. member that there is nobody on this side of the House who, even though the postal workers go on strike, intends to make the kind of recommendation that he and his party made in June of 1966 when they introduced a bill to force the long shoremen back to work on the ground that this was in the public interest. The hon. member was here at that time. So he gives the postal workers the right to strike, and the moment it becomes inconvenient to him, he wants to take it away. Well, this government does not intend to do that.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kierans: Let me quote an NDP press release of June 9, 1966. It states:

> The time has therefore come when Parliament and the government cannot further postpone appropriate action to bring the strike to an end.

That is from your own press release. Then you explained why the NDP was submitting a draft bill to order the striking longshoremen in eastern Canadian ports to abandon their legal right to strike and return to work on terms that were fixed by your bill.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Kierans: When Mr. Howard presented this bill he said, as reported at page 7704 of *Hansard* for July 14, 1966:

> I might say that even though the bill was in my name, I only acted in that respect as an agent for the party itself, because this was a matter of strong unanimity.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Kierans: So it is the NDP, I think, that would like the chaos of a general strike so they could propose a similar bill forcing the postal workers back to work. Well, that may be their policy but it is not ours.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker,—

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

[Mr. Kierans.]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. Does the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) rise on a point of order, or to ask a question?

Mr. Orlikow: I should like to ask the minister a question, Mr. Speaker, if I may.

Mr. Kierans: Mr. Speaker, I should like to finish what I have to say. I listened with a great deal of interest to what the hon. member had to say and I did not ask him any questions. I did not expect there was any information there that I could get. The people of Canada have given postal workers the right to strike. This government does not intend to take it away from them.

• (5:30 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kierans: I should like to say, however, at the same time, that the people of Canada and this government at all times expect them to use that privilege with a sense of responsibility.

An hon. Member: They can strike.

Mr. Kierans: Yes, they can strike. There will be no legislation introduced to bring them back.

An hon. Member: Never?

Mr. Kierans: We will see. This is not our present intention. It is not my intention. They have that right, and I have no present intention to propose legislation to force them back. It is up to them to weigh the costs and the responsibilities. But I say that their present conduct may lead to greater problems for them in the long run than to go on strike because, just as one of the freedoms in this country is the right of people to go into business and to court the risk of bankruptcy, so also is it a freedom of a union to pursue policies that can eventually lead only to a reduction in the number of its own members and a reduction in the size of the union.

At the present time the series of slowdowns, rotating strikes or sitdowns is leading to a situation in which they are in effect crippling for a long time the postal service of Canada. If they do that, they are crippling themselves because if in the long run the people of Canada find they are dissatisfied with the service and turn to other means, they may not, when this series of disagreements is over, wish to come back to the Post Office. I will give one example of how this works. It is an example which relates to Ottawa and area, although similar examples

could be found right across this country. Ottawa's highway services arrive early in the morning. On Wednesday the Ottawa employees went on strike at 5 a.m., so mail posted, say in Brockville, had to be diverted to another office, say Smiths Falls. The Ottawa workers went back to work on Thursday, but offices like Smiths Falls, which had been holding Ottawa mail, were on strike; therefore, the Ottawa-bound mail stayed there. On Friday the smaller offices returned to work but Ottawa went on strike, so the mail from offices such as Brockville, Smiths Falls and Hull could not be taken into the Ottawa office.

This brings us up to the weekend. If there are no further disruptions, mail from the offices tributary to Ottawa will arrive on Monday morning. Some of it will be delivered on Monday, much of it on Tuesday and the remainder, at least firstclass mail, on Wednesday if there are no further disruptions. I cannot stop this. If they want to do it, they can do it. The reaction, however, is not from me but the the Canadian people who become fed-up and seek to employ other means and will remain with those other means, a lot of them, long after this strike is over—over but not forgotten.

At the present time the volume of mail handled in the Post Office is at the 1966 level. There is still a Postmaster General and a Deputy Postmaster General. But I want to say this: in 1966 that volume of mail was handled by 4,100 fewer union employees than the 27,000 in the Council of Postal Unions. I am simply saying that if this situation remains, and if this long series of rotating strikes and impediment to the movement of mail continues so that the public does not come back, and if we have this continuing volume of 1966 or perhaps even less, then there will have to be lay-offs.

These lay-offs, however, will not be for reasons of mechanization or automation but for the quite simple reason that the Canadian people will no longer have the same demand for their services. If the volume of mail continues at the rate of 4 billion items per year instead of slightly more than 5 billion items, then even when the strike is over I do not think the people would expect me to keep hiring and paying salaries to the 4,100 people from whom the Canadian people will not be requiring services. I do not intend to hire people in the Post Office who are not needed. But I do intend to hire all the people who are needed. That need is expressed, not by me but by the confidence and appreciation the people of Canada have for the services offered by me and by all of my 45,000 colleagues. Nor do I intend to bring in legislation that would prevent any other private company carrying the second, third or fourth-class mail.

I simply say to my colleagues in the unions that if the postal workers, letter carriers and all people in the Post Office work together with management and co-operate, we do not care how many private companies spring up or how many of them may prosper during this regrettable period, because if we all work together we can drive them out of business overnight. But if we do, it will not be by legislation; it will be by the co-operation of all of us.

Mr. Speaker, hon. members opposite have said we are using the Post Office, in the words of the hon. member for Winnipeg North, as a patsy for the guidelines. I want to say to the hon. member for Winnipeg North that these negotiations started 10 months ago, long before there was any talk about 4 per cent, 2 per cent, 10 per cent or 6 per cent guidelines. In that intervening period agreements have been concluded with the postmasters and subpostmasters within the Post Office for three years at 5½ per cent, at 5 per cent and 5 per cent, long before there was any mention of guidelines. This is what we consider to be a fair and reasonable offer. This is what the unions should now be negotiating with the Treasury Board. But this is not being used as a lead-horse for a guidelines policy. This long antedates the oratory that is presently being spent on the guidelines policy.

• (5:40 p.m.)

Within the last several years the Post Office has changed considerably from the days when Judge Montpetit in 1965 and 1966 described basically what had gone on under the previous government. Since that time, of his 282 recommendations, 238 have been implemented in whole or in part. Never, to my knowledge, have so many recommendations of a royal commission, even the Glassco Commission, been accepted, adopted and implemented. Four have been rejected by the government, another four jointly by the department and the unions, and others are still up for negotiation. There are many that we ourselves can do nothing about.

Judge Montpetit, for example, recommended that there should be rotating shifts within the Post Office. While the Postmaster General might wish it as being fair to all employees

and as making the Post Office a more attractive place for new people, obviously he cannot impose it. That is a matter for the unions themselves. If they are unwilling to, or if they remember the days when it took 15 years of night work in a post office to qualify for day work, that is their problem. But approximately 50 of the 282 recommendations have not been implemented and, as I said, 238 have been implemented in whole or in part. Since that time the government and the Post Office have invested tremendous amounts of money, and I am willing to invest as much more as I possibly can, in the human capital that is in the Post Office that has been neglected for so long by Liberal and Tory governments of the past. There is now consultation, and there will be consultation before major moves are made in the Post Office.

The purpose of putting in mechanization is not to eliminate jobs, and I repeat here that it will not. If there are any lay-offs this year in the Post Office, they will be due to the decline in demand created by the present situation and by nothing else. Unfortunately, it means that those who have newly entered the Post Office, the last in, will be the first out, the first to be laid aside. But mechanization will not lead to any lack of job security. It is meant to meet problems, and the problems are those of performing the same tasks in exactly the same way as they were performed under the Tories or the way they were performed two generations ago. Mechanization is designed to make more complex work easier, to eliminate drudgery and routine, not to eliminate people. As I have said, people will not be eliminated for these reasons.

I have described what the future is with regard to mechanization—the introduction of new and easier methods. I have looked at the production. I appreciate the fact that an inside worker does not handle as many pieces as he did before. I can understand this because I am not anti-labour, as the hon. member for Winnipeg North would have the House believe. If nothing is changed in doing things in this age when everything else is changed in the world and a man is sorting and turning over letters in exactly the same way, it becomes more boring and tiring. This we can overcome by modernizing, by investing in training on the job, in making available courses at all levels so that people can move up more rapidly in the service than ever before.

With respect to the general position of job security about which so much has been said, I would just like to say the following in French:

Les facteurs et les commis des Postes par la loi sur l'emploi—

The letter carriers and mail clerks of the Post office under the Employment Act—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I regret having to interrupt the minister, but his time has expired. The minister can pursue his remarks, with the consent of the House. Is this agreed?

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, we certainly would not prevent the minister from completing his remarks, but there are a number of hon. members who would like to speak and I would urge the minister, if he has considerably more to say, to give his notes to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) who might complete his speech for him.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Kierans: I am very grateful to my colleagues.

Job Security—The permanent letter carriers and mail clerks of the Post Office are protected under the Public Service Employment Act to the same extent as all other permanent employees of the Public Service of Canada. A check of the records of the last twenty-five years has not revealed a single case of a Post Office employee belonging to those bargaining units who had lost his job in the Public Service because of technical or operational changes.

[*English*]

Since my time is up, I simply want to make one plea. All of us in the Post Office have an obligation. We are facing a situation which carries in the long run a great deal of risk for all of those who work inside the Post Office. If there is a lack of security in the Post Office then it seems to me, after listening to the various motions of non-confidence, that I am a member of the Post Office who probably has the least security of all.

But what we all have to do in the Post Office is work together to regain the confidence of the people of Canada and to put the service on its best footing so that people will believe in it and want to use it. If we do that, if there are just rewards for their work of the employees and returns for their productivity, and if we can accomplish this in such a way that we can be an example to all of what a department can do, then I think the Post Office will have not only increasing security for those who work in it but, even more important, an expanding growth curve which provides opportunities for self-advancement to everyone working in the Post Office. It will also provide them with an opportunity to

make a contribution, not only on their own behalf but on behalf of all the people of Canada.

• (5:50 p.m.)

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, I rise to participate in this emergency debate with feelings of ambivalence and trepidation. We are going home for the summer recess perhaps a little later than we expected this evening. We are doing so in face of what I believe has come to be a very grave national situation. For the last 25 minutes we have listened to the Postmaster General (Mr. Kierans) address himself to that problem which Your Honour held serious enough to adjourn the normal proceedings of the House in order to permit it to be debated What have we heard? We have heard a minister publicly announce that he has withdrawn—as he is doing from the chamber now—I am glad to see him come back and sit down, because before he goes I want to say to him—

An hon. Member: Say something sensible.

Mr. Forrestall: I will say it behind his back, then, and he can read it in the record. He has lectured us like an associate professor lecturing first-year political science students, adopting as a model the difficulties of a particular department, with the lecturer describing the ineptitude, inadequacy and total rejection of acceptance of responsibility, outlining the dangers that can arise in such a situation as that which we are facing. Nobody objects to the Postmaster General modernizing and updating the Post Office—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Forrestall: Let the rabbits over there be quiet. Nobody in Canada wants an outdated postal system, least of all we in the opposition. We want to see a modernized, updated, or to use the minister's term, mechanized department. That is not what we are here for today, Mr. Speaker. That is not what is bothering us now. We are here to discuss why we have a situation such as exists, what has caused it, and why we have a government that will not deal with the postal workers with some compassion, understanding and feeling. Why do we have this rigidity of view? Why do we have a Postmaster General who presumed to tell us that the Post Office needs modernizing? The hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie) told us that ten years ago. We do not need the Postmaster General to tell us it today.

We are discussing this matter at five minutes to six o'clock on a Friday evening. The Postmaster General knows we will be out of here tomorrow, but I am rapidly coming to the conclusion that that would be a mistake. It is no wonder that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), in his academic arrogance, has seen fit to take the responsibility for the negotiating process out of the hands of the Postmaster General and place it in the hands of the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury). However, I am not sure that any minister who permitted the situation of the days of horses on the payroll, and continued to permit the situation with respect to the overhaul of the *Bonaventure,* is the man we want to hold negotiations with the postal workers. But I say it is better that he do it rather than the Postmaster General. It is time that the Postmaster General resigned.

How long is it since the Prime Minister went to the President of the Treasury Board and said, "Bail us out. For God's sake, bail us out of the difficulties we are in"?

Mr. Perrault: Tell us what you would do.

Mr. Forrestall: We would have settled it a little while ago.

An hon. Member: On what basis?

Mr. Forrestall: All you have done for the last six months is sit on your rear and make noises.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall) has the floor. With all these interruptions it is difficult for the Chair to follow his speech.

An hon. Member: What speech?

Mr. Forrestall: I wish we could get rid of the rabbits in this warren so that I could get on with my remarks. The matter which keeps us here this afternoon, and which should bring us back tomorrow, Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday until this matter is resolved, is the rights of the postal workers, the rights of the people of Canada, and the obligation of the Postmaster General and the Prime Minister to arrive at an honourable settlement—and soon, not next month.

Does the price of stability in Canada have to be unemployment? The President of the Treasury Board has told us that. I hope he is more often aware of what he says than would

appear to be the case. The Prime Minister saw fit to remove from the Postmaster General the responsibility for conducting the negotiations which lead to the current series of rotating shutdowns across the country.

Mr. Osler: Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Forrestall: I do not know whether the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Osler) has anything to contribute at this time, but if he has a question I will entertain it.

Mr. Osler: If the hon. member is advocating parliamentary intervention in this labour dispute, would he suggest here and now a figure at which he would make a settlement?

Mr. Forrestall: I indicated that if the hon. member had a question, I would entertain it. Of course, I shall not entertain that suggestion at all.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Forrestall: We have more to do here this afternoon than listen to spurious comment. Of course the postal people have the right to strike. But the postal employees have bent over backwards to give an opportunity to the government to arrive at a reasonable formula for resolving the problem. Don't talk to me about the academic exercise of a 6 per cent guideline. I have had my fill of that and so has the rest of the country. We have had our fill of public apologies, of wishy-washy government statements. The last thing I expected to see in this House the day after the election in 1968 was another government of crisis to crisis, so preoccupied with its own ineptitudes that it could not find time to iron out day-to-day problems with the compassion and understanding that the people of Canada want. We still have not got a half decent government.

Mr. McGrath: The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) does not help when he uses wrong figures.

Mr. Forrestall: The Prime Minister may not know the situation. He relied on the advice given him. I am not at all sure he is particularly interested in the factual details of the situation. I give him some credit for being aware that difficulties may evolve as time goes on if this question is not resolved. But the fact is that the Prime Minister is so vain that he does not want to see any more resignations from his government because it might reflect on his ability to choose men.

[Mr. Forrestall.]

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that the Prime Minister and his colleagues from Montreal, excluding the hon. member for Westmount, run this country and do not permit very much to get out of their hands? We had a classic example this afternoon in the Postmaster General, who caused me to abandon the notes I had carefully prepared. We did not come here to hear the Postmaster General's observations. We came here to be told by the government what it is going to do about this problem and when it will bring a little compassion and understanding to the negotiations. When is that going to take place? Don't talk to me about mechanization. The problem centres around the inability of the ministry. The Prime Minister has to rely on members of his cabinet. No wonder he will change half the cabinet this summer.

• (6:00 p.m.)

An hon. Member: Which half?

Mr. Forrestall: I tell members on the back benches, including the rabbit from up the valley, that they could probably make a much greater contribution than the Postmaster General made this afternoon. We are discussing this matter in the House, where it ought to be discussed. We ought to see some evidence of some semblance of organization and reason on the part of the government. Its supporters should not be permitted to go home for the summer until the government has agreed to introduce a little compassion, not to mention honesty, logic, reason and reasonableness, into the negotiations with the postal workers of Canada.

This situation cannot continue, Mr. Speaker. I think the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury) should get up this afternoon and fill that great vacuum which has been left by the remarks of the Postmaster General (Mr. Kierans). His remarks this afternoon were totally irrelevant to the situation. The House should not adjourn for the summer until the situation is corrected. Perhaps the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) can display a little compassion and understanding. Perhaps he will inject himself into the debate. We should know whether the government intends to act honestly, reasonably and responsibly in this matter. The people of Canada are entitled to adequate and continuing postal service. Also, the people who provide this service are equally entitled to reasonable consideration from the minister and the government. After all, they work for the people of Canada.

We did not come here this afternoon to listen to an academic lecture on the mechanization of the Post Office. We came to hear what the Postmaster General might have to say about how he intends to resolve these problems. We did not hear that, and that is unpardonable. Not only is it unpardonable, but it is an affront to the chamber which anyone listening in the gallery who happens to be interested in these workers must find unforgivable. A little bit of compassion, coupled with an explanation lasting five minutes, and a reasonable approach to this problem by the Postmaster General would have yielded greater results this afternoon. I hope that the President of the Treasury Board will have the courage to defend his totally inadequate colleague from Montreal.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully and intently to every word uttered this afternoon by the Postmaster General (Mr. Kierans).

Mr. Forrestall: What did he say.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): He went out of his way to contend that speakers on the opposition side of the House had indulged in irrelevancies; then, he proceeded to be as irrelevant on the issue that is before us as he possibly could be.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I am hearing some remarks from the little Chicago area. I would be very happy if one of those hon. members would stand up and tell us of any one point raised by the Postmaster General that dealt with the issue before us.

An hon. Member: They are afraid to stand.

An hon. Member: Tell us what he said about the NDP.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): What is that issue, Mr. Speaker? The issue before us is getting the strike settled.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): There is no strike.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The issue is not whether anyone is anxious to turn these rotating strikes into a general strike. There is no issue about taking away the right to strike. Nobody is proposing that—although the remarks of the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) came pretty close to that. That is not the issue. The issue before us is that there is a dispute which has expressed itself in a series of rotating strikes, and everybody wants that situation settled. By "everybody" I mean the members of the House of Commons, the general public and the postal workers themselves. I submit that what cabinet ministers and government supporters ought to be doing in this debate is addressing themselves to ways in which the present strike situation can be settled with the least possible delay.

I said that the Postmaster General raised some matters that are irrelevant. I will not take time to deal with them. I do not blame the Postmaster General for wanting to score debating points, but I insist that the issue is getting this dispute settled. Despite the arguing by assertion in which the Postmaster General indulged, I submit that what stands in the way of the settling of this dispute is that the government is using the postal workers as pawns in its guidelines game. The Postmaster General says that this is obviously not so, because these negotiations began long before these guidelines were proposed. It does not matter when they were begun, because the government now is making it very clear to the postal workers that these guidelines hold and that nothing will be done for the postal workers that does not come inside these guidelines.

The Postmaster General confirmed that this afternoon. He said he believes in collective bargaining, including the right to strike. He believes in people sitting down across a table and working out their problems. But he said that those people on the other side of the table, the postal workers, should be reasonable; they should accept the 5 per cent offer that has been proposed to them as reasonable. Mr. Speaker, that is not collective bargaining. That is not bargaining in good faith. That is not bargaining on the basis of the merits of the issue. Actually, I submit that what is going on today is thoroughly dishonest. That is why the strike situation is continuing and why the postal workers have no option but to carry on with these rotating strikes in an attempt to bring pressure on their employers to meet the situation.

I strongly suspect that the government is relying on something else. The postal service has deteriorated so much already that the government thinks the people do not mind the interruptions which come from these one-day strikes, and that even if we get two of them in the same week, the people will put up with them. It is relying on the notion that

the people of Canada are worried about inflation and that therefore anybody who is accused of being responsible for it must be responsible. So the government, as I say, is relying on a certain amount of public feeling against the postal workers, and hoping that this will come to the point where the postal workers will feel that they must give in. In the meantime, the present situation, essentially, is that no honest bargaining is taking place and that meetings are held under the shadow of the guidelines. That is not collective bargaining; that is not bargaining in good faith.

We shall not see bargaining in good faith until the government says that the guidelines are not the final factor and that, "We are here to sit across the table from the postal workers to deal with the issues on their merits and come to a conclusion." My colleague for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) has already said that the guidelines have been blown to bits by many agreements which have been made. I believe he quoted figures from government sources showing that hourly wages paid to postal workers are below the average hourly wages that workers involved in industry might expect. I believe the postal workers have a case. Instead of taking time to go into that case this afternoon, I shall stay with this point: the bargaining that is taking place is not honest bargaining. It is not honest, good faith collective bargaining at all.

• (6:10 p.m.)

One way this problem could be settled would be that the next time the government people meet with the Council of Postal Unions they could say, "All right, we are starting afresh. We have called each other names. We have had these rotational strikes. We have had this for a long time. We are now prepared to deal with this issue on its merits. Put your case before us. Give us the statistics. We will deal with the matter on its merits." If out of that some reasonable proposal can be made, I believe that the matter will be settled in a reasonable time.

I wish to say a few words regarding the matter of job security. After all, the issues that separate the parties are pretty well down to two, wages and job security. I have tried to listen to and to read all that has been said or written about it. I cannot understand why the government says, through the Postmaster General (Mr. Kierans), that it is expected there will be more jobs in the Post Office in four or five years than at the present time and yet is unwilling to put a job security

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

clause into the contract. If it was the other way and the government was afraid it was going to have to reduce the number of jobs, we could understand the position. This position is completely beyond understanding. I think it is fair on the part of the workers to ask for job security. On the other side of the coin, there is no reason for the position the government has taken.

It is Friday afternoon. It is getting late. Many members want to speak. There is no reason why everyone must speak his full time. I am going to take my seat because I want my intervention in this debate to be one that zeroed in on one point. We do not need the kind of talk we have had from the Postmaster General, taking us all over the lot. What is needed is to face the important issue, getting the strike settled. The only way the strike can be settled is by an honest dose of collective bargaining. We will not get that as long as it is done under the shadow of the present guidelines policy, and I urge an immediate commencement of bargaining that is really in good faith.

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member who has just spoken has indicated, there might be some merit in trying to put the facts, as well as some of the myths, regarding this particular situation into proper perspective. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) has suggested that, as he sees it, there is a distinct lack of honesty in the process of collective bargaining which is now going on. I wish to address myself to that question. Perhaps the hon. member has been misled or does not understand the actual steps that have been taken and the offers which have been made. The suggestion that the collective bargaining process in this particular instance is being rendered nugatory as a consequence of guidelines proposed by Dr. Young, Chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission and supported by the government, is really without foundation.

Perhaps it is important for hon. members to know that there is now, and has been since early June, an offer made by the employer, in this case the government, before the Council of Postal Unions that will raise the rate of pay for letter carriers from the current figure of $2.99 an hour to the equivalent of $3.19 per hour, retroactive to October 1, 1969 with a further raise to $3.25 an hour as of June 1, this month, and a further raise to $3.40 per hour as of April 1, 1971. That offer is now on the table.

This offer was made at the time of mediation, May 31 to June 2, and was referred to by the Council of Postal Unions or one of its spokesman as baloney. If this is baloney, I suggest it is quite a large package representing, as it does, an increase in pay and benefits of approximately $42 million over the 30-month period of the proposed contract. Further, the postal clerks would now be receiving $3.40 per hour and could look forward to a pay rate of $3.55 per hour as of April 1, 1971 if the Council were to accept the government offer.

In spite of what the hon. member who has just spoken alleges, the government has offered and continues to stand ready to write into any future contract comprehensive provisions for the protection of workers in the bargaining unit from the impact of technological change. I am told that this term of art is covered by the phrase "job security". As far as I can ascertain, what is being sought specifically under the heading of "job security" is not protection for the worker from the onslaught of technical change, but an unqualified guarantee that once on the payroll the man will not for any reason be put off the payroll. I think probably that is a little unique in Canadian employment practices. I think hon. members will understand if there is resistance to this kind of demand. I hope there will be an acceptance of the arithmetic of the current wage offers.

Having made a series of offers beginning last February and in spite of many attempts to get the Council to at least present some kind of counter-proposal substantiated with some supporting facts, the Council has stood rooted in the position set out in the minority report of its representative on the conciliation board. Hon. members will recall that the report of this board was made public on May 4, almost two months ago.

I mentioned on an earlier occasion a number of issues which still divide the position rigorously maintained by the Council from the views of the majority on the conciliation board. I will not attempt to repeat them here. I remind hon. members that with respect to employment in the public service there is a very wide range of fringe benefits which members of the public service, including those in the postal service, now enjoy. This range of benefits is far in excess of those available to employees in comparable occupations in the private sector.

There has recently been considerable publicity surrounding certain information on current rates of pay and earnings of postal employees compared with other elements in the private sector. I wish to say a few words about these alleged comparisons. For example, it has been mentioned that the average weekly earnings of employees in Canadian industry were $124.64 per week in February of this year.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

• (6:20 p.m.)

Mr. Drury: I repeat, the average weekly earnings of employees in Canadian industry are $124.60 a week as of last February. This figure includes overtime payments, shift premiums and other payments. The comparable average for postal employees, including the same premium payments, is now $132.69 as of last February. We should, then, be comparing $124 as an average for industrial employees in Canada with $132 for postal employees. These are the figures prior to, and not including, the pay increases which have been offered. These increases, if accepted, would raise the earnings of postal employees to $143.20 as of June 1 of this year.

Another set of figures relates to the average hourly earnings of employees in manufacturing industries which will be acknowledged, I think, as being one of the better paid sectors of industry in Canada. In February of 1970, their hourly wages, including overtime and other premium payments, were $2.93 an hour. The average hourly earnings of postal employees, including the same premium payments, were $3.32 an hour prior to the increases now being proposed and which would be applicable if the current government offer accepted. If the present offer were accepted, the average would rise to $3.58 per hour as of June 1 of this year.

Previous speakers have made reference to a letter addressed by the co-chairmen of the Council of Postal Unions to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) yesterday alleging a series of statements attributed to the Prime Minister and making a rather unfortunate attempt to refute an alleged statement by the right hon. gentleman. I shall not attempt to deal with this, except to say that this afternoon the Prime Minister sent to the co-chairmen a detailed answer to this letter refuting effectively the misstatement.

Mr. Orlikow: It had better be more correct than his figures last week. They were wrong.

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of mythology which makes this whole postal

situation so confused. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken is in the happy position of not having heard the Prime Minister speak, of not having had a chance to see a transcript of what was said; he is relying upon the allegations of a group of people who likewise had no opportunity of hearing what was said or of knowing the context in which it was said, and who are merely making allegations without foundation. I hope he will not fall into this kind of error in the future.

What follows? I repeat, as I have throughout the course of this difficult negotiation, that we stand prepared to negotiate upon any reasonable basis. I suggest we cannot in good conscience make any progress while the Council of Postal Unions remains adamant and inflexible in its position and refuses to put forward any concrete proposals other than those put forward by the union according to the minority report of the conciliation board. The charge is made, of course, and I have heard it repeated in the House today, that the position of the government is rigid. I would suggest to the House that the record of this negotiation would, if examined, disclose that the employer was the first to make a proposal relating to pay. Some seven months after the conclusion of the agreement, without any specific union pay demand having been formulated, when it was obvious that no progress was being made, it was the employer who initiated the proposal that the matter should go before a conciliation board. Once the report of the board had been received, it was again the employer who took the initiative to keep negotiations going.

When it became clear that progress was still impossible it was the employer who suggested to the Council that the services of a mediator should be employed. The Council regretted that it could not join us in such a request. It was again the employer who made a new offer, a proposal which would have increased the cost of the earlier government offer by more than $300,000.

The Council, I regret to say, has failed to support any of its demands with statistical data or with any kind of substantive argument. Perhaps one clue as to the motivation which governs at least one side of the bargaining table has been given by one of the co-chairmen, Mr. Roger Decarie, of the Council of Postal Unions. I quote a view expressed this month by Mr. Decarie:

> If the employer is really hurt, then that is the time to sit down and bargain a settlement.

[Mr. Drury.]

It is clear from utterances we have heard that the Council of Postal Unions does not feel that the present disrupting tactics it has carried on at the expense of the taxpayer and of the general public have hurt the government. Until they come to the conclusion that the government has been sufficiently hurt they are not ready to sit down and negotiate a settlement.

This is the real crux of the problem, not, as the hon. member for Winnipeg North suggested, lack of honesty in collective bargaining. The actual fact of the matter is that the Council takes the view that until somebody is hurt enough it is no use talking about a settlement, and it appears we have not yet reached this point.

Mr. Speaker, I think it would be quite difficult to hurt the government. It will not be hard to hurt the taxpayers of Canada, the unfortunate public of Canada, but it will be very hard indeed for this kind of operation to hurt the government.

Mr. Orlikow: Insensitive.

Mr. Drury: I suggest to the interjector who has just made that observation—

Mr. Stanfield: May I ask a question?

Mr. Drury: I have to deal with another Tory. It is not a question of insensitivity. What is involved is a rather more clear understanding of the facts, an understanding which seems to have escaped the interjector. He is not too clear what this is all about. Now, if the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) wishes to ask a question I will be glad to answer.

Mr. Stanfield: Just for clarification, would the minister indicate the percentages involved in the increases which have been proposed by the employer?

Mr. Drury: I do not have the precise arithmetic, I regret to say.

Some hon. Members: Oh.

• (6:30 p.m.)

Mr. Stanfield: Might I assist the minister and ask him whether the percentages exceed the guidelines that the government has laid down?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, in response to that question, may I say that none of the agreements which the employer, in this case the government, has negotiated with the public

service have exceeded the guidelines. As I recited some time ago, we have already achieved some eight agreements by negotiation, none of which exceeded the guidelines. I think that if this proves anything it is that, so far as the government is concerned, it is not that the guidelines are binding but that reason prevails; that the guidelines are appropriate for a reasonable series of settlements.

Mr. Broadbent: By definition.

Mr. Drury: By definition; that is correct. By logic, not by emotion. According to the hon. gentleman's emotion, the guidelines are wrong. Logic, however, fails him.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the President of the Treasury Board a question? He has told the members of this House that none of the agreements negotiated have given the employees more than the increase laid down in the guidelines. Could the President of the Treasury Board tell the House how much the salary of the position of secretary of the Treasury Board has increased during the last two years? Is it more than 5 or 6 per cent, or less?

Mr. Drury: On a per annum basis?

Mr. Orlikow: Yes.

Mr. Drury: The secretary of the Treasury Board has not yet held that office for two years.

Mr. Orlikow: Not the person, the position.

Mr. Drury: The increases provided to that level of public servant, specifically secretary of the Treasury Board, have not exceeded 5 per cent per annum. This is, as the hon. gentleman knows, the size of the permissible range. The actual increases granted will only reach that figure if there is a certificate of meritorious performance. It may not be that high; it is not automatic.

Mr. Baldwin: There is no hope for the cabinet, then.

Mr. Drury: The hon. gentleman apparently does not know what cabinet ministers are paid. His ambition to become one might become less strong if he realized how hard he would have to work and how little he would be paid.

Mr. Baldwin: I know how ineffective they are.

Mr. Drury: Throughout these negotiations with the council, as with our negotiations with the other 80 bargaining units in the public service, the employer has held to the belief that the only sound and reasonable way to reach equity is through comparisons of benefits, pay and otherwise, between the public servant and the comparable occupations in the private sector. Where direct comparisons are not possible, then those outside occupations with the greatest number of similar qualifications and type of work are used.

It is obvious that under such a system one cannot compare seriously the rewards earned by a highly qualified tradesman with an occupation with a relatively low skill requirement. The application of this system has resulted in the establishment and maintenance of a standard of employment conditions within the public service that in general—and I firmly believe this—are second to none in this country and in many respects superior to most.

I am confident that the process of collective bargaining which is going on in the public service with the bargaining units is being conducted in most instances on the basis of logic and reason and will continue to be so conducted; that the public servants, with perhaps some few exceptions, will show themselves to be reasonable; and that we will be successful in establishing the right and proper kind of industrial relations between employer and employee that are based on a fair, reasoned and agreed settlement of changes in conditions of pay and other conditions of work.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to speak this evening, and I shall not speak for long, but there are one or two things that need to be said following the speech of the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury).

First of all, it is clear that there is no collective bargaining here in the ordinary sense. It is also very clear that the government has, as it has said, established a guideline beyond which it does not intend to go. The President of the Treasury Board is infinitely satisfied that this is a fair and reasonable upper limit to which the government should adhere. This may or may not be the case, but it is a purely subjective judgment on his and the government's part, except to the extent that both rely upon the guideline program of the Prices and Incomes Commission as the governing authority.

If the President of the Treasury Board takes the position that a guideline has been laid down for the whole country and that it is

being followed, then there is some criterion upon which the government can rely. I must say that it seemed to me the President of the Treasury Board spoke with great confidence, if I may say so—I do not wish to be personal in this regard—about his wisdom and objectivity.

Mr. Drury: It is certainly justified.

Mr. Stanfield: He says that it is justified, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Baldwin: He was laughing when he said that, too.

Mr. Stanfield: I want to make the point that all there is is his own personal judgment, and the judgment of those associated with him as to whether he is being reasonable. The vehemence with which he attacked, not his opponents, but the union, and the vehemence with which he attacked their motives makes his own objectivity a little suspect, as far as I am concerned, and I am putting it very mildly when I say that.

I do not want to take too much of the time of the House, but the position is this: The government is taking a fixed position which it has convinced itself is reasonable, and it refuses to go beyond that. It takes the position that anybody who suggests that it should go beyond that is being completely unreasonable. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, there is surely no longer any collective bargaining in the ordinary sense of the term. If the government likes, it can blame the post office employees for being unreasonable. It can blame the post office employees for refusing to accept what the government is proposing. But the President of the Treasury Board is caught on the horns of a dilemma. He has had to concede, as he conceded in response to my question, that the government is not prepared to exceed the 6 per cent guideline. I simply say to the President of the Treasury Board, and to the other members of the government, that if this is to be the guideline for the whole country they should see that it is followed.

The minister produced nothing in the way of information this afternoon that was at all convincing with regard to objectivity. There may be stubbornness on both sides, but we have had a pretty good display of stubbornness and sanctimoniousness here this afternoon.

• (6:40 p.m.)

Mr. Drury: I wonder whether the hon. gentleman would permit a question?

[Mr. Stanfield.]

Mr. Stanfield: Yes.

Mr. Drury: The suggestion was made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) that the government was wrong in insisting that the offer it made was reasonable and insisting on reasonableness. He apparently does not share the view that the offer made by the government is a reasonable one, and feels that by sticking to it and assuming it is reasonable, the government is behaving less than wisely. I am not sure that he wants us to be unreasonable and go beyond what we consider to be reasonable. I ask him then, if the government offer is not reasonable, what would be a reasonable offer? Given the fact that before the proposed increases the current wages of postal workers exceeded the average of hourly earnings and hourly rates in Canadian industry, what would be a reasonable offer if the offer made by the government is not reasonable? The hon. gentleman tells me that what I have described as reasonable is not so.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, let me say first of all that if the hon. minister wants me to settle a dispute, he better move out or move over. Let me say secondly, that the minister himself said a little earlier that one ought to be a little careful about making comparisons. He has given no indication at all this afternoon as to why it is reasonable to compare the wages being discussed with a Canadian average. There has been absolutely nothing said by the minister that would indicate this is a reasonable comparison. This is a comparison that the minister and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) have been flinging around. They themselves are always careful to say that one should always exercise some care with regard to what one is comparing. The minister simply said that the postal wages exceed the average wage, but what reason have I or has anyone else to believe that this is a reasonable comparison?

Mr. Olson: You looked into it far enough to call it unreasonable.

Mr. Stanfield: What I said, quite simply was that the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury) is taking the position that he is infinitely reasonable and the other fellows are infinitely unreasonable. Don't bother shaking your head, I listened to the minister tell us how reasonable he is. I am simply saying that it is clear the government is adhering to the guideline policy and, therefore, there is not

collective bargaining in the ordinary sense of the term. I think those facts are completely undisputable.

Mr. Olson: Tell us what a reasonable offer is.

Mr. Stanfield: It is not for me to decide what a reasonable offer is; I am not engaged in the negotiating process.

An hon. Member: Oh, yes you are.

Mr. Olson: You are getting into it now. Tell us where we are wrong.

Mr. Stanfield: I am telling you that you are taking an arbitrary position which the President of the Treasury Board says is reasonable, although he has given us no reason to believe that it is. He has taken a position which we see being pierced all over the place. This puts the minister in a position that he has not justified.

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): As the Leader of the Opposition has just pointed out, the President of the Treasury Board presented us with a typical Liberal view which defines reasonableness in terms of what the cabinet happens to believe at a given time. We need only wait for the President of the Treasury Board to make the equation between what the Liberal party believes, reasonableness and Godliness. I expect that in an age of prevailing agnosticism, we should forget the Godliness part.

The President of the Treasury Board claimed he was going to make a reasonable reply to emotion laden speeches from this side of the House. He claimed he was going to introduce some facts into an otherwise vacuous debate. I should like to deal very briefly with his purported facts which any reasonable man, according to him, should accept. I will deal with those and then sit down.

The President of the Treasury Board recognizes that there are two important questions involved here; the first concerns security and the second wages. Let me indicate why security is important to the postal workers. We have a man in charge of postal services in this country who has talked about the relevance and importance of introducing mechanistic and automatic devices into postal services. He talked very sensibly about these. The workers very sensibly, in turn, have also been quite concerned about the effects this might have on their jobs. Some of them quite properly have also referred to the Freedman report which this government has had before it for five years or so, and which the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) says he supports philosophically.

Let me draw attention to the fact that this report suggests that the workers of this country have a vested interest in their jobs, as do owners and the government. A very philosophical distinction was introduced by Mr. Justice Freedman. The workers are concerned with the issue of job security and have referred to a government commission which supports their view that the government, of all employers, should be trying to do something about this issue of workers' rights and protection in their jobs. The report suggests that this government institution should lead the way in the country in bringing in progressive measures which would provide real security, worker involvement and opportunity. This government has not come up with an improvement in this respect over any which have existed, even among the most reactionary kind of enterprise in this country.

Let me be specific and refer to what the minister said a few moments ago. He said it was not the case that the postal workers were not presented with a proposal concerning job security. He told the House that, in fact, the government negotiators agreed to talk about control over the effects of technological change. The facts are, as I have been informed recently, that this is not being done or at least is not being done in any meaningful way. What the workers have been told is, on the one hand, that postal officials will agree to talk about the effects of the introduction of technological change, or at best it has been suggested that they could have a contract which would involve 90 days notice to any worker who is about to be laid off. Many private firms in this country are now willing to give up to six months notice to a worker who is going to be laid off.

Here we have a government which the Minister of Labour claims is progressive. Here we have a President of the Treasury Board who thinks that you deal meaningfully with the question of technological change by making the offer that workers will be given 90 days notice before being dismissed. I suggest that this amount is no offer at all. Of course, this could mean that workers who have held their jobs for 20 years or more could be laid off with 90 days notice. Why is not some proposal presented to the negotiators for the unions which would involve them in a much more positive way in the working out of the effect of the technological changes;

why is there not such a suggestion made to the workers? Of course, if some attempt is to be made to qualify the effect, why is it not suggested that workers with a minimum of two years or five years seniority be given the security they request. It seems to me this would be the type of positive proposal the government could make if it wanted to deal meaningfully with the matter of job security. No such offer, however, has been made, and I believe the postal workers are absolutely right when they suggest the government is not seriously negotiating on the question of job security.

• (6:50 p.m.)

Let us look at the other so-called reason brought forward by the President of the Treasury Board. He trotted out statistics. He charted a list of specific wage increases, claiming of course by implication that the list of figures he was giving the House represented a very substantial increase in wages for the workers involved. What he did not tell the House, of course, is that when one analyses the figures he presented they really amount to the 5-5-5 percentage formula that has already been suggested. In other words, it is not even up to the guideline proposal of 6 per cent. It is 1 per cent below it. It is not up to the proposal of Judge Lippé, but is 1.1 per cent below it. So, it is well within the guidelines and well below any acceptable standard I would suggest for workers in the postal service. In other words, the President of the Treasury Board in his wonderful contribution to this debate in the name of reason has really trotted out the old arguments and has provided no new information. In fact, he is misleading the House about what actually has been happening.

An hon. Member: Oh, oh.

Mr. Broadbent: That is the case. You can get up and refute what I say with facts later if you like. I suggest he not only has misled the House with what he presented to us but has revealed the kind of attitude with which obviously the workers in the postal service had to deal. It is an attitude which assumes that some kind of a national guideline of 6 per cent has been established, and that any reasonable man in any part of the government service, or indeed in private enterprise, should accept it. But as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) pointed out the government has not at any time in this debate, or at any other time, attempted to present a rational economic justification for the 6 per cent approach. I say to the President of the Treasury Board that there are women workers in my community who are receiving $1.30 an hour now. They are on strike and are being offered 2 per cent by their wonderful employer. I would suggest to him that 6 per cent would not be adequate for these workers and that something like at least 15 per cent might be justifiable.

If the government is to bring in any kind of guidelines, it makes no economic sense whatever, if any degree of equity is to be considered, to impose a uniform standard upon workers across this country. To conclude my remarks, I should like to return to the point raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). It would seem to me to be quite clear now, especially following the observations of the President of the Treasury Board, that the government is using the postal workers as an example for all workers in Canada, public or private, and is imposing the 6 per cent standard on them. I say it is about time the government brought before the country, either in this House or in some other forum, serious economic reasons for its program in an effort to justify the 6 per cent guidelines. It should go beyond its rhetoric of reasonableness. I suggest beyond that, that if we are to have any kind of guidelines as such, they must take into consideration prices and profits. We in the New Democratic Party would participate in the development of such a program in this country. We would participate if the workers in this country were involved in such an effective policy which would include prices and profits and differentiate between levels of incomes among different workers and in different sectors of the economy.

I say that the postal workers are justified in their criticism of the government's general handling of the negotiations, and are justified in their specific demand in respect of job security and wage policy.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters).

Mr. Osler: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The Chair has already recognized the hon. member for Timiskaming.

Mr. Osler: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the point that was brought forward by the previous speaker appears to me to be off the

mark because the commission has already set $3 or $3.50 an hour—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member knows that is not a point of order.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member for Winnipeg North or South or East wishes to make a speech, I will yield to him because I have always been very happy to take the last slot in any session. This year we have not been able to bargain for anything for ourselves, so perhaps we should put in a word for the postal workers. I listened to the comments of the Postmaster General (Mr. Kierans) and of the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury) today. As I listened to these gentlemen, I realized how the employees probably feel. The arguments these gentlemen used would seem to be directly limited to their personal experience in the political arena. Their ability to negotiate leaves a great deal to be desired. It would seem that when the government passed legislation that would allow certain civil servants to negotiate in the normal procedure, it really did not believe they should have this right. It would seem also that most of the people who supported that legislation were of the opinion that the civil servant should not have the right to go on strike, that this is a terrible thing and that such a right should be curtailed and kept within certain limits.

I suggest that if negotiations are to be conducted, they must be conducted outside this sphere. The government is not impartial in its negotiations with its employees. In this case they bring in a guideline and in another case it will be something else. In my opinion, the government does not negotiate in good faith. While speaking to one of my friends in the CLC, it came to my attention that if the proposals suggested for the Post Office workers were implemented, the Post Office workers would in fact receive very little. The example was used of a postal worker earning $6,718 a year. If he received 6 per cent, and not the 5 per cent the government is talking about, this would give him an increase of $403.08. Looking at the tax structure of last year, and applying it to his total salary, this would cost him an additional $114, so he would be left with $289.08.

• (7:00 p.m.)

The cost of living over the last four or five years has averaged slightly less than 5 per cent. The Dominion Bureau of Statistics figures indicate it will be 4.9 per cent this year. When deducted from the increase, this would amount to $287.82. The hours of work have been cut from six days to five days, and the workload has not been decreased. We are offering these employees $1.26 spread over the next 52 weeks. If anybody thinks that is generous, I wonder who they are. I suggest that this government is not negotiating in good faith and that it never has negotiated in good faith. This government has no interest in organized labour.

Today we have tabled under your name, Mr. Speaker, a document showing the wage increases for a whole list of employees of the House of Commons. It was presented by the Commissioners of Internal Economy. It is called the "Revised list of pay for employees of the House of Commons whose positions are classified hereunder". They received 5 per cent, with no union and no bargaining at all. The government decided, out of the goodness of its heart, that the least it could do was pay them 5 per cent more or it would lose some of these people. Now we talk about negotiations. That is b.s., Mr. Speaker! These are not negotiations. The government is not offering to this union any more than it gave its employees, who are not organized. The government does not believe in negotiations.

An hon. Member: But that is reasonable.

Mr. Peters: Somebody says that is reasonable. I have seen company unions that were reasonable, and if you stayed long enough they even took your shirt. I would not blame this union for taking pretty strong action against the government. Some of the responsibility then becomes my responsibility because I am a representative of the people, as are the rest of my 263 colleagues.

I suggest that we should not accept the statement made by the President of the Treasury Board this afternoon that his offer to the union is reasonable. It is not reasonable. It is the kind of thing one gives to somebody without their even asking for it. I always thought it was a good thing to give my kids 25 cents. When they became a little older and started negotiating, it was not 25 cents or $1 for which they asked. It used to shock me, but they asked for $5. They said they needed it to take the girl friend to a show, to buy her a coke afterwards and to buy gas with which drive the car. They had to have the money to cover that. So it was not the 25 cents which I thought was reasona-

ble; it was what they were able to show me was reasonable in terms of their needs. Any organization that negotiates on a poorer basis than that is not really negotiating.

Mr. Côté: How much did you give your kids?

Mr. Peters: I usually ended up giving them $5. I do not believe that in negotiations one should give more than is asked. The minister asked this afternoon how much we would give them. We would give them somewhere between 5 per cent and what they are asking for. I suggest that this is the only way in which negotiations can be conducted. If these workers are told day in and day out that they will lose their jobs because of automation, then you should give them greater security than they have today. I am not telling the minister what kind of security he should give them, but I am telling him to be reasonable, to be responsible and to negotiate a wage somewhere between their demands and what he thinks is fair and reasonable. He represents the country, and he represents me in these negotiations. We do not want to give more than the $5 the kid asks for, but surely we can go part way in giving these workers what they ask for, if they can show us that it is reasonable.

I suggest that if all the civil servants who do not have a bargaining agency receive the same as is being offered to this union, either the government is not being reasonable or these people had better get rid of their union. If the government think they are justified in forcing a strike situation which will be costly to everyone, they will eventually have to ask us to come back to Parliament to solve their problems for them. I suggest it may cost them more in the end. I suggest that if the Commissioners of Internal Economy could have given the civil servants under your jurisdiction, Mr. Speaker, out of the goodness of their hearts, 5 per cent, the government should at least be as generous or more generous with the people who are negotiating with them and offer them a wage half way between what they think is reasonable, which is 5 per cent, and what the union is asking for. The negotiations can be brought to a conclusion very easily if both parties meet halfway.

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, I should like to add a few words to this debate. The hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) said he would be the last to speak in this part of the session of Parliament. He may or may not be. However, it seems to me that the whole debate this afternoon is focused on a very basic problem in the country. I do not really think that more talk in this chamber will help the workers, help the government or help anyone else. But I do think that the government has to accept its responsibility in this very basic problem of the postal service for Canadians.

To my mind this situation illustrates the malaise that is starting to affect the whole society. It is not a breakdown of law and order, but a breakdown in the credibility and responsibility of the government. It is a breakdown in our reliance on things which we used to take for granted. Perhaps the Postmaster General (Mr. Kierans) should go up in the air in a rocket to see Telesat, and from up there perhaps he could help solve the postal problem. Perhaps he could do that better than by giving gratuitous press conferences in the lobbies and corridors, which I think upsets the balance in the collective bargaining process.

I think the basic problem, which the President of the Treasury Board in his bland statement in the House today completely ignored, of the Canadian public who have always relied on a reliable Post Office service and who have always believed that the mail goes through regardless of sleet and snow—a belief which has now been upset—is that the mail service is disturbed or is not working, depending on what part of the country you are in when the rotational strike hits. Mr. Laniel from Beauharnois, or whoever he may be—

An hon. Member: Don't be so comic.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member knows he cannot refer to his colleagues by name. He should refer to their constituency.

Mr. Nowlan: I apologize, Mr. Speaker, but I have not seen the hon. member often enough to know him by his constituency. However, I realize that that is what I should have done. Be that as it may—and I will conclude in 30 seconds—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nowlan: If I get such applause when I say I will close in 30 seconds, perhaps I should suggest that I will do so in two minutes and the applause will increase in ratio. I do not intend to hold anything up but I want to impress upon the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury)—I do not think

it has come through to him as yet—that the sickness in the whole system is the issue right now. I refer to the fact that Parliament will recess tonight and the postal service will continue to have its problems and will strike on a rotational basis where some places will get service and others will not.

• (7:10 p.m.)

The fact is that the whole system is on trial here. It is not just the political career of the President of the Treasury Board that is at stake. He may negotiate a settlement, or he may not. The fact is that if the government lets this thing go it will be like a cancer spreading through the whole system.

The government came into office two years ago yesterday, on the basis of—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nowlan: The hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour (Mr. Perrault) and some others give halfhearted applause. I suggest the Canadian people would give only halfhearted applause, in view of the great expectations they had two years ago. A government that came into power on a platform of participatory democracy, a just society and all these beautiful sounding phrases which have been preached since Jesus Christ walked out of the Sea of Galilee, is not discharging its duty by letting this sickness continue.

The President of the Treasury Board put a facetious question to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield). He asked, "What would you offer"? The Leader of the Opposition, as the hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour knows only too well, is not involved in contract negotiations at the table.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nowlan: If the young member from Matane wants to get off the repository for his brains, I will answer any question he wishes to ask.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Annapolis Valley (Mr. Nowlan) has the floor. If the hon. member for Matane wants to make a speech, he can do so afterwards.

[*Translation*]

Mr. De Bané: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The member for Matane on a point of order.

Mr. De Bané: Mr. Speaker, my colleague opposite urged me to ask him a question which he would gladly answer. I shall do so immediately—

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That was not my understanding. I understood the hon. member suggested that if the hon. member for Matane wanted to make a speech, he could make it. The hon. member is now asking whether the hon. member for Annapolis Valley will accept a question.

[*Translation*]

The hon. member for Matane may put his question.

Mr. Nowlan: I will try to answer it.

Mr. De Bané: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member rises every day to speak on any subject. The President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury) asked him to make a constructive suggestion. Is he in a position to do so instead of making speeches?

[*English*]

Mr. Nowlan: I have not been making too many daily speeches, Mr. Speaker. The fact is that I am as much an expert on postal services as the hon. member for Matane or the President of the Treasury Board, because my mail is arriving two days, two weeks, two months late. In that way I feel every bit as qualified as anyone else to comment on the postal service.

The point I am making is that Parliament is now going to rise. That is fine. Let us get away from here because conservation, dialogue and debate will not resolve the postal situation. With all due respect to the Minister of Communications, I do not think the postal disturbance will be resolved until he is moved out of that portfolio. I believe that the postal unions in effect would like to have his head on a platter. For what it is worth in a political sense, if that would solve the postal problem I suggest his head should be placed on a platter. The President of the Treasury Board should consider this suggestion. Mr. Speaker, I am not suggesting this with any malice aforethought or afterthought.

This debate was called by the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie) and by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis)—who, incidentally, could not find the time to be here—to try and focus the attention of the government, not just on the administration of

the postal department but upon the fact that as long as this situation continues the people of Canada will more and more wonder about the whole system. In that respect the postal problem is very important, and it is a situation that the President of the Treasury Board seems incapable of settling.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 26(13), I am satisfied that the debate is concluded and I therefore declare the motion carried.

[*English*]

Pursuant to the special order adopted earlier this day, this House stands adjourned until two o'clock p.m. on Monday, October 5, 1970. Before I leave the chair I should like to invite hon. members to spend the next few minutes in room 16.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The House adjourned at 7.17 p.m. until Monday, October 5 at two o'clock p.m., pursuant to special order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, October 5, 1970

The House met at 2 p.m.

[*Translation*]

PRIVILEGE

MR. COMEAU—EMPLOYMENT OF MEMBER FOR HALTON-WENTWORTH BY NEWFOUNDLAND DEPARTMENT

Mr. Louis-Roland Comeau (South Western Nova): Mr. Speaker, since I am the first one to take the floor since the adjournment, I take this opportunity to offer you my best wishes for a good session, even though there have been some changes in the cabinet and the opposition has re-organized itself.

[*English*]

I rise on a question of privilege affecting all members of the House of Commons as the representatives of the people. Since July 15 the hon. member for Halton-Wentworth (Mr. Morison), chairman of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Regional Development, has been employed by the Department of Community and Social Development of the province of Newfoundland.

I do not quarrel with the hon. member having been hired by a provincial government, but his employment in this case appears to be in conflict with the House of Commons Act as it relates to Members of Parliament. I do question, however, the impartiality of the hon. member and his continuing as chairman of the Standing Committee on Regional Development. This committee reviews the estimates of the department and is responsible for voting government moneys to carry out its regional development programs all across Canada, including the federal-provincial Newfoundland plan.

According to reports, the hon. member was working for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion liaison committee of federal-provincial officials and was employed as a consultant working with the committee to initiate the Newfoundland projects. Although I have much respect for the chairman of the committee, as a member for Nova Scotia may I point out that that province signed an agreement with Ottawa and is on the verge of signing a new agreement affecting a greater part of the province; consequently I feel that the Newfoundland plan is much more liable to receive attention than others, and I sense a direct conflict of interest.

In conclusion, if the chairman of the Standing Committee on Regional Development does not resign as chairman immediately, I shall move a motion, seconded by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath), that this matter be studied by the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

• (2:10 p.m.)

Mr. J. B. Morison (Halton-Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I rise to reply to the question of privilege that has just been raised. I will pass over the first part of the question of privilege in that my seat in the House does not appear to be in question.

Before going to Newfoundland I checked with the Department of Justice and also checked with the House whether or not I was contravening the Act. The advice I received was that a precedent had been set before in connection with working for a provincial government and that I was not contravening the Act.

As to my impartiality as chairman of the committee, I should like to say to you, sir, that when I first came to this House I was amazed at the facility that you displayed here. That amazement became almost hero worship as the years went by. I thought this facility was partly due to your wit or personality, but as I watched you I realized that a great deal of your facility was based on knowledge.

I have been chairman of the Standing Committee on Regional Development for a couple of years. Over that period of time I would say that, apart from the time taken by one member from the east and one member from the west, most of the time spent on the work of the committee has been taken up by members from Newfoundland. I felt that if I were really going to do a job as chairman of that committee I should make myself aware of the situation in Newfoundland.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Morison: The best way to do this, of course, was to get some first-hand information. If opposition members think I am

making light of this matter, may I point out to them that one of the members from Newfoundland tried to encourage my committee to come to Newfoundland in May or June with the promise that we would go tuna fishing. I believed him, Mr. Speaker, until I realized that the tuna do not come in until July.

Be that as it may, I believe within my heart that I am now a better chairman of the regional development committee. The decision whether I am going to be chairman during the next session of the House depends on the committee. Since to all intents and purposes my work on the committee is now finished, I am perfectly prepared to stand for re-election when the committee is convened again. It was opposition members who asked me to be chairman, and if the members of the committee ask me to be chairman again, I will be proud to accept the offer of the opposition. Otherwise I shall take my seat as an ordinary member of the committee.

Some hon. Members: Hear! hear!

Mr. Speaker: The matter raised by the hon. member for South Western Nova is one of interest not only to the hon. member who raised the question and to the hon. member who has just spoken but to the whole House. In view of the fact that there is such a lengthy program of business ahead of us today, perhaps hon. members will allow the Chair to give the situation some thought and to study the precedents before a ruling is handed down. The matter will be taken under very serious consideration during the next day or so.

VACANCY

Mr. Speaker: It is my duty to inform the House that I have received a communication notifying me that a vacancy has occurred in the representation, namely:

Mr. George Muir, member for the electoral district of Lisgar, by decease.

Accordingly I have addressed my warrant to the Chief Electoral Officer for the issue of a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

THE LATE GEORGE MUIR

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we were saddened by the news during the recess of the death of our colleague and friend, George Muir, member for Lisgar. Born and raised in Manitoba, he was an accomplished farmer, a man who understood both the hardships and the satisfactions associated with that way of life.

He was first elected to this House in 1957 and served continuously until his death a little more than a month ago. We remember him as a man of warmth and kind humour, and we share our sense of loss with that of his family and those Canadians he represented in Parliament.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in paying tribute to the late George Muir. Probably those among whom one lives are in the best position to judge a person. When one applies this test to George Muir there can be no question about the love and affection with which he was regarded by his constituents and the people among whom he lived. He was a quiet-spoken man, a reasonable man, but also a man of strong convictions and a very high sense of public duty. He had a thorough knowledge of agricultural problems, particularly with regard to the West. We in my party, and I am sure the House as a whole, will greatly miss his counsel and advice.

On behalf of my colleagues and myself I join with the Prime Minister in extending our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Muir and the members of the family.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, the members of this party want to concur in the expressions of appreciation and the tributes that have been paid to the late hon. member for Lisgar.

George Muir sat close to this group and consequently we had an opportunity to get to know him very well. We had a great appreciation of his kindliness, his good humour and his thorough knowledge of agricultural problems and the people he represented in the House. All of us were surprised and saddened at the news of his death. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that you will be expressing the view of members in all parts of this chamber in conveying to his family and his constituents the deep sense of loss that we feel at his untimely death.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my group I join with the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and with

the Leader of the Official Opposition to extend to the family of George Muir our deep sympathy.

Mr. Muir was highly considered in the House of Commons and the electors of the Lisgar constituency have surely lost one of the most active members in the House.

Our most sincere sympathy goes to his family.

VACANCY

Mr. Speaker: I must inform the House that I have received notice that a vacancy has occurred in the representation due to the resignation of the member for Labelle, Hon. Léo Cadieux, who has accepted an office of emolument under the Crown.

I accordingly issued my warrant to the Chief Electoral Officer to make out a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

[*English*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

RESIGNATIONS OF DEPUTY SPEAKER AND DEPUTY CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES OF THE WHOLE

Mr. Speaker: With regret I have to inform the House that the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Faulkner) has submitted his resignation as Deputy Speaker of the House and also that the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Béchard) has tendered his resignation as Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole House.

During his term of office the hon. member for Peterborough had acquired an excellent knowledge and understanding of the rules.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: His interpretation of the Standing Orders and precedents has always been marked by fairness and good judgment and tempered with understanding and good humour. I am sure I express the views of all hon. members when I say that as Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole he has enjoyed the well deserved confidence of his colleagues. I am personally grateful to him for his wise counsel and sympathetic support at all times and in all circumstances. On behalf of the House I wish him well in the discharge of his new responsibilities.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: I also received with regret notice of the resignation of the hon. member for Bonaventure.

Like the Deputy Speaker, the Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole House demonstrated unfailing impartiality and fairness, thus earning the confidence of his colleagues and of the House.

Speaking for the House, I express our gratitude to the hon. members for Bonaventure and Peterborough for the services rendered to us, and wish them Godspeed in the discharge of their new responsibilities.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

• (2:20 p.m.)

[*English*]

APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY SPEAKER AND CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES OF THE WHOLE

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

That Mr. Russell C. Honey, member for the electoral district of Northumberland-Durham, be appointed Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Motion agreed to.

[*Translation*]

APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES OF THE WHOLE

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, that Mr. Gérald Laniel, member for the electoral district of Beauharnois, be appointed Deputy chairman of Committees of the Whole House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Motion agreed to.

[*English*]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a Message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate have passed Bill C-4, An Act to amend the Canada Corporations Act and other statutory provisions related to the subject matter of certain of those amendments, with amendments, to which the concurrence of this House is desired.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

LABOUR, MANPOWER AND IMMIGRATION

Third report of Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration—Mr. Weatherhead.

[*Translation*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND NATIONAL DEFENCE

The Deputy Chairman: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on External Affairs and National Defence, I have the honour to submit, both in French and in English, the 11th report of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence.

[*English*]

TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

Fourteenth report of Standing Committee on Transport and Communications—Mr. Turner (London East).

[*Editor's Note: For text of above reports, see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

ANNOUNCEMENT OF BY-ELECTIONS IN LISGAR, FRONTENAC AND LABELLE ELECTORAL DISTRICTS

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I should like to inform the House that by Order in Council PC 1970-1717 of October 2, 1970, writs have been issued today for by-elections to be held on Monday, November 16th, 1970, in the federal electoral districts of Lisgar, Manitoba, Frontenac, Quebec, and Labelle, Quebec.

THE MINISTRY

ANNOUNCEMENT OF CHANGES—APPOINTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, as is customary I should like to inform the House of certain changes in the ministry since the House recessed on June 26, 1970.

[*Translation*]

The Hon. Léo Cadieux resigned as Minister of National Defence to take up the duties of Canadian ambassador to France.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Since he was elected in 1962, Mr. Cadieux has represented the electoral district of Labelle. During his term as minister, his impeccable courteousness and his sense of humour made him popular, which is rarely the case amongst the ministers of a department that raises so much interest and provokes as many questions as that of the National Defence.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, the members' reaction would indicate that his agreeable presence will be missed by all those in this House.

[*English*]

A reallocation of responsibilities of five members of the cabinet was made, effective September 24, 1970: the Hon. Allan MacEachen, President of the Privy Council and Government House Leader, the Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté, Minister without Portfolio responsible for the Post Office, the Hon. Donald Macdonald, Minister of National Defence—

An hon. Member: This means war.

Mr. Trudeau: —the Hon. Otto Lang, Minister of Manpower and Immigration, with continued responsibility for the Wheat Board—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Trudeau: He is looking after me—the Hon. Herb Gray, Minister of National Revenue, with continued responsibility for advising the government on questions relating to foreign ownership. Also, on October 1, 1970, 14 new Parliamentary Secretaries were appointed.

I wish to table the letter of resignation from the Hon. Léo Cadieux and my reply thereto.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I may say a word in response to the official notification given by the Prime Minister. I should like to congratulate the new Minister of National Defence (Mr. Macdonald). I notice that the other day he said something to the effect that the troops were well prepared. I can only hope that they are well prepared for him, sir.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Stanfield: I wish to congratulate the new President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen), my colleague from Nova Scotia

and prospective House Leader. We look forward, of course, to continuing our usual amiable relationship.

With regard to the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Côté) who now has the responsibility of salvaging the operations of the Post Office, I must say something about this apparent sacrifice on his part, namely, that it seems a little mysterious. But perhaps, like some other mysteries, it will be cleared up in due course.

As to the new Parliamentary Secretaries, of course I congratulate them and extend my deepest sympathy to the former Parliamentary Secretaries as well as to their wives and families.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said he was going to make an announcement regarding changes in the cabinet. I think that most members will consider this to be a very gentle shuffle rather than a change. But it does provide an opportunity to pay tribute to one minister who is no longer here, namely, the former Minister of National Defence, Mr. Cadieux, and to say that we all agree with the Prime Minister that he was popular in all parts of the House and that with him go our best wishes for his success in the diplomatic field.

I will not deal with each of the ministers who has been moved around except to say to the Prime Minister, particularly for those who are concerned about the agricultural situation on the Prairies, that it seems to me that the Wheat Board has been passed from hand to hand over the years. First it was with the Department of Trade and Commerce, then with the Department of Agriculture, then went back to the Department of Trade and Commerce, then was under a Minister without Portfolio, and now it will be under the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Lang). What the relationship is between these two responsibilities is difficult for one to conjure, but it seems to me that responsibility for the Wheat Board could very easily have been given to one minister in view of the very serious situation in the grain marketing business in Canada at the present time. I still hope that the Prime Minister will give some thought to seeing that a full-time minister devotes his attention to this very difficult task.

• (2:30 p.m.)

Mr. Trudeau: Would you like me to name yet another minister?

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): If the Prime Minister wishes to consult me at any time with regard to a possible nominee I certainly will be glad to assist him. I might even be able to suggest someone who knows something about the marketing of grain.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): May I say to the Prime Minister that after his changes I am reminded of the famous words of Pythagoras, the Greek philosopher, who said that the more things change the more they are the same.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt whatsoever that the best notice given by the right honourable prime minister (Mr. Trudeau) today is that of the three by-elections on November 16.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Caouette: Also, on behalf of my colleagues and on my own, I wish to congratulate the new portfolio incumbents, as well as the new parliamentary secretaries. I thought that the Finance Minister (Mr. Benson) whould be replaced, but he has been kept to cope with the national problems.

Mr. Speaker, the newly-appointed parliamentary secretaries, according to some newspaper comments, are an injection of new blood. I note, among them, people who are set on serving the public well and that is why I congratulate them.

Finally, we are happy to hear that the former Minister of National Defence, hon. Léo Cadieux, has been appointed Canadian ambassador to France. Everybody called him Léo. We never called him Mr. Minister. He was everybody's friend. In my opinion, all hon. members were pleased by the news of his appointment. We wish him a long stay there and we are sure that he will be a worthy representative of Canada, his country and ours.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

ITEMS FOR BALANCE OF SECOND SESSION AND BEGINNING OF THIRD

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, in view of the relatively recent shift in responsibilities it has been agreed between my colleague, the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) and myself that for the balance of the current session and for the opening proceedings of the next session I will continue to act as House Leader in order to wind up this session and start the next.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I thank hon. members for their expressions of concurrence in this arrangement. In view of the fact that I will be moving to defence shortly I will try not to be too offensive in this role at the present time.

First I would like to confirm the timetable for the balance of this session, something which has been discussed with the representatives of the various parties. It would be the government's intention to seek prorogation of the present session on Wednesday afternoon toward the close of that day's sitting.

The Speech from the Throne commencing the third session would be on Thursday morning, and the motion to move and second the Address in Reply would be put on Thursday afternoon. Discussions along these lines have been held with representatives of the various parties. I believe it has been generally agreed that leaders' day would take place on Friday next, and if it were found necessary the House would concur in a motion to extend the time of the sitting on Friday so that the leaders of all parties would not be cramped for time. As Monday next is the Thanksgiving holiday, the general debate on the Speech from the Throne would begin on Tuesday of next week.

With respect to this week's business, for today the first item to be called under government orders would be government order No. 68, the report stage of the shipping conference exemptions bill, to be followed by the bill from the Senate with regard to the incorporation of the Hudson's Bay Company. When we reach that stage of our proceedings I would suggest and make a motion to the House that the bill be considered in committee of the whole rather than be referred to an appropriate standing committee. That is government order No. 108.

[Mr. Caouette.]

The third item today would be government order No. 82, the Canada Grains Act. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that there has been some doubt expressed in some quarters as to the propriety of hon. members placing amendments at this time, particularly in view of the fact that this bill was reported just on the last day before the House adjourned for the summer recess. On behalf of the government I would be prepared to put forward a motion of a procedural nature so that it would be possible for amendments to be moved today, in order that they could be considered today, if the House is prepared to agree to that.

Tomorrow we would propose to call the motion to concur in the Senate amendments to Bill C-4, the Canada Corporations Act, and as the second item of business the Canada Grains Act. On Wednesday we would again call the Canada Grains Act if it were still under debate and, as I indicated, later in the afternoon we would seek prorogation of the session, bringing the second session of this Parliament to an end.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I would be graciously pleased to endure the continued existence of the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Macdonald) as Government House Leader until the end of this session, and would even be happy to accept his suggestion that Bill S-25 be dealt with in all stages in the House. This is an admirable suggestion, and we would be glad to co-operate.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): We agree, Mr. Speaker. We even agree to suffer the minister for two more days.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, the Ralliement créditiste agrees with the proposals of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) inasmuch as they apply to the current session and to the beginning of the next one. We regret one thing. Parliament will be prorogued after over three months of holidays for hon. members who could easily have done a lot of work during summer and properly prepared themselves for resuming their business in the House.

[*English*]

Mr. Horner: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, it has been my understanding that before debate commences on a given government item it must be on the Order Paper for 48 hours. To my knowledge it was impossible

for government order 82 to be on the Order Paper for 48 hours because the Standing Committee on Agriculture only submitted its findings to the House on June 26, the last sitting day before the summer recess, and no Order Paper has been published since that day. Therefore I doubt whether, without unanimous consent of the House, we can deal with this item until it has been on the Order Paper for 48 hours.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, this was an objection I anticipated in saying that the government would seek the consent of the House to go ahead with the item today, particularly to go ahead with amendments that the hon. member or other hon. members may wish to put. It is the view of the government that it is desirable to deal with the measure as soon as possible subject, of course, to the right of the House to put amendments and to debate them. It is for that reason that we would seek the consent of the House, under these special circumstances, to deal with the matter. The bill and the amendments and the report back from the committee have been available for some time, and it seems to us reasonable that we should go ahead today.

Mr. Speaker: My understanding is that a motion will be proposed by the minister seeking unanimous consent of the House, but in any event the 48-hour requirement would be met by tomorrow.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

STATEMENT ON ABDUCTION OF JAMES RICHARD CROSS, SENIOR BRITISH TRADE COMMISSIONER

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I regret to have to inform the House that Mr. James Richard Cross, Senior Trade Commissioner of the British Trade Commission in Montreal, was abducted from his home early this morning by armed men. The reasons for this act have not been conclusively established. Police were immediately informed and road blocks and spot checks on major arteries leading to and from the city, including bridges leading to the south shore, have been established. The Montreal Police, the Quebec Provincial Police and the RCMP are co-operating in investigating this case.

The Canadian government is consulting closely with the British authorities in this matter. It is fully aware of its responsibility for the protection of foreign representatives in this country and is sparing no effort to discharge this duty. All appropriate steps are being taken to ensure additional protection for diplomatic and consular persons and premises. We are in close touch with all provincial and municipal authorities concerned and there is no doubt as to their full co-operation.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I am certainly shocked, as I am sure all Canadians are, by what happened this morning in Montreal. We have all known of similar instances in other lands but we had considered ourselves fortunate in not being directly involved and that our country was somewhat different in this respect. Now that we are involved we expect the government of Canada to face up squarely to an admittedly delicate and difficult situation. On behalf of the Canadian people we expect that the government of Canada will do everything possible. We will hold it to a very high standard of effort with regard to this situation and we will expect the government to take the House into its confidence with regard to any decision that it makes as it goes along.

I should like to express my deep regret and sorrow to Mrs. Cross on behalf of my colleagues. We also send our regrets to the British government that this incident has taken place in Canada.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all members of the House and all Canadian citizens will be disturbed by this abduction of Mr. Cross, a British diplomatic official. We have been shocked by the abductions which have taken place in some other countries, with people being held for various kinds of ransom, usually a form of blackmail for the release of prisoners who have been found guilty of sabotage or some other act of violence. I do not think that any of us expected this to happen in Canada. I can only say that I am sure all Canadians expect the government to prosecute the search for the persons responsible as expeditiously as possible and to take all steps to see that such an incident is not repeated.

If the minister has any information as to what the terms for the release of Mr. Cross are, I hope he will be willing to make that information available to members of the House of Commons. It may be that the government will have to face a very serious decision in this matter, and I think both the House and the Canadian people would

appreciate being taken into the full confidence of the government.

I am sure members in all parts of the House express their sincere sorrow and regrets both to the family of Mr. Cross and to the British government. We hope the government will be able to give some further information to the country as to what success has crowned its efforts.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, this morning's incident is most unfortunate. As a citizen of the province of Quebec, I am sorry this happened in Canada's metropolis where bombshells are not unusual, as we know.

Mr. Speaker, a distinction should now be made. The city of Montreal as a whole or all its inhabitants are not responsible for what happened. However, we must admit that a few twisted minds, a few hot-heads are enough for such an incident to happen. I deeply regret that this took place again in the province of Quebec, as it seems to me that most of the citizens of that province do not deserve what they are going through today because of some individuals.

I hope that the consul kidnapped this morning will be found by the police safe and sound and will not have been subjected to further assaults or insults because he has gone through enough already. I expect that those responsible for that kidnapping will be punished in an exemplary fashion in order to avoid repetition of such an incident in Quebec as well as in the rest of Canada. There is no need to resort to such means and to copy what happens in some other rebellious countries of the world. We have not reached that point yet. And I say again that it is distressing to see that there are such hot-heads in Quebec and especially in Montreal.

[*English*]

AGRICULTURE

PROHIBITION OF INTERPROVINCIAL MARKETING—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43 I intend to ask the House for unanimous consent to present a motion on a matter of pressing and urgent necessity. In accordance with the rule, I now explain the basis of the urgency which compels me to seek this leave.

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

A most critical situation has developed since the House adjourned last June; it is caused by the unilateral action of several provinces to prohibit, through marketing legislation, the entry into such provinces of farm products from other provinces. Such action appears to be clearly unconstitutional, particularly under Section 121 of the British North America Act; however, a judgment of a provincial court has upheld the prototype of such provincial legislation. A final appeal of this judgment may take many months. Meanwhile, other provinces have indicated they will pass retaliatory laws. There is now a drastic interference with the economics of the agricultural industry which may spill over into the other primary industries and the manufacturing industry as well.

The Prime Minister, with respect to the agricultural crisis, indicated that the passage of Bill C-197 would by itself provide the solution, that there was no need for a constitutional reference to the Supreme Court of Canada to settle the matter once and for all. He was wrong on both counts. With the failure of the government to bring in an acceptable bill which would be passed by Parliament this session and accepted by the provinces, it is now absolutely essential that there be an immediate reference to the Supreme Court. I therefore ask the unanimous consent of the House to propose, seconded by the hon. member for Kent-Essex (Mr. Danforth), the following motion:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is essential that the government of Canada, upon consultation with the provinces, frame terms of reference under section 55 of the Supreme Court Act to secure the opinion of the court as soon as possible on the important constitutional questions raised by action taken by certain provinces attempting to prohibit the entry into such provinces of agricultural products from other provinces.

Mr. Trudeau: A delaying process.

Mr. Speaker: As hon. members know, the motion proposed by the hon. member for Peace River requires the unanimous consent of the House and I must inquire now whether there is such unanimous consent.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: As there are dissenting voices, the motion cannot be put at this time.

Mr. Trudeau: I do not agree with delaying tactics so I said no.

FISHERIES

DEPLETION OF RESOURCES BY FOREIGNERS—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43 I ask the unanimous consent of the House to present a motion in a matter of urgent and pressing necessity.

This matter involves the management and conservation of our marine resources on both our Atlantic and Pacific coasts. The depletion of our marine resources by foreign nationals, especially by the Soviet Union, necessitates that Canada assume its responsibility under the articles of the law of the sea and initiate an international conference on fish conservation and management.

With the unanimous consent of the House I therefore would move, seconded by the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Carter), the following motion:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government take the initiative in convening an international conference of the fishing nations of the world to discuss the conservation and management of marine resources in the waters adjacent to the territorial seas of Canada.

Mr. Speaker: Again, this is a motion which requires unanimous consent. I ask whether there is unanimous consent.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimous consent. The hon. member's motion cannot be put at this time.

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk)

RELEASING OF INFORMATION BY HAROLD HUSKILSON

Question No. 513—**Mr. Crouse:**

1. What is the official status of Harold Huskilson of Lockeport and Shelburne, Nova Scotia, who recently announced federal government contracts in Nova Scotia?

2. Does the government see fit to channel such information through him rather than through the Office of the Minister or the Information Division of the particular department and, if so, for what reasons?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): 1. The Department of Public Works has no knowledge of the official status of Harold Huskilson.

2. Not applicable.

Questions

OTTAWA—OFFICES FOR MINISTERS WITHOUT PORTFOLIO

Question No. 587—**Mr. Winch:**

1. Do the two most recent Ministers without Portfolio have offices located in departmental buildings and, if so, were renovations required and what were these renovations for each?

2. What was the cost of the renovations in each case?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): 1. Work was carried out in the National Building, 130 Slater Street, Ottawa, to accommodate the Hon. R. D. G. Stanbury. It included painting, partitioning, electrical and mechanical work, and the cutting of a new door. The Hon. H. E. Gray occupies an office in the Confederation Building, Wellington Street, Ottawa. Renovations carried out to this space consisted of painting and the installation of new electrical fixtures.

2. Cost of work in the National Building $2,500., Confederation Building $720.

PUBLIC WORKS—CONSTRUCTION OF FEDERAL BUILDING, ANDOVER, N.B.

Question No. 713—**Mr. Coates:**

1. On what date was the federal building constructed at the border crossing between Andover, N.B., and Port Fairfield, Maine, that is presently not in use and what was its cost of construction?

2. Has the building in question ever been used by the federal government and, if so, for what periods of time since its construction?

3. What was the purpose for construction of the building and why has it remained unused for substantial periods of time?

4. Have steps ever been taken by the federal government to dispose of the building or have any representations ever been received by the federal government as to its disposal and, if so, what were the recommendations in question?

5. What are the present considerations by the federal government regarding this building?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Public Works and National Revenue as follows: 1. A contract for the building was awarded in November 1952 and it was completed in September 1954. The cost of construction was $218,181.60.

2. This building has been used infrequently for Customs purposes since its construction.

3. At the time of construction, reports indicated that the State of Maine proposed constructing a new highway across the northern part of Maine connecting the Provinces of Quebec and New Brunswick at Andover. The Department of National Revenue felt that the new highway would attract a considerable amount of truck traffic through Andover and it was in anticipation of meeting these de-

mands that the new building was constructed. The new highway never materialized and the building has seen little use since erected.

4. and 5. After the Department of National Revenue reported in 1967 that they had no longer a requirement for the building, several unsuccessful attempts were made to find alternate federal uses for it. Disposal action was begun in May 1969, but was delayed due to technical difficulties in obtaining survey documents. Actual disposal action is now well advanced and the necessary documents are being transmitted to the Crown Assets Disposal Corporation.

ADVERTISING AGENCY EMPLOYED BY UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

Question No. 1,037—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys):**

1. What is the name and address of the advertising agency responsible for the recent advertisements of the department warning about fraudulent claims against the Unemployment Insurance Fund and what was the fee for this service?

2. How many newspapers carry these advertisements?

3. What has been the cost to date for same?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): 1. Goodis, Goldberg, Soren Limited of Don Mills, Ontario.

2. Thirty-eight dailies, 470 weeklies and 12 other newspapers across Canada.

3. $207,882.76.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE FUND CONTRIBUTIONS, QUEBEC

Question No. 1,168—**Mr. Caouette:**

For each of the past three years, how much was contributed by the employers and the employees of the Province of Quebec to the Unemployment Insurance Fund?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): The Unemployment Insurance Commission advises that the contributions paid by employers and employees are kept on the national basis only. They are not identified by region and there is no regional data on this matter.

YEARLY COST OF ASSISTANCE TO INDIANS, 1950 TO 1969

Question No. 1,280—**Mr. Robinson:**

What was the total cost of support given to Indians during each year 1950 to 1969 inclusive?

Mr. Judd Buchanan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):

(In Thousands of Dollars)

Fiscal Year	O and M Capital and Grants	Indian Annuities (Statutory)	Total
1950-51	14,241	323	14,564
1951-52	13,717	337	14,054
1952-53	14,812	369	15,181
1953-54	16,143	360	16,503
1954-55	17,637	386	18,023
1955-56	21,115	368	21,483
1956-57	23,330	404	23,734
1957-58	27,458	393	27,851
1958-59	35,974	416	36,390
1959-60	40,664	452	41,116
1960-61	45,980	447	46,427
1961-62	49,950	461	50,411
1962-63	50,535	466	51,001
1963-64	55,112	484	55,596
1964-65	64,250	514	64,764
1965-66	81,119	563	81,682
1966-67	104,132	514	104,646
1967-68	121,957	552	122,509
1968-69	141,854	624	142,478
1969-70	172,762	585	173,347*
	1,112,742	9,018	1,121,760

* Note: Expenditures for 1969-70 are estimated

YEARLY COST OF ASSISTANCE TO ESKIMOS, 1950 TO 1969

Question No. 1,281—**Mr. Robinson:**

What was the total cost of support given to Eskimos during each year 1950 to 1969 inclusive?

Mr. Judd Buchanan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): The departmental records do not provide the specific data requested and the information in the following is the best estimate of the expenditure involved.

Fiscal year	Amount
1950-51	$ 1,494,600
1951-52	1,207,000
1952-53	1,029,400
1953-54	1,231,300
1954-55	1,480,800
1955-56	2,602,400
1956-57	6,015,000
1957-58	10,791,000
1958-59	14,499,400
1959-60	16,970,500
1960-61	16,384,000
1961-62	18,206,000
1962-63	19,413,500
1963-64	19,598,900
1964-65	20,700,900
1965-66	25,282,300
1966-67	26,861,100
1967-68	35,980,500
1968-69	41,270,300
1969-70	43,192,000

RESEARCH STUDIES, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

Question No. 1,310—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. What research studies have been carried out, or on ebhalf of, the Department of Public Works during each year 1960 to 1969 inclusive?

2. What research studies are presently being carried on and/or are contemplated during the next five years?

3. What was the cost of each of the research studies completed in each year 1960 to 1969 inclusive?

4. What is the estimated cost of each of the studies presently in being or contemplated during the next five years?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works):

1 and 3. A review of various studies undertaken between 1960 and 1969 indicate that the following could be considered as of a research nature:

Year	Expenditure	Description
1960-61	$ 51,500.	Investigation of Littoral Drift and Harbour Siltation
1961-62	25,000.	
1965-66	5,000.	Study of Ships Waves and their Erosive Effects on Banks of Waterways
1966-67	6,000.	
1967-68	5,000.	Study of Floating Breakwaters
1968-69	12,000.	Study of Strength Mechanisms of Sensitive Clays
1969-70	10,000.	
1969-70	8,000.	Study of Stability Characteristics of Breakwater Armour Units.
2 and 4. 1970-71	4,000.	Study of Stability Characteristics of Breakwater Armour Units.

Specific research studies which may be carried out during the next five years have not been identified in cost or name at this time. It is expected, however, that expenditures on the type of research study previously carried out by the Department will continue at approximately the same level during the next five years.

CONSULTANTS ENGAGED, DEPARTMENT OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Question No. 1,361—**Mr. Robinson:**

How many consultants have been engaged by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development during each of the years 1950 to 1970 inclusive (a) what was the cost of the consultants (b) how were the consultants utilized (c) for what reasons were the consultants necessary?

Mr. Judd Buchanan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): For the period 1950-1962: The information is not retrievable from existing records. For the period 1963-1969: Returns tabled, in response to question No. 1325—Mr. Skoberg, on June 25, 1969. For the period 1969-70: Number of Consultants engaged by the department, 154. (a) $1,068,580.

(b) To provide specialized professional studies and recommendations in the field of economics, sociology, education, engineering and architecture, forestry, archaeology, hydrology, statistics and management. (c) To provide independent reports, specialized expertise not available within the Department on projects not requiring full-time personnel, and additional assistance, where shortages of qualified staff would have caused unacceptable delays in the programs.

CONSULTANTS EMPLOYED BY TREASURY BOARD

Question No. 1,464—**Mr. Robinson:**

How many consultants have been engaged by Treasury Board during each year 1950 to 1970 inclusive (*a*) what was the cost of the consultants (*b*) how were the consultants utilized (*c*) for what reasons were the consultants necessary?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): The Treasury Board Secretariat separated from the Department of Finance on October 3, 1966 and became a separate department of government. The numbers, names, costs and utilization of consultants employed by the Treasury Board since becoming a department until the fiscal year 1969-70 are shown in the answers to Questions 1,323 and 2,452 of the last session, tabled on June 25, 1969 and October 22, 1969 respectively. In so far as the fiscal year 1969-70 is concerned, one consultant only has been engaged by the Treasury Board at a cost of $7,100. The consultants were necessary to supplement and complement the resources and expertise available within the Treasury Board Secretariat.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION—PART-TIME EMPLOYEES

Question No. 1,512—**Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse):**

Does the federal government have part-time employees in the rural constituencies for the purpose of helping workers fill out their requests for Unemployment Insurance benefits and, if so (a) what are the names and addresses of these persons in the constituencies of Lotbinière and Bellechasse (b) what is their annual salary?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): (a) Yes. Mrs. L. Goulet, Armagh, County of Bellechasse; Mrs. G. Chabot, St-Damien, County of Bellechasse; Mrs. O. T. Lejeune, St-Magloire, County of Bellechasse; Mrs. J. Rouillard, St-Philémon, County of Bellechasse; Mrs. A. Bernard, St-Raphael, County of Bellechasse; Mr. L. Deshaies, Deschaillons, County of Lotbinière; Mr. P. Croteau, St-Agapit, County of Lotbinière; Mrs. J. A. Roy, St-Flavien, County of Lotbinière; Miss Y. Hardy, Ste-Croix, County of Lotbinière. (b) The rate of remuneration is $1.50 for each application completed.

EXPORT OF ITEMS UNDER CLASS 600

Question No. 1,523—**Mr. Lewis:**

1. Are any of the items under export class 600 (aircraft, aircraft engines and parts, etc.) that were sold to Portugal, Angola, Mozambique or the Portuguese colonies in Africa in the years 1963 to 1969 inclusive, capable of being used in or intended to be used in military aircraft?

2. In particular, were any parts for F-86K Sabre jets sold to any of these countries?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): 1. Items shipped under export class 600 to Portugal, Angola, Mozambique and Portuguese colonies are of a recognized commercial nomenclature. Any potential military use of these items would be limited by the commercial characteristics and age of the aircraft concerned. The Canadian government has not permitted the export to Portugal or the territories under Portuguese administration of any aircraft, aircraft engines, and parts, etc., which in the Canadian government's judgment would be used for military purposes in the Portuguese overseas territories.

2. No.

LEGISLATION COVERING SERIAL NUMBERING OF BICYCLES

Question No. 1,585—**Mr. Southam:**

Is it the intention of the government to give consideration to the request of the Bicycle Guild Incorporated of Montreal, to pass legislation making it mandatory that all bicycles imported or manufactured in Canada be identified by having stamped clearly and distinctly on the bicycle frame the manufacturer's coded serial number?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Insofar as the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs is concerned: No. Registration schemes for bicycles would seem to be more appropriately dealt with by provincial legislatures.

Insofar as the Department of Finance is concerned: In the absence of legislation requiring domestic manufacturers to serially number Canadian-made bicycles, the prohibition of unnumbered imported bicycles would appear to be contrary to Article III: 4 of the

General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade which provides in part that

The products of the territory of any contracting party imported into the territory of any other contracting party shall be accorded treatment no less favourable than that accorded to like products of national origin in respect of all laws, regulations and requirements affecting their internal sale, offering for sale, purchase, transportation, distribution or use.

LASER INVENTION

Question No. 1,600—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. Which companies have applied to Canadian Patents and Development Limited regarding a licence to use the new laser invention developed by Defence Research Board scientists at Val Cartier, Quebec?

2. What criteria was used to choose the company or companies licensed for the laser invention?

3. Which company was awarded the laser licence?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): 1. Canadian Patents and Development Limited received requests for a licence on the laser invention developed at Defence Research Establishment, Val Cartier from the following companies: Compagnie de Physique Appliquée de Québec Ltée, Quebec City; Eastern Geophysics Limited, Toronto; Devtek Limited, Toronto; Gen-Tec (1969) Incorporated, Quebec City; Glentech Instruments Limited, Toronto; Nash and Harrison Limited, Ottawa; United Aircraft of Canada Limited, Longueuil; Union Carbide of Canada Limited, Toronto; Aviation Electric Limited, Montreal; Lumonix Limited, Ottawa; Orenda Limited, Toronto; Huntec Limited, Toronto.

2. All companies that expressed interest in seeking a licence were provided wtih the attached statement of criteria (Annex 'A') for selecting licensees, and this criteria was used in making the selections.

3. Canadian Patents and Development Limited has agreed to license two companies: Lumonix Limited, 231 Grandview Road, RR. 2, Bell's Corners, Ontario, and Gen-Tec (1969) Incorporated, 2625 rue Dalton, Quebec 12, P.Q.

Selecting Licensees for the Development, Production and Marketing of Tea Lasers.

In licensing the patents on the TEA lasers Canadian Patents and Development Limited will seek to derive the maximum economic advantage for the people of Canada. Licensees will be required to carry out development work in Canada, to guarantee adequate expenditures on development within stated periods to ensure active development and to manufacture in Canada for world markets.

In choosing licensees CPDL will consider the following: The applicant's plans for exploiting the laser, and particularly his plan for long term growth. The applicant's ability to have the necessary development work performed. The applicant's access to appropriate scientific and technical competence. The applicant's financial and managerial resources. The applicant's experience in and facilities for manufacturing. The applicant's experience in and facilities for marketing on a world-wide basis, and his freedom of access to world markets. The extent to which the applicant is "controlled in Canada" as defined in Section 139A of the Income Tax Act. Applicant's present involvement in laser technology and his production of complementary or competing products.

RESOLUTION TO AMEND BRITISH NORTH AMERICA ACT

Question No. 1,633—**Mr. Carter:**

Did the government receive a resolution from the Newfoundland Legislature to amend the British North America Act, more specifically, to amend Term 17 of the Terms of Union and, if so, on what date?

Mr. Barney Danson (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): Yes, the government has received a resolution from the Newfoundland Legislature to amend the British North America Act, more specifically, to amend Term 17 of the Terms of Union. This resolution was received by the Governor General on October 28, 1968.

STATUTES OF CANADA

Question No. 1,634—**Mr. Woolliams:**

1. What progress has been made in the consolidation and revision of the Statutes of Canada?

2. When is it now anticipated that the revised Statutes of Canada will be (a) published (b) available for distribution (c) proclaimed?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): 1. The text of the public general statutes has been consolidated and revised to December 31, 1969, and manuscript therefor sent to the Canadian Government Printing Bureau.

Because of technological difficulties encountered in developing software to produce a bilingual page format by automation, the printing schedule fell behind in 1969 with the

result that legislation enacted 1969 had to be added to the manuscript. The Printing Bureau was finally able to go into full scheduled production of the revision in June, 1970, but to avoid further delay in editing and proofreading, the legislation enacted in 1970, and to be enacted in the interim before proclamation of the revision will be included in supplements, the first of which is now being prepared.

2. (a) The revised production schedule estimates the completion of composition in late November, 1970, with a press run to follow immediately thereafter. (b) Publication will follow the press run after the Statute Roll has been presented to the Governor in Council. It is hoped to present the Statute Roll in November or December. (c) The printed volumes cannot be distributed across Canada before late Spring, 1971. (d) The most logical date for proclamation now appears to be July 1, 1971.

INCORPORATION OF CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS 1960-70

Question No. 1,658—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. How many charitable organizations have been incorporated in each year 1960 to 1970 inclusive?

2. (a) How many charitable organizations have ceased to operate in each year 1960 to 1970 inclusive (b) what are the names of each (c) where was each located (d) for what reason did each cease to operate?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): 1. The number of corporations incorporated under Part II of the Canada Corporations Act, in each of the years 1960 to 1970, is as follows:

1969-70	129
1968-69	101
1967-68	91
1966-67	85
1965-66	67
1964-65	65
1963-64	59
1962-63	64
1961-62	57
1960-61	57
1959-60	45

It should be noted that these figures include all corporations incorporated under Part II of the Canada Corporations Act and not all of these are charitable organizations.

2. This information is not available. It could only be obtained through a file by file review of the 17,000 files in the Corporations branch. The whole question as to what information should be collected in connection with corporations incorporated under Part II of the Canada Corporations Act is, however, under review in the department.

INDIAN RESERVE—ST. RÉGIS

Question No. 1,660—**Mr. Caouette:**

1. Have Indians specific rights with regard to crossing the bridge between the Indian Reserve at St. Régis and the United States and, if so, (a) do the rights still exist (b) if not, how were these rights lost?

2. Was the Indian Reserve at St. Régis incorporated in the City of Cornwall, Ontario and, if so, (a) were the Indians consulted (b) where (c) on what date (d) did the Indians approve of this change?

3. Is the Indian Reserve at St. Régis subject to the Ontario Assessment Act and, if so, do the terms of this Act conflict with those of the Indian Act?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. In 1933, the former Roosevelt Bridge, now dismantled, was converted from a railway bridge to accommodate both rail and vehicular traffic. On August 14, 1933, a Licence of Occupation was granted to the Cornwall-Northern New York International Bridge Corporation, incorporated under the laws of the State of New York, to use and occupy certain lands adjacent to the New York Central Railway Company tracks, for a period of 25 years. On the expiration of this Licence of Occupation in 1958, the Band required a four and a half year extension of the licence because of the delay in the construction of the new bridge. Clause 4 of the 1933 Licence stipulated that... "All the Indians of the St. Régis Band, the Missionary and all departmental officials, shall have for and during the term of any Licence granted by the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs to the Cornwall-Northern New York International Bridge Corporation, and of any renewal thereof, the right to go to and fro over the said road and bridges used in connection with the said road without charge, tax or tolls whatsoever in respect of their persons, their vehicles, implements, stock or their personal belongings; provided, however, that an Indian using his vehicle for hire or for the transport for hire of persons or freight or for any purpose of gain, shall not be allowed free passage". Order-in-Council dated November 29, 1956, conveyed some 130 acres of land to the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority for the new bridges and road across Cornwall Island. Although the Authority has issued passes to Band members permitting the holders free

passage over the new bridges, the St. Régis Band do not have contractual rights guaranteeing this privilege.

2. On February 22, 1956, the City of Cornwall obtained the approval of the Ontario Municipal Board to extend its boundaries to include portions of the Cornwall Island Reserve. According to departmental information, there was no prior consultation with the St. Régis Band.

3. No.

REGISTERED CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS

Question No. 1,685—**Mr. Robinson:**

Will the federal government consider the feasibility of establishing an information service with respect to registered charitable organizations?

Hon. Herb Gray (Minister of National Revenue): The only information about a specific charitable organization that can be divulged is whether it is registered as such for income tax purposes. Such information is available at District Taxation Offices.

GRANTS UNDER DEFENCE EXPORT MODERNIZATION PROGRAM

Question No. 1,720—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. For the fiscal year 1969-70 (a) which and how many non-resident owned or controlled firms have been awarded financial grants or incentives under the Defence Export Modernization Program, administered by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce (b) in each case, what was the total financial grant or incentive allotted?

2. For the same year (a) which and how many Canadian owned or controlled firms have been awarded financial grants under the Defence Export Modernization Program (b) in each case, what was the total financial grant or incentive allotted?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to written question 1,719 tabled this day.

RESEARCH STUDIES, DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES AND FORESTRY

Question No. 1,723—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. What research studies have been carried out by, or on behalf of, the Department of Fisheries and Forestry during each year 1960 to 1969 inclusive?

2. What research studies are now being carried on and/or are contemplated during the next five years?

3. What was the cost of each of the research studies completed in each year 1960 to 1969 inclusive?

4. What is the estimated cost of each of the studies now in being or contemplated during the next five years?

Mr. Eymard Corbin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): 1. Hundreds of projects (studies) have been conducted by the Canadian Forestry Service since 1960. A "KWIC Index" to projects, instituted in 1969, shows that 914 projects were active last year. Of these, 702 were started in 1960 or later, and 316 are currently scheduled to be completed in the early 1970's. At present the Fisheries Research Board is working on 200 research projects.

2. See Item 1.

3. The total expenditures, by service, have been as follows:

	Forest Resource Research and services $ (000)	Forest Products Research and services $ (000)	Fisheries Research Board $ (000)
1960-1961	4,591	969	4,590
1961-1962	5,134	1,100	4,578
1962-1963	5,486	1,130	5,195
1963-1964	5,992	1,155	5,284
1964-1965	6,582	1,263	5,959
1965-1966	6,748	1,309	6,854
1966-1967	9,190	1,842	8,368
1967-1968	11,855	2,373	10,142
1968-1969	13,642	2,734	11,014
1969-1970	15,432	3,086	13,035

4. Information not available.

Questions

CONSULTANTS ENGAGED, DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR

Question No. 1,724—**Mr. Robinson:**

How many consultants have been engaged by the Department of Labour during each year 1950 to 1970 inclusive (a) what was the cost of the consultants (b) how were the consultants utilized (c) for what reasons were the consultants necessary?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Departmental records show that three consultant firms were retained in the specified period. (a) (i) 1956-66, $40,250; (ii) 1968-69, $9,000; (iii) 1968-69, $9,450. (b) (i) Preparation of an organizational study of the Canada Department of Labour; (ii) Provision of public relations counsel; (iii) Compilation of a public attitude survey. (c) In each case, the consultants were retained because the required skills or resources were not available to perform the tasks.

COMPLEXITY OF SOCIETY AND SOCIAL ACTION

Question No. 1,796—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. To what extent does the federal government recognize the increasing complexity of our society and the shortening time base that is available for effective social action?

2. To what extent does the federal government recognize the funding problems of cross-disciplinary studies that do not fall into existing categories or precedents?

3. What action does the federal government contemplate in setting up funding mechanisms for cross-disciplinary or other studies submitted by national scientific organizations?

Mr. Barney Danson (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): 1. Fully.

2. The government recognizes the value of mission-oriented research that does not fall into existing categories or precedents. Special circumstances arise, however, in the funding of cross disciplinary research projects proposed by private groups. These circumstances are now under review and it is expected that a report, containing recommendations, will be made to the Government within the next few months.

3. It is too early to say what funding mechanisms may eventually be established. This will depend on the study referred to in Part 2, above.

COMPENSABLE DOLLAR LOSSES RESULTING FROM ACCIDENTS 1967-68

Question No. 1,815—**Mr. Mather:**

What was the percentage of the compensable dollar losses resulting from deaths and serious injuries in 1967 and 1968 accidents paid by the auto insurance industry?

[Mr. Corbin.]

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): An analysis of automobile claims under the category "deaths and serious injuries" is not available from data filed with the Department of Insurance by insurance companies registered to transact automobile insurance business. Data is available for automobile liability claims in general. The ratios of such claims incurred to premiums earned for 1967 and 1968 are reported as 69.0 per cent and 70.4 per cent respectively in the Report of the Superintendent of Insurance for Canada (Volume 1 for each year, page 12B)

INFORMATION CANADA—PUBLICATIONS

Question No. 1,824—**Mr. Coates:**

1. Does the Queen's Printer sell certain publications at an increased cost for the English edition as compared with the French edition, such as (a) Meat—How to buy and prepare (b) How to run a business (c) Dinosaurs of Canada and, if so, for what reason?

2 What is the cost of these publications in English and in French at government book stores?

Hon. Robert Stanbury (Minister without Portfolio): 1. The policy is that the same selling price applies to the English and to the French edition of any publication.

2. The first one is $1 and the two others are 75 cents each.

ESTIMATED VALUE OF STRATEGIC WAR MATERIALS SUPPLIED TO UNITED STATES

Question No. 1,831—**Mr. Mather:**

What, in dollars, is the estimated amount of the value of strategic war materials, weapons or components of war weapons supplied to the United States by Canadian sources during the past four years?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): The value of defence materials and equipment procured by the United States in Canada under the Canada-United States Defence Production Sharing Program, for the four years ended December 31, 1969:

Year	(Millions Cdn. $)
1966	317.1
1967	307.7
1968	320.0
1969	299.8
	$1,244.6

Canada exports items such as raw materials, fuels and lubricants. These materials

are exported to many countries for use in their processing and service industries. It is not possible to establish what proportion of such exports may ultimately find their way into defence production.

COST OF MAINTENANCE OF MILITARY HOSPITALS

Question No. 1,849—**Mr. Caouette:**

What was the amount paid annually during the past five years for the maintenance of military hospitals in Canada?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of National Defence and the Department of Veterans Affairs as follows: Records in the Department of National Defence are not maintained in a manner which would permit this information to be readily available. However, for the fiscal year 1969-70, building upkeep and utility costs covering the National Defence Medical Centre, Ottawa, Canadian Forces' Hospitals, Halifax, Kingston, Cold Lake and Esquimalt totalled $555,700. Veterans' hospitals operated by the Department of Veterans Affairs: 1965-66, $36,624,572; 1966-67, $36,518,378; 1967-68, $36,271,837; 1968-69, $41,741,338; 1969-70, $37,606,618.

TRAVELLER'S BUILDING, WINNIPEG—SPACE RENTED BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Question No. 1,860—**Mr. Rowland:**

1. Has the federal government rented space in the Traveller's Building, 283 Bannatyne Avenue, Winnipeg, and, if so, for what period of time?

2. What was the amount of the annual rental fee paid for each of the years during which the federal government rented space?

3. Which department occupied the space during each year?

4. What was the total floor space rented in each year?

5. To what use was the space put in each year?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): So far as the Department of Public Works is concerned:

1. Yes. For 10 years commencing October 1, 1954.

2. $54,000.

3.

Dates of Occupancy	Number of Square Feet	Tenant
October 1, 1954 to October 14, 1961	30,000	Unemployment Insurance Commission
March 1, 1964 to July 31, 1964	22,000	Canada Number Registration Programme, conducted by the Unemployment Insurance Commission and Department of National Revenue (Taxation Division))

4. 30,000 square feet.

5. Answered in Part 3.

ENGAGEMENT OF CONSULTANTS BY DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Question No. 1,872—**Mr. Robinson:**

How many consultants have been engaged by the Department of External Affairs during each year 1950 to 1970 inclusive (a) what was the cost of the consultants (b) how were the consultants utilized (c) for what reasons were the consultants necessary?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):

The Records covering fiscal years 1950-51 to 1963-64 were destroyed. From 1964-65 to 1970-71, the number of consultants engaged was as follows: 1964-65, 6; 1965-66, 9; 1966-67, 5; 1967-68, 9; 1968-69, 9; 1969-70, 11; 1970-71, 5. (a) 1964-65, $14,592.00; 1965-66, $25,711.00; 1966-67, $18,523.00; 1967-68, $58,466.00; 1968-69, $82,213.00; 1969-70, $36,542.00; 1970-71, $18,558.00. (b) The consultants have produced research, studies and analyses in such fields as international law and cultural affairs. (c) These persons were employed so that the Department of External Affairs could take advantage of their expertise and have them complete projects or studies which the Department could not undertake with its sole resources.

EFFICIENCY STUDY ON PUBLIC OWNERSHIP OF OIL AND GAS INDUSTRY

Question No. 1,878—**Mr. Saltsman:**

Has the National Energy Board conducted any efficiency studies on public ownership of the gas and oil industry to determine whether or not public ownership would be beneficial and, if not, will the appropriate Minister direct the National Energy

Board, under Section 22(2) of the National Energy Board Act to undertake such a study and, if not, for what reason?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): The National Energy Board reports as follows: No, in view of other priorities this study is not desirable at this time.

RETURN RECEIVED BY CANADIAN WHEAT PRODUCERS

Question No. 1,880—**Mr. Yewchuk:**

1. Do Canadian wheat producers receive less return, per bushel of wheat, than European community wheat producers and, if so, by what amount?

2. Do Canadian barley producers receive less return per bushel of barley than European community barley producers and, if so, by what amount?

3. Is it possible for the Canadian Government to institute practices which would result in the Canadian producers of wheat and barley receiving returns from their products comparable to those received by European producers?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (For the Canadian Wheat Board): In so far as the Canadian Wheat Board is concerned: 1 and 2.

Wheat and Barley Producers—Average Returns Per Bushel in U.S. Dollars

	Wheat 1968/69	Barley 1968/69
West Germany	2.55	2.01
Canada	1.30	.79
Difference	1.25	1.22
France	2.48	1.70
Canada	1.30	.79
Difference	1.18	.91
Italy	2.73	2.12
Canada	1.30	.79
Difference	1.43	1.33
Netherlands	2.72	1.95
Canada	1.30	.79
Difference	1.42	1.16
Belgium	2.55	1.80
Canada	1.30	.79
Difference	1.25	1.01

Note: Wheat returns for EEC countries do not include durum.

3. The EEC is a net importer of grain. Most of the grain produced in the EEC is also consumed there. Thus, the EEC countries are able to pass most of the cost of their high support prices on directly to EEC consumers. Domestic producers are protected from competition through a system of import levies and funds from this source are used to subsidize exports.

[Mr. Saltsman.]

Canada on the other hand is a major net exporter of grain. If EEC levels of support were adopted in Canada the cost to taxpayers of export subsidies to reduce prices to competitive levels would be much greater than in countries which export a small proportion of their grain production. Similarly Canadian livestock producers, who are also interested in increasing their exports, would require subsidies to offset the increased cost of feedstuffs. The cost of these subsidies to livestock producers and to exporters of grain would be prohibitive.

BRIDGEWATER, N.S.—FEDERAL BUILDING

Question No. 1,893—**Mr. Crouse:**

1. What progress is being made towards acquiring a site for a new federal building in Bridgewater, Nova Scotia?

2. On what date is it anticipated a site will be acquired?

3. After acquisition of a site, on what date does the government plan construction of a federal building?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): 1. A number of sites are being investigated.

2 and 3. Not known.

TRANS CANADA HIGHWAY

Question No. 1,908—**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):**

1. What is the percentage contribution by the Government of Canada to any construction now under way in the Trans Canada Highway system and does it vary from province to province?

2. How many miles, by province, remain to be completed and what is the anticipated completion date for an all Canada highway link to Trans Canada Highway standard?

3. Since 1966, what has been the total, by province, of the federal contribution toward the cost of the construction of the Trans Canada Highway, and, in each year, what was the percentage contribution, by province, of any such construction?

4. What is the estimated cost of completing the Trans Canada Highway and what is the estimated federal share?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): 1. In the Atlantic Provinces the federal government's contribution is 90 per cent of the shareable construction costs. In the remaining provinces the federal contribution is 90 per cent of the shareable construction costs on a designated 10 per cent of the mileage in each province and 50 per cent of the shareable construction costs on the remaining 90 per cent of the mileage.

2. Province — Miles to be completed as of June 1970

Province	Miles to be completed as of June 1970
Newfoundland	134*
Nova Scotia	3*
New Brunswick	69*
Prince Edward Island	nil
Quebec	173
Ontario	108
Manitoba	53*
Saskatchewan	100*
Alberta	41*
British Columbia	5

*Primarily upgrading of previously constructed sections to Trans-Canada Highway standards.

Under the legislation Canada shares in construction costs for work done to December 31, 1970. With the exception of sections which might be under construction on that date, the remainder of the highway will be paved.

3. Federal contributions towards shareable construction costs follow:

Province	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69	1969-70
	Millions of Dollars			
Newfoundland	5.8	9.5	9.1	6.7
Nova Scotia	18.3	12.9	10.0	6.7
New Brunswick	10.6	11.2	3.2	2.0
Prince Edward Island	0.4	0.9	0.2	0.1
Quebec	41.8	22.1	8.8	3.1
Ontario	2.9	5.2	3.1	4.5
Manitoba	nil	1.1	1.2	0.7
Saskatchewan	0.4	1.0	0.7	0.3
Alberta	0.3	0.5	0.6	1.1
British Columbia	0.4	0.5	0.5	1.6

The federal government contributes towards construction costs for an equivalent two-lane facility under the percentage formula given in Part 1. Costs for the acquisition of right of way and for additional lanes beyond a two lane facility are the responsibility of the province and are not shareable by the federal government. Thus the actual costs to the provinces are not known.

4. Legislation provides a maximum federal contribution of $825 million for work done to December 31, 1970. Contributions to the Provinces to June 30, 1970, amount to $783 million leaving a balance of $41.9 million available for work done by the completion date of the program.

BOXCARS

Question No. 1,931—**Mr. Sulatycky:**

How many boxcars of each type suitable for hauling wheat did Canadian railroads own in 1955, 1960, 1965 and 1969?

Mr. Gérard Duquet (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The Canadian Transport Commission advise as follows: Canadian Pacific: March 1, 1955, 39,853 cars with 5′ or 6′ doors. April 1, 1960, 38,618 cars with 5′ or 6′ doors, 6,992 cars with 8′ doors, 45,610 Total. July 1, 1965, 35,965 cars with 5′ or 6′ doors, 8,833 cars with 8′ doors, 44,798 Total. July 1, 1969, 30,658 cars with 5′ or 6′ doors, 8,585 cars with 8′ doors, 39,243 Total.

Note: While figures have been included for cars with eight foot doors capable of handling grain it should be noted that these would not normally be used and that only very rarely would these cars be used in grain service.

Canadian National Railways: Company records are incapable of producing information concerning ownership of cars capable of hauling grain during past years. Listed below are figures of the highest and lowest number of cars in grain service for a four-year period:

	1969	1968	1967	1966
Low	9,200	9,400	10,200	9,700
High	14,000	13,002	13,000	12,600

As of June 1, 1970, Canadian National owned 26,713 boxcars and 3,582 covered hopper cars capable of hauling grain. It should be noted that in terms of capacity the covered hopper type car is equivalent to one and one-half boxcars.

Questions

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTIONS TO CANADIAN OLYMPIC COMMITTEE

Question No. 1,932—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. How much has the federal government contributed to the Canadian Olympic Committee for each year since 1964?

2. Is the Committee bound in any way to accept restraints imposed by Canada's external policy with respect to (a) communist countries (b) South Africa (c) Rhodesia?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. Under the Fitness and Amateur Sport Program the Canadian Government has contributed directly to the Canadian Olympic Association the following amounts of money. (See annex following).

CANADIAN OLYMPIC ASSOCIATION

Project	1964–65	1965–66	1966–67	1967–68	1968–69	1969–70	Total
	$	$	$	$	$	$	$
Olympic Medical Archives	8,500	—	—	—	—	—	8,500
Establishment of a National Secretariat	—	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	—	120,000
Pan American Games	—	—	—	56,953	—	—	56,953
Olympic Winter Games	50,000	—	—	—	32,785	—	82,785
Pre Olympic Meet Mexico	—	—	—	—	13,867	—	13,867
Olympic Summer Games	76,000	—	—	—	73,485	—	149,485
Policy Meeting	—	—	—	—	—	4,650	4,650
Total	134,500	30,000	30,000	86,953	150,137	4,650	436,240

2. The Canadian Olympic Association is a private association over which the Canadian Government exercises no control. The Association has the obligation, however, to accept such restraints imposed by Canada's external policy (e.g. Canada's United Nations-Rhodesia Regulations) as may apply to all Canadians.

ARRANGEMENTS MADE FOR CREW OF *PATRICK MORRIS*

Question No. 1,933—**Mr. Lundrigan:**

Were special arrangements made for the crew of the ill-fated *Patrick Morris* to contact their homes immediately on landing at Point Cartier and, if so, what were they?

Mr. Gérard Duquet (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The management of Canadian National Railways advise as follows: Prior to the rescue vessel arriving at Point Cartier the names of survivors were obtained by telephone and the families of the men were contacted by Newfoundland area officers.

When the men landed at Seven Islands they were immediately taken by charter bus to the airport where a charter Air Canada aircraft was standing by to fly them to Sydney. On arrival at Sydney those wishing to contact their families did so.

[Mr. Duquet.]

USE OF COMPUTER, DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL REVENUE

Question No. 1,934—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of National Revenue have the use of a computer in its operations and, if so, to what extent is it utilized?

2. Is the computer programmed 24 hours per day and, if not, for what reason?

3. What is the number of hours planned for utilization of the computer?

4. What has been the annual cost of computer services for each year 1960 to 1970 inclusive?

5. How many programs are in preparation for the computer at the present time and how will each affect the efficiency of the Department?

Hon. Herb Gray (Minister of National Revenue): In so far as the Customs and Excise Division is concerned: 1. The Customs and Excise Division utilizes a computer in the following operations: (a) Financial management statements prepared by the Department of Supply and Services computer facilities. (b) Sales tax licencee distribution reporting system provided by the I.B.M. Service Bureau facility.

2 and 3. The Department of Nationa Revenue, Customs and Excise, does not have its own computer facilities.

4. Financial management statements are presently supplied by the Department of Supply and Services on a no charge basis.

The sales tax licencee distribution reporting system is provided by the I.B.M. Service Bureau facility at a cost of approximately $10,000 per year. This system has been in operation since 1968.

5. At the present time preparations are in progress by Customs and Excise for possible computer applications in the field of Customs operations and Excise Tax administration.

In so far as the Taxation Division is concerned: 1. Yes. The Taxation division has the use of three computer systems. These are utilized 24 hours on scheduled work days and on weekends and statutory holidays as required.

2. The computer systems are programmed for use 24 hours per day except for those weekends and statutory holidays when the use of the systems is not required.

3. In a year, the time planned for utilization of each computer system is approximately 6,000 hours.

4.	1960-65 $	1965-66 $	1966-67 $	1967-68 $	1968-69 $	1969-70 $
Equipment Purchased	Not Available	150,110	—	—	1,422,000	621,345
Equipment Rented	Not Available	399,008	482,464	899,853	1,229,013	877,206

5. There are now 218 programs in preparation. Most of these are necessary to improve operations by enabling the department to handle the increasing workload without a proportionate increase in computer capability. Over 50 per cent of the new programs are in the statistical and management information fields and will not yield immediate gains but are necessary to provide the basis for future planning.

REQUIREMENTS OF MUNICIPALITIES FOR WATER TREATMENT PROJECTS

Question No. 1,937—**Mr. Gilbert:**

1. With regard to the answer to Part 2 of Question Number 1,527 as reported in *Hansard* of May 20, 1970 at page 7106, what are the known requirements of municipalities in each province for 1970 regarding water treatment projects?

2. What were the previous commitments made in each province between the federal and provincial governments on water for financing the construction of water treatment projects?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): 1 and 2. The National Housing Act does not make provision for assisting in the financing of water treatment projects, and consequently Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation is not involved in such an operation, as was pointed out in the answer to Part 1 of Question No. 1,527.

DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT, DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Question No. 1,938—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Veterans Affairs have data processing equipment (automatic) and, if so, for how long?

2. What was the initial cost of the equipment?

3. What yearly costs are anticipated for data processing in the Department?

Hon. Jean-Eudes Dubé (Minister of Veterans Affairs): 1. Yes, 25 years.

2. None. Equipment is contracted for on an annual rental basis.

3. For the fiscal year 1970-71 the anticipated cost for data processing equipment is forecast at $33,678.

FUNDS FOR UPGRADING SANITATION AND SEWAGE FACILITIES

Question No. 1,942—**Mr. Mazankowski:**

Has the government any plans or programs available to provide the necessary funds for upgrading inadequate sanitation and sewage facilities of various municipalities across Canada?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): In December, 1960, an amendment to the National Housing Act made provision for financial assistance to municipalities for the construction of sewage treatment facilities and trunk sewage collector systems. The assistance is in the form of loans, not exceeding two-thirds of the cost of the eligible works, for a term of not more than 50 years at favourable interest rates. As a further incentive, the borrower is forgiven repayment of 25 per cent of the principal amount of the loan, and of the interest on the loan accrued to the date of completion. One of the amendments to the National Housing Act, in June, 1969, extended the period for forgiveness to March 31, 1975. Loans approved,

during the first eight years of the program, have averaged about $35.0 million per year, increasing to $50.0 million in 1969. The Capital Budget of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation was increased in 1969 to provide for this higher level, and has been further increased in 1970 to $75.0 million.

GRANTS TO CANADIAN NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR THE BLIND

Question No. 1,943—**Mr. Laprise:**

During 1969-70 and 1970-71, did the government make grants to the National Canadian Institute for the Blind and, if so (a) what were the amounts of the grants (b) for what purposes were they awarded?

[*Translation*]

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Yes, the Department of National Health and Welfare did make grants to the Canadian Institute for the blind. (a) In 1969-70 two amounts were granted, the annual sustaining grant of $55,000, and a special grant of $500,000. In 1970-71 the annual sustaining grant of $55,000 will be paid assuming approval of departmental estimates. The sustaining grants are in support of the general operations and programs of the national organization. (b) The special grant of $500,000 was to enable CNIB to assist its provincial divisions in Quebec and in Newfoundland and Labrador in improving the level and quality of CNIB services to the blind in those provinces.

[*English*]

DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, MINES AND RESOURCES

Question No. 1,947—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources have data processing equipment (automatic) and, if so, for how long?

2. What was the initial cost of the equipment?

3. What yearly costs are anticipated for data processing in the department?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): 1. Yes, since 1962.

2. All major items of unit record equipment are leased rather than owned.

3. Costs of unit record equipment and services for the fiscal year 1970-71 are estimated at $83,000.

[Mr. Andras.]

USE OF COMPUTER, DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Question No. 1,950—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Veterans Affairs have the use of a computer in its operations and, if so, to what extent is it utilized?

2. Is the computer programmed 24 hours per day and, if not, for what reason?

3. What is the number of hours planned for utilization of the computer?

4. What has been the annual cost of computer services for each year 1960 to 1970 inclusive?

5. How many programmes are in preparation for the computer at the present time and how will each affect the efficiency of the Department?

Hon. Jean-Eudes Dubé (Minister of Veterans Affairs): 1. Yes. Computer service is provided by the Department of Supply and Services in the preparation of monthly accounting and payrolls. The time required for these applications is not known by this Department. In addition, the Department occasionally rents computer time for special projects (see answer No. 4).

2. Not applicable.

3. Not known (see answer No. 1).

4. The Department has not been required to pay for monthly accounting and payrolls. Expenditures by the Department for occasional computer time: 1959-60 to 1967-68, No expenditure data available; 1968-69, $4,441; 1969-70, $4,221.

5. One. Provide management with more updated data on the financial aspects of property sales.

USE OF COMPUTER, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, MINES AND RESOURCES

Question No. 1,951—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources have the use of a computer in its operations and, if so, to what extent is it utilized?

2. Is the computer programmed 24 hours per day and, if not, for what reason?

3. What is the number of hours planned for utilization of the computer?

4. What has been the annual cost of computer services for each year 1960 to 1970 inclusive?

5. How many programmes are in preparation for the computer at the present time and how will each affect the efficiency of the Department?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): The Department of Energy, Mines and Resources makes extensive use of a number of computing facilities in its operation. In general, these can be divided into two classes; those which the

Department owns or leases and those computing services which are purchased from service bureaux or computer utilities.

Owned or leased computers: The Department owns or leases two medium scale computers, both of which are Control Data 3100's, one of which is located in Ottawa, the other at Bedford Institute of Oceanography in Dartmouth, Nova Scotia. A number of other special purpose computers are used by the Department for such purposes as control of scientific experiments and collection of scientific data.

Computer utilities and service bureaux: The Department makes use of a number of service bureaux and utilities for a variety of reasons. Included in these reasons are: (a) the inadequacy of owned or leased equipment to process the required workload; (b) more economical operation of the computing utilities equipment for particular problems; (c) the geographic dispersion of many of the Department's research activities.

2. Over the past several years the Control Data 3100 computer in Ottawa has been operating for three shifts a day, five days a week. At present, it is operating at full capacity, that is three shifts a day, seven days a week. In fact, the computer is being used at a rate in excess of the recommended 20 hours a day.

The Control Data 3100 at the Bedford Institute of Oceanography is operate dat the rate of three shifts a day, five days a week.

3. For the immediate future, no diminution of the workload is anticipated. In the longer term, there will be a substantial growth of workload.

4. It is difficult to state, as asked, the cost of computing services by year from 1960 to 1970. This is partly for the reason that the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources has not existed in its present form for this period, and also, for most of the period, computing costs have been accumulated with general administrative costs. The following estimated costs are available and include personnel costs, computer rental costs, and the cost of computer time purchased from utilities: 1967-68, $916,367; 1968-69, $1,705,154; 1969-70, $2,287,191.

5. Because of the diversified nature of the Department's activities, (that is basically research) it is difficult to state how many programs are in preparation for the computer at any point in time. On the average, it is estimated that between 250 and 350 programs are in development at any one time. Most of these programs are developed by scientists and are directly related to the scientist's own work. Programs developed affect the efficiency of the Department in several ways: (a) increase the efficiency of the scientist in his research activities; (b) enable the scientist to work on projects where the nature of the problem or data is such that a solution without the use of computers would be impossible or, at best, impractical; and (c) contribute to the efficiency of the Department's administrative and managerial practices.

NATIONAL DEFENCE HEADQUARTERS

Question No. 1,953—**Mr. Coates:**

1. What was the cost of acquiring the land for the site of National Defence Headquarters?

2. What was the name of the firm of consultants retained to advise the government on the National Defence Headquarters and what are the names of the principal officers of the firm?

3. How much did the consultants receive in fees from the federal government, were these consultants the only firm involved in the reply received to Question Number 1,759 and, if not (a) what other consulting firms were involved (b) what did they receive in fees (c) for what reason were they included in the question regarding the cost of the new National Defence Headquarters?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): 1. $2,937,284.

2. Parkin, Architects, Planners, 1500 Don Mills Road, Don Mills, Ont. There are nine partners: John C. Parkin; James E. Searle; E. J. Smith; E. R. Wilbee; John E. Owen; D. C. Rowland; Dr. H. E. H. Roy; W. J. Neish; D. H. Carter.

3 To September 15, 1970, Parkin received $943,853 in fees. There were other consultants as listed below:

(a) and (b) Firm	Amount
Woods, Gordon & Co.	$7,042.76
McRostie Seto Genest	784.63
Canadian National Institute for the Blind	7,920.00
Butts, Ross, Magwood & Hall	552.00
DeLeuw, Cather	3,000.00

(c) As a standard procedure in the Department, all expenditures which can be directly charged to a specific project are shown against the cost of that project. All firms listed in (a) and (b) provided a service contributing directly to the construction of the new National Defence Headquarters.

Questions

PRIME MINISTER'S PACIFIC TOUR

Question No. 1,955—**Mr. Coates:**

1. What was the total cost to the taxpayers of the Prime Minister's Pacific tour?

2. How many employees of the federal government travelled with the Prime Minister, what positions do they hold and what is the salary classification of each?

3. How many miles were travelled by the government aircraft and how many members of the armed forces were involved in the operation?

4. How many receptions were sponsored by the federal government in the various countries visited by the Prime Minister and what was the total cost of this entertainment?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Prime Minister's and Privy Council offices, the Departments of National Defence and External Affairs as follows: 1. It is not possible to provide an answer at this time as it will be some weeks before all accounts are in. Actual flying time of the Canadian Armed Forces aircraft was 62.1 hours at an estimated cost of $809.50 per flying hour, $50,269.95. Crew expenses amounted to $9,074.45.

2 and 3. A total of 19 federal employees travelled with the Prime Minister, as follows:

Name	Appointment	Salary scale or range $
R. G. Robertson	Clerk of the Privy Council and Secretary to the Cabinet	37,000-40,000
A. E. Ritchie	Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs	37,000-40,000
Ivan L. Head	Legislative Assistant to the Prime Minister	25,000-30,000 (by contract)
Romeo LeBlanc	Press Secretary to the Prime Minister	20,000-25,000
J. L. Gray	President, Atomic Energy of Canada (New Zealand and Australia only)	Since Atomic Energy of Canada Limited operates in a competitive market, it is not company policy to divulge salary information.
D. D. Transley	Vice President (Operations), Canadian International Development Agency	23,000-29,000
A. G. Kniewasser	Assistant Deputy Minister, Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce	28,000-33,000
Gordon Gibson	Executive Assistant to the Prime Minister	17,500-20,000
John Gongos	Inspector, Royal Canadian Mounted Police	14,490-15,750
J. B. Giroux	Inspector, Royal Canadian Mounted Police (to alternate with Inspector Gongos)	14,490-15,750
H. Stewart	Director of Administration, Privy Council Office	19,000-23,500
R. V. Gorham	Department of External Affairs, Far Eastern Division	20,377-22,627
A. Donnelly	Press Assistant, Prime Minister's Office	15,000-17,500
V. Chapman	Assistant, Prime Minister's Office	12,500-15,000
Capt. R. Godfray	Canadian Armed Forces (baggage master)	Pay of rank
Miss Cecile Viau	Private Secretary to the Prime Minister	10,000-12,500
Miss Annette Walls	Secretary to the Clerk of the Privy Council	10,500-11,931
Miss Therese Brazeau	Secretary, Prime Minister's Office	7,500-10,000
Y. Rivet	Communicator, Department of External Affairs	7,035- 7,773

[Mr. Laing.]

The Canadian Armed Forces aircraft travelled 24,864 miles with a crew of 16 personnel in the following ranks at pay of rank: Lieutenant Colonel, 1; Major, 1; Captain, 4; Chief Warrant Officer, 1; Master Warrant Officer, 1; Warrant Officer, 2; Sergeant, 1; Corporal, 3; Private, 2.

4. Nil. However, some informal gatherings were arranged by Canadian diplomatic representatives in the various countries to enable the Prime Minister to meet the local Canadian community. The costs were met by the officers concerned out of their representational allowances.

OTTAWA—ADDITIONAL RENOVATION WORK TO JACKSON BUILDING

Question No. 1,956—**Mr. Coates:**

1. What additional work was carried out by Cambrian Construction Limited on the Jackson Building and what was the cost to the federal government for the extras?

2. What formula was used to determine the cost of the additional work that was carried out?

3. What was the estimated profit to the contractor for carrying out the additional work?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): 1. All the additional work and cost will not be known until the work is completed. At this time, it is expected that the work will be completed in December 1970.

Additional work: Revisions to exterior walls, necessary as the frame of the old building differed from the assumptions upon which the re-design had been based. This condition was not apparent until demolition of the walls had been completed.

—Estimated cost—$350,000

As work progressed, additional work had to be carried out to provide for as-found conditions. This involved revamping of existing mechanical and electrical systems, levelling of floors, changes to the existing roof, reinforcing the existing structure, miscellaneous plastering, etc.

—Estimated cost—$90,000

During construction, some renovations were made due to changed requirements and to improve the design. This included provision of canteen and cafeteria facilities which requirements were not finalized until after a contract had been awarded.

—Estimated cost—$125,695

After the contract had been awarded, the Treasury Board approved the adoption of the open office landscape concept. This involved the provision of carpeting, draperies, special partitions, etc. It also involved the deletion of vinyl asbestos tile, venetian blinds and standard partitioning.

—Estimated cost—$124,305

Total estimated cost of additional work —$690,000

2. The formula used to determine the cost of additional work is outlined in the general conditions of the contract. Generally, the contractor is paid his costs directly attributable to the work, plus an allowance of 10 per cent for other expenditures and for profit. The other expenses are for costs relating to overhead, head office expenses and general administration costs to the contractor, including finance and interest charges.

3. $69,000 less head office and other expenses as outlined in Part 2.

RESEARCH INTO PCB CONTENT IN FOOD

Question No. 1,958—**Mr. Harding:**

Has the Food and Drug Directorate of the Department of National Health and Welfare done any research into the PCB content in Canadian foods?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): The Food and Drug Directorate of the Department of National Health and Welfare has undertaken an active program of research on the development of analytical methods for the PCBs (polychlorinated biphenyls) and on their metabolism in animals. At present the PCB content of foods has not been determined but it is planned to begin a survey program later this year.

TOBACCO

Question No. 1,962—**Mr. Douglas (Assiniboia):**

1. How much did the government collect in taxes on the sale and use of tobacco in the latest fiscal year for which figures are available?

2. How much money was spent in that same year to assist the tobacco industry and producers in Canada?

3. How much money was spent by the Department of National Health and Welfare in that same year to discourage the use of tobacco in Canada?

4. What is government policy with regard to the production and use of tobacco in Canada?

5. How much was spent by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce on promoting the export of tobacco to foreign countries in the latest year for which figures are available?

Questions

6. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion made any grants to the tobacco industry and, if so, who were the recipients and what were the amounts of each grant?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): 1. During the fiscal year 1969-70 excise duty of $193,791,374.63 and excise tax of $291,346,502.56 was collected on cigars, cigarettes, and manufactured tobacco. In addition, the general sales tax applies to these items but statistics are not available as to the revenue which has resulted from the sale of individual products.

2. 1968-69, $536,160. 1969-70, $489,337.

3. For fiscal year 1968-69 an amount of $239,649 was spent by the Health Services Branch of the Department of National Health and Welfare for research and health education to discourage cigarette smoking in Canada.

4. The policy of the Department of National Health and Welfare is to discourage cigarette smoking and for those who continue to smoke, to encourage the use of less hazardous products and ways to smoke.

5. The Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce in the fiscal year 1969-70 spent approximately $15,000 on a trade mission promoting the export of tobacco.

6. Yes. During the fiscal year ending March 31, 1970, the offers under A.D.I.A. were made to: Tobacco Acres Ltd., Brooklyn, P.E.I., $29,606; Joseph C. Spriet, Montague, P.E.I., $7,219; Belfast Tobacco Growers, Belfast, P.E.I., $80,000; Island Tobacco, Montague, P.E.I., $260,000; Iona Farms Ltd., Iona, P.E.I., $42,089; John A. Power Ltd., Greenfields, P.E.I., $4,700; Riverbrook Farms Ltd., Hillarton, N.S., $18,000; Bastos du Canada, Louiseville, Que., $467,502.

CANADIAN AID TO FRANCOPHONE AFRICA

Question No. 1,964—**Mr. Skoberg:**

1. What is the total amount of Canada's aid program to Francophone, Africa?

2. Does the government have data on the amount of aid from the Province of Quebec to Francophone, Africa and, if so, what is the total of such aid?

3. How many Canadian embassies are located in Francophone, Africa?

4. When were these embassies built or acquired?

5. How many employees are on staff at each embassy?

6. What is the total amount paid in salaries at each embassy?

7. What is the total amount paid for the upkeep of each embassy?

[Mr. Douglas (Assiniboia).]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): In so far as the Canadian International Development Agency and the Department of External Affairs are concerned: 1. The total amount of funds allocated for Canada's bilateral aid program to Francophone Africa is $34.1 milion for the fiscal year 1969/70.

2. No.

3. There are five Canadian Embassies located in Francophone Africa at the present time.

4. These chanceries were acquired at the following times: Dakar, Senegal: leased in 1966, then purchased in 1968. Abidjan, Ivory Coast: leased in 1969. Tunis, Tunisia: leased in 1966. Kinshasa, Congo: leased in 1967, a former building was leased by this Department in 1963 but prior to that date was occupied by the Canadian Trade Commissioner Service for a number of years. Yaounde, Cameroun: leased in 1963.

5. Number of employees:

	Canada based	Locally engaged	Total
Dakar	11	7	18
Abidjan	7	8	15
Tunis	8	7	15
Kinshasa	9	7	16
Yaounde	8	9	17

6. Salaries: Dakar, $144,065; Abidjan, $77,941; Tunis, $98,508; Kinshasa, $76,489; Yaounde, $91,318.

7. Operations costs*: Dakar, $349,646; Abidjan, $221,794; Tunis, $166,745; Kinshasa, $245,429; Yaounde, $252,501.

* Figures are based on 1969-70 fiscal year.

USE OF COMPUTER, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

Question No. 1,975—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Public Works have the use of a computer in its operations and, if so, to what extent is it utilized?

2. Is the computer programmed 24 hours per day and, if not, for what reason?

3. What is the number of hours planned for utilization of the computer?

4. What has been the annual cost of computer services for each year 1960 to 1970 inclusive?

5. How many programmes are in preparation for the computer at the present time and how will each affect the efficiency of the Department?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): 1. The Department does not have its own computer but uses the services provided by the Department of Supply and Services and to a lesser extent private service bureaux.

2, 3 and 5. Not applicable.

4. Fiscal year	Data processing services	Computer rentals	Total
1967-68	—	$ 550.92	$ 550.92
1968-69	$ 47,823.74	210.27	48,034.01
1969-70	123,103.12	19,823.22	142,926.34

Note: No data available prior to 1967-68.

PROHIBITION OF ENTRY OF BOOKS INTO CANADA

Question No. 1,979—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. How many books, pamphlets, etc., have been prohibited from entering Canada in each of the past five years under Item 99201-1, Schedule C of the Custom Tariff Act on the grounds that they are of a treasonable or seditious nature?

2. How many books, pamphlets, etc., have been prohibited from entering Canada in each of the past five years under Item 99201-1, Schedule C of the Custom Tariff Act on the grounds that they are of an immoral or indecent character?

3. What official or officials in the Department of National Revenue or what experts outside of the Department make the decisions prohibiting entry of the above-mentioned items?

4. What procedures have been established for appeals by individuals or organizations who feel that the decisions of the Department are unfair or improper?

Hon. Herb Gray (Minister of National Revenue): 1. 1969, two importations; 1968, Nil; 1967; one importation; 1966-1965: information not available.

2. 1969, 2,530 importations; 1968, 518 importations; 1967, 115 importations; 1966-1965: information not available.

3. Decisions can only be made by officials of Customs and Excise. These decisions are first made by senior executives and on appeal by the Deputy Minister, and on further appeal by the Courts.

4. Appeal procedures are set out in Sections 43 and 46A of the Customs Act, R.S.C. 1952, c. 58, as amended.

USE OF COMPUTER, DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR

Question No. 1,980—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Labour have the use of a computer in its operations and, if so, to what extent is it utilized?

2. Is the computer programmed 24 hours per day and, if not, for what reason?

3. What is the number of hours planned for utilization of the computer?

4. What has been the annual cost of computer services for each year 1960 to 1970 inclusive?

5. How many programmes are in preparation for the computer at the present time and how will each affect the efficiency of the Department?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): 1. Yes. A U9200 computer, for use as a terminal, was installed May 22, 1970, and operational June 8, 1970. At present, operator training is being carried out and existing programs modified for production via the terminal. When the terminal is not required, the U9200 will be used to perform listings, tabulation and simple card programmes.

2. No. Present programmed requirements do not warrant a 24 hour schedule.

3. For 1970-71, planned utilization is 8 hours per day. Given an anticipated increase in workload, a second shift is being considered for 1971-72.

4. Annual cost of computer services 1960 to 1970 inclusive

Fiscal Year	Amount
1959-60	$ 52
1960-61	2,278
1961-62	3,382
1962-63	3,588
1963-64	16,900
1964-65	16,198
1965-66	22,629
1966-67	18,056
1967-68	40,133
1968-69	57,455
1969-70	156,920

5. One hundred and four programs are in preparation. These are designed to supply data not now easily accessible, but required to meet approved program needs of the department. As these programs are in preparation stage, it is not possible at this time to estimate their final impact on the efficiency of the department.

Questions

DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT, DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR

Question No. 1,982—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Labour have data processing equipment (automatic) and, if so, for how long?

2. What was the initial cost of the equipment?

3. What yearly costs are anticipated for data processing in the Department?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): 1. The first ADP equipment was rented by the Department of Labour in 1950 and rental has been on a continuous basis since that time.

2. No initial cost was involved as all equipment has been on a rental basis.

3. For ADP equipment the yearly costs are estimated at $12,000.

SAYWARD, B.C. POST OFFICE

Question No. 1,983—**Mr. Barnett:**

1. On what date was the Sayward, B.C., Post Office first established?

2. On what date did the Canadian Permanent Committee of Geographical names first recognize Sayward, B.C. as a place name?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Post Office Department and the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources as follows: 1. July 1, 1886, know then as Sayward-Alberni Post Office.

2. April 5, 1938.

RETENTION OF FOREIGN ORGANIZATIONS FOR ACQUISITION OF LANDS IN ONTARIO

Question No. 1,988—**Mr. Alexander:**

Has the government retained any foreign or international organizations, institutions or corporations to acquire lands in the Province of Ontario and, if so (a) for what reason (b) what are the names of the organizations, institutions or corporations (c) how much money is involved (d) where is the land situated?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): No.

*BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH CENTRE

Question No. 1,989—**Mr. Fairweather:**

Have appointments been made to the Board of Governors of the International Development Research Centre, and (a) if so, who are the appointees (b) if not, when will the government announce the appointments?

[Mr. Mackasey.]

Mr. Barney Danson (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, no appointments have been made to date. Announcements will be made in due course.

CLOSURE OF POST OFFICES, FUNDY-ROYAL AND YORK-SUNBURY

Question No. 1,990—**Mr. Fairweather:**

Since April 1, 1968, what post offices have been closed or are scheduled for closing before December 31, 1970 in the constituencies of Fundy-Royal and York-Sunbury?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister without Portfolio): Since 1st April 1968:

Fundy-Royal E.D.	York-Sunbury E.D.
Millstream	Napadogan
Nauwigewauk	Davidson Lake
Newcastle Creek	Magundy
North Minto	
Pamdenec	
Upham	
Gaspereau Forks	
Hampton	
Lower Jemseg	
Lower Millstream	
Jemseg	
Narrows	
Shannon	
East Riverside	

Post Offices to be closed before 31st December 1970:

Fundy-Royal E.D.	York-Sunbury E.D.
Coal Creek	Astle
Edgetts Landing	Kingsclear
Oak Point	
Queenstown	
Surrey	
Upper Gagetown	
Rusagonis Station	

CARPENTRY COURSE, FORT SMITH ADULT VOCATIONAL TRAINING CENTRE

Question No. 1,994—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

1. Has a basic carpentry course been established at the Adult Vocational Training Centre in Fort Smith, N.W.T.?

2. Who is the instructor for the course?

3. What equipment is available for the course?

4. What classroom space is available (a) is this space adequate (b) if not, what plans are afoot for expansion?

5. Have complaints been received concerning the inadequacy of facilities at the AVTC in Fort Smith and, if so (a) what are the complaints (b) what steps have been taken to deal with them?

Mr. Judd Buchanan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. Yes, this course has been established and is run by the Department of Education, Government of Northwest Territories.

2. At the present time there is no instructor. The first course was completed on schedule June 5, 1970. The next course is not due to commence until August 3, 1970.

3. Equipment consist of 592 tools and related items valued at approximately $7,000.

4. Classroom space of 3,196 square feet is available. (a) This space is considered adequate for a class of ten students. (b) N/A.

5. Yes, complaints have been received. (a) (i) Lack of space; (ii) lack of equipment; (iii) student grade level on entrance to class. (b) (i) Not considered valid when compared to other school; (ii) on the basis of the number of students and type of course, existing equipment is considered adequate, (iii) the Centre is not post high school vocational technical school but a centre for upgrading and pre-employment skill training for individuals with little education.

USE OF DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT—DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE

Question No. 2,003—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of National Health and Welfare have data processing equipment (automatic) and, if so, for how long?

2. What was the initial cost of the equipment?

3. What yearly costs are anticipated for data processing in the Department?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare):

Division/Branch		1	2	3
Research and Statistics	Since	1969	$ 1,275	$ 64,000
Health Services		1968	$21,400	$ 79,400
Food and Drug		N/A	N/A	$100,000
Health Insurance and Resources		N/A	N/A	$ 20,900
Administration		1970	$72,800	$ 21,900

CTV PROGRAM "QUESTION PERIOD"

Question No. 2,004—**Mr. Rose:**

1. Who have been guests on CTV program "Question Period" since the beginning of the fall season up to and including Sunday, April 26?

2. How many were of the federal government?

3. How many were employees of the federal government or of government agencies?

4. How many were of opposition parties?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): The Secretary of State does not have the data required to provide the information requested.

[*English*]

"LIFT" PROGRAM

Question No. 2,007—**Mr. Southam:**

1. Is the government giving consideration to compensating Grain Elevator Agents in Western Canada involved in assisting farmers to complete their application forms under the current "Lift" program and, if not, for what reason?

2. If compensation is to be paid, when will it commence and in what amounts?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): 1. The government has given consideration to compensating Grain Elevator Agents who have assisted farmers to complete applications under the "Lift" program. Because, under the Wheat Inventory Reduction Regulations, farmers are responsible for preparing such applications and delivering them to their Elevator Agents at the time of applying for Canadian Wheat Board permit books for the 1970-71 crop year and because assistance of this kind given to farmers by Elevator Agents is normally provided as a service to clients or customers, no compensation is to be paid by the government for such services.

2. See answer to Question No. 1.

DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Question No. 2,009—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Agriculture have data processing equipment (automatic) and, if so, for how long?

2. What was the initial cost of the equipment?

3. What yearly costs are anticipated for data processing in the Department?

Questions

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):
1. Yes, since 1935.

2. The initial rental of equipment was $4,800 per annum.

3. Current year's estimated cost of data processing equipment rentals and contract services is $582,730.

USE OF COMPUTER, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Question No. 2,011—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Agriculture have the use of a computer in its operations and, if so, to what extent is it utilized?

2. Is the computer programmed 24 hours per day and, if not, for what reason?

3. What is the number of hours planned for utilization of the computer?

4. What has been the annual cost of computer services for each year 1960 to 1970 inclusive?

5. How many programmes are in preparation for the computer at the present time and how will each affect the efficiency of the Department?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):
1. Yes, 24 hours a day for five days a week, for in house equipment.

2. Yes, excepting Saturdays and Sundays, for in house equipment.

3. The number of hours planned for future computer utilization depends on the type of computer operated in house, the number and nature of new applications and on utilization of outside computers and service bureaux.

4. Annual cost of computer services (departmental and outside facilities):

1960-61	1961-62	1962-63	1963-64	1964-65
$17,053.78	$39,870.90	$39,979.00	$46,449.36	$76,800.97
1965-66	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69	1969-70
$73,663.27	$195,006.78	$267,139.40	$273,818.49	$357,189.94

5. Over 100 departmental applications are on computers at various universities and commercial agencies across Canada and about 75 on facilities at Ottawa. New programs are continually being written, primarily to provide more efficient analyses of scientific research data and to provide effective administrative support to Production and Marketing, Health of Animals and Agricultural Stabilization activities.

The above answers exclude the Board of Grain Commissioners and the National Farm Management Service (Canfarm) whose requirements are met through separate computer services.

INCENTIVE GRANT TO PRATT REPRESENTATIVES (NEWFOUNDLAND) LTD.

Question No. 2,014—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion under the Regional Development Incentives Act authorized or provided an incentive grant or grants to Pratt Representatives' (Newfoundland) Limited and, if so, what is the amount of each grant?

2. Who are the directors and executive officers of the company?

3. To what extent is this company non-resident or foreign-owned or controlled?

4. What is the name and country of the known non-resident ownership in this company?

[Mr. Robinson.]

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion and the Bureau of Statistics as follows:

1. This information was contained in the monthly report, tabled in Parliament on the operation of the Regional Development Act.

2. The directors of Pratt Representatives' (Nfld.) Limited as of December 31, 1968 were: J. C. Hudson, Topsail Road, St. John's Nfld.; C. C. Pratt, 10 Waterford Ave., St. John's Nfld.; E. A. Pratt, 140 Waterford Bridge Road, St. John's, Nfld.; W. S. Rowe, 3 Ross Road, St. John's, Nfld.; N. H. Smith, Waterford Avenue, St. John's, Nfld.;

The executive officers were: C. C. Pratt, 10 Waterford Ave., St. John's, Nfld.; E. A. Pratt, President, 140 Waterford Bridge Road, St. John's, Nfld.; W. S. Rowe, Secretary-Treasurer, 3 Ross Road, St. John's, Nfld.; N. H. Smith, Managing-Director, Waterford Ave., St. John's, Nfld.

3. Non-residents have no interest in the voting shares of the company either directly or through other holdings.

4. None.

CLOSURE OF POST OFFICES

Question No. 2,015—**Mr. Rodrique:**

Since April 1, 1968, what post offices have been closed or are scheduled for closing prior to December 31, 1970 in the constituencies of (a) Beauce (b) Frontenac?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister without Portfolio): Since April 1, 1968: (a) Beauce: Bellarmin, St-Ephrem Station, Station-St-Victor, St-Hilaire-de-Dorset. (b) Frontenac: Kinnear's Mills, Normand, Ste-Julie-Station.

Before December 31, 1970: (a) Beauce: Feuille d'Érable, Quatre-Chemins, St-René, St-Simon-les-Mines, (b) Frontenac: Broughton Station, St-Jean d'Irlande, Vimy Ridge Mine.

MAINTENANCE COSTS OF FEDERAL BUILDINGS IN BEAUCE CONSTITUENCY

Question No. 2,016—**Mr. Rodrique:**

What is the cost of repair and maintenance for all buildings owned by the Department of Public Works in the constituency of Beauce?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): For the fiscal year 1969-70 the total operation and maintenance costs for all Department of Public Works buildings was $62,154.01.

BEAUCE CONSTITUENCY—CLOSURE OF POST OFFICE

Question No. 2,017—**Mr. Rodrique:**

Has the Post Office Department considered reviewing its decision to close the St. Simon les Mines Post Office in the constituency of Beauce?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister without Portfolio): This case was re-examined to ensure that a just decision had been made and there was no deviation from our established policy that could justify the retention of this office.

JUMBO JETS—RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN NOISE AND MENTAL ILLNESS

Question No. 2,018—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

In preparation for the introduction of the jumbo jets, have any studies been undertaken, or are any in prospect, such as the one recently completed at Heathrow Airport in London, England, on the relationship between noise pollution and mental illness?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): No studies have been undertaken by the Department of National Health and Welfare, nor are any in prospect on the relationship between noise pollution and mental illness.

Continuous monitoring by the Department of Transport has indicated that lower levels of noise are being recorded for the jumbo jets (e.g. Boeing 747) than for current jet aircraft. Further, the reaction of people in the vicinity of airports to the jumbo jet is that the noise subjectively is less irritating, and the aircraft appears to be quieter.

INCENTIVE GRANT TO POSTE DE CLASSIFICATION MAURICIEN INC.

Question No. 2,019—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion under the Regional Development Incentives Act authorized or provided an incentive grant or grants to Poste de Classification Mauricien Inc. and, if so, what is the amount of each grant?

2. Who are the directors and executive officers of the company?

3. To what extent is this company non-resident or foreign-owned or controlled?

4. What is the name and country of the known non-resident ownership in this company?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): 1 and 2. This information was contained in the monthly report, tabled in Parliament on the operation of the Regional Development Act.

3, 4, and 5. This information is not presently available as this corporation is not required to report under any Act of Parliament.

INCENTIVE GRANT TO VICTOR WOOLLEN PRODUCTS LIMITED

Question No. 2,020—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion under the Regional Development Incentives Act authorized or provided an incentive grant or grants to Victor Woollen Products Limited and, if so, what is the amount of each grant?

2. Who are the directors and executive officers of the company?

3. To what extent is this company non-resident or foreign-owned or controlled?

4. What is the name and country of the known non-resident ownership in this company?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion and The Dominion Bureau of Statistics as follows: 1. This information was contained in the monthly report, tabled in Parliament on the operation of the Regional Development Act.

Questions

2. The directors of Victor Woollen Products Limited as of December 31, 1969 were: Mr. Henri Duval, St. Victor Village, Cté Beauce, P.Q.; Mr. Patrice Duval, St. Victor Station, Cté Beauce, P.Q.; Mr. Victor Duval, St. Victor Station, Cté Beauce, P.Q.

The executive officers were: Mr. Henri Duval, Vice-President, St. Victor Village, Cté Beauce, P.Q.; Mr. Patrice Duval, President, St. Victor Station, Cté Beauce, P.Q.; Mr. Victor Duval, Secrétaire, St. Victor Station, Cté Beauce, P.Q.

3. Non-residents have no interest in the voting shares of the company either directly or through other corporations.

4. None.

INCENTIVE GRANT TO PARKLAND PLASTICS LIMITED

Question No. 2,021—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion under the Regional Development Incentives Act authorized or provided an incentive grant or grants to Parkland Plastics Limited and, if so, what is the amount of each grant?

2. Who are the directors and executive officers of the company?

3. To what extent is this company non-resident or foreign-owned or controlled?

4. What is the name and country of the known non-resident ownership in this company?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See answer to Question No. 2,019 answered this day.

INCENTIVE GRANT TO PRS TARP MFG. CO.

Question No. 2,022—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion under the Regional Development Incentives Act authorized or provided an incentive grant or grants to PRS Tarp Mfg., Co. and, if so, what is the amount of each grant?

2. Who are the directors and executive officers of the company?

3. To what extent is this company non-resident or foreign-owned or controlled?

4. What is the name and country of the known non-resident ownership in this company?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See answer to Question No. 2,019 answered this day.

INCENTIVE GRANT TO NEWPORT INDUSTRIES LIMITED

Question No. 2,023—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion under the Regional Development Incentives Act authorized or provided an incentive grant or grants to Newport Industries Limited and, if so, what is the amount of each grant?

[Mr. Jerome.]

2. Who are the directors and executive officers of the company?

3. To what extent is this company non-resident or foreign-owned or controlled?

4. What is the name and country of the known non-resident ownership in this company?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See answer to Question No. 2,019 answered this day.

INCENTIVE GRANT TO MUSQUODOBOIT LUMBER COMPANY LIMITED

Question No. 2,024—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion under the Regional Development Incentives Act authorized or provided an incentive grant or grants to Musquodoboit Lumber Company Limited and, if so, what is the amount of each grant?

2. Who are the directors and executive officers of the company?

3. To what extent is this company non-resident or foreign-owned or controlled?

4. What is the name and country of the known non-resident ownership in this company?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion and the Dominion Bureau of Statistics as follows: 1. This information was contained in the monthly report, tabled in Parliament on the operation of the Regional Development Act.

2. The directors of the Musquodoboit Lumber Company Limited as of November 30, 1967 were: Mr. Jack Brown, Upper Musquodoboit, Halifax Co., N.S., Mr. Murray S. Prest, Mosseland, Halifax Co., N.S.; Mr. James B. Wilbur, 1770 Bloomingdale Terrace, Halifax, N.S. The executive officers were: Mr. Jack Brown, Treasurer, Upper Musquodoboit, Halifax Co., N.S.; Mr. Murray S. Prest, President, Mosseland, Halifax Co., N.S.; Mr. James B. Wilbur, Secretary, 1770 Bloomingdale Terrace, Halifax, N.S.

3. Non-residents have no interest in the voting shares of the company either directly or through other holdings.

4. None.

INCENTIVE GRANT TO McMILLAN PRESS LIMITED

Question No. 2,025—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion under the Regional Development Incentives Act authorized or provided an incentive grant or grants to McMillan Press Limited and, if so, what is the amount of each grant?

2. Who are the directors and executive officers of the company?

3. To what extent is this company non-resident or foreign-owned or controlled?

4. What is the name and country of the known non-resident ownership in this company?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion and the Dominion Bureau of Statistics as follows: 1. This information was contained in the monthly report, tabled in Parliament on the operation of the Regional Development Act.

2. The directors of McMillan Press Limited as of December 31, 1968 were: Mrs. Alice T. Alexander, 12 Buena Vista Ave., Saint John, N.B.; Mr. Robert T. Alexander, 10 Buena Vista Ave., Saint John, N.B.; Mr. Donald S. Barlow, 38 Alward St., Saint John, N.B.; Mr. Edwin A. Kennedy, 8 Queen Sq., Saint John, N.B.; Mr. Frank Perkins, Duke Street, Saint John, N.B. The executive officers were: Mrs. Alice T. Alexander, Vice-President, 12 Buena Vista Ave., Saint John, N.B.; Mr. Robert T. Alexander, President, 10 Buena Vista Ave., Saint John, N.B.; Mr. Donald S. Barlow, Secretary-Treasurer, 38 Alward St., Saint John, N.B.; Mr. Frank Perkins, Accountant, Duke Street, Saint John, N.B.

3. Non-residents have no direct interest in the voting shares of the company. Moreover, no information is available on whether the intermediate company, McMillan Litho Ltd., has non-resident participation or not. This company was not required to file ownership information under the Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act by virtue of its relatively small size.

4. None.

INCENTIVE GRANT TO C.M. McLEAN LIMITED

Question No. 2,026—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion under the Regional Development Incentives Act authorized or provided an incentive grant or grants to C. M. McLean Limited and, if so, what is the amount of each grant?

2. Who are the directors and executive officers of the company?

3. To what extent is this company non-resident or foreign-owned or controlled?

4. What is the name and country of the known non-resident ownership in this company?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion and the Dominion Bureau of Statistics as follows: 1. This information was contained in the monthly report, tabled in Parliament on the operation of the Regional Development Act.

2. The directors of C. M. McLean Limited as of December 31, 1968 were: Lois Hennessey, 51 Villa Avenue, Charlottetown, P.E.I.; C. M. McLean, Box 1111, Charlottetown, P.E.I.; C. Mitchell McLean, Box 1111, Charlottetown, P.E.I. The executive officers were: Lois Hennessey, Secretary-Treasurer, 51 Villa Avenue, Charlottetown, P.E.I.; C. M. McLean, President, Box 1111, Charlottetown, P.E.I.

3. Non-residents have no interest in the voting shares of the company either directly or indirectly.

4. None.

INCENTIVE GRANT TO MANCANA INDUSTRIES LIMITED

Question No. 2,027—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion under the Regional Development Incentives Act authorized or provided an incentive grant or grants to Mancana Industries Limited and, if so, what is the amount of each grant?

2. Who are the directors and executive officers of the company?

3. To what extent is this company non-resident or foreign-owned or controlled?

4. What is the name and country of the known non-resident ownership in this company?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See answer to Question No. 2,019 answered this day.

INCENTIVE GRANT TO LORETTE MECHANICAL MANUFACTURING LTD.

Question No. 2,028—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion under the Regional Development Incentives Act authorized or provided an incentive grant or grants to Lorette Mechanical Manufacturing Ltd. and, if so, what is the amount of each grant?

2. Who are the directors and executive officers of the company?

3. To what extent is this company non-resident or foreign-owned or controlled?

4. What is the name and country of the known non-resident ownership in this company?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See answer to Question No. 2,019 answered this day.

Questions

INCENTIVE GRANT TO INSULATED PRODUCTS LIMITED

Question No. 2,029—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion under the Regional Development Incentives Act authorized or provided an incentive grant or grants to Insulated Products Limited and, if so, what is the amount of each grant?

2. Who are the directors and executive officers of the company?

3. To what extent is this company non-resident or foreign-owned or controlled?

4. What is the name and country of the known non-resident ownership in this company?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See answer to Question No. 2,019 answered this day.

INCENTIVE GRANT TO IMPRIMERIE DES CÈDRES INC.

Question No. 2,030—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion under the Regional Development Incentives Act authorized or provided an incentive grant or grants to Imprimerie des Cèdres Inc. and, if so, what is the amount of each grant?

2. Who are the directors and executive officers of the company?

3. To what extent is this company non-resident or foreign-owned or controlled?

4. What is the name and country of the known non-resident ownership in this company?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See answer to question No. 2,019 answered this day.

INCENTIVE GRANT TO HAWKER INDUSTRIES LIMITED

Question No. 2,031—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion under the Regional Development Incentives Act authorized or provided an incentive grant or grants to Hawker Industries Limited and, if so, what is the amount of each grant?

2. Who are the directors and executive officers of the company?

3. To what extent is this company non-resident or foreign-owned or controlled?

4. What is the name and country of the known non-resident ownership in this company?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion and the Dominion Bureau of Statistics as follows: 1. This information was contained in the monthly report, tabled in Parliament on the operation of the Regional Development Act.

[Mr. Jerome.]

2. The directors of Hawker Industries Limited as at December 31, 1968, were: A. A. Baillie, 50 Sunnydene Crescent, Toronto, Ontario; T. J. Emmert, 500 Avenue Road, Toronto, Ontario; J. F. Howard, R.R. No. 2, Woodbridge, Ontario; D. G. Kettering, 67 Sir William's Lane, Islington, Ontario; W. D. Walker, 3 Hunthill Court, Islington, Ontario; The executive officers were: A. A. Baillie, Vice-President—Finance, 50 Sunnydene Crescent, Toronto, Ontario; I. E. Bull, Treasurer, 38 Brookfield Road, Willowdale, Ontario; T. J. Emmert, Chairman and President, 500 Avenue Road, Toronto, Ontario; J. H. Ready, Secretary, 2 Swindon Road, Islington, Ontario.

3. Non-residents have a 57.5 per cent interest in the voting shares of the company.

4. The majority of the voting shares is held by Hawker Siddeley Canada Ltd. The non-resident interest in this company resides primarily in the United Kingdom.

INCENTIVE GRANT TO H & R INDUSTRIES (DAUPHIN) LTD.

Question No. 2,032—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion under the Regional Development Incentives Act authorized or provided an incentive grant or grants to H & R Industries (Dauphin) Ltd. and, if so, what is the amount of each grant?

2. Who are the directors and executive officers of the company?

3. To what extent is this company non-resident or foreign-owned or controlled?

4. What is the name and country of the known non-resident ownership in this company?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See answer to Question No. 2019 answered this day.

INCENTIVE GRANT TO FIBRE DE VERRE DE L'EST INC.

Question No. 2,033—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion under the Regional Development Incentives Act authorized or provided an incentive grant or grants to Fibre de Verre de l'Est Inc. and, if so, what is the amount of each grant?

2. Who are the directors and executive officers of the company?

3. To what extent is this company non-resident or foreign-owned or controlled?

4. What is the name and country of the known non-resident ownership in this company?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See answer to Question No. 2,019 answered this day.

INCENTIVE GRANT TO FEDERAL PRODUCTS LIMITED

Question No. 2,034—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion under the Regional Development Incentives Act authorized or provided an incentive grant or grants to Federal Products Limited and, if so, what is the amount of each grant?

2. Who are the directors and executive officers of the company?

3. To what extent is this company non-resident or foreign-owned or controlled?

4. What is the name and country of the known non-resident ownership in this company?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion and the Dominion Bureau of Statistics as follows: 1. This information was contained in the monthly report, tabled in Parliament on the operation of the Regional Development Act.

2. The directors of Federal Products Limited as of December 31, 1968, were: Mr. Charles E. Lewis, 50 Smith Ave., Truro, N.S.; Mrs. Marjorie A. Lewis, 50 Smith Ave., Truro, N.S.; Mr. R. Lorne Macdougall, 128 Brunswick St., Truro, N.S.; The executive officers were: Mr. Charles E. Lewis, President, 50 Smith Ave., Truro, N.S.; Mrs. Marjorie A. Lewis, Vice-President, 50 Smith Ave., Truro, N.S.; Mr. R. Lorne Macdougall, Secretary-Treasurer, 128 Brunswick St., Truro, N.S.

3. Non-residents have no interest in the voting shares of the company either directly or through other holdings.

4. None.

INCENTIVE GRANT TO CUSTOM PROFILE & PIPE EXTRUSION

Question No. 2,035—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion under the Regional Development Incentives Act authorized or provided an incentive grant or grants to Custom Profile & Pipe Extrusion and, if so, what is the amount of each grant?

2. Who are the directors and executive officers of the company?

3. To what extent is this company non-resident or foreign-owned or controlled?

4. What is the name and country of the known non-resident ownership in this company?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See answer to Question No. 2,019 answered this day.

INCENTIVE GRANT TO CHARCUTERIE LA FERNANDIÈRE INC.

Question No. 2,036—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion under the Regional Development Incentives Act authorized or provided an incentive grant or grants to Charcuterie la Fernandière Inc. and, if so, what is the amount of each grant?

2. Who are the directors and executive officers of the company?

3. To what extent is this company non-resident or foreign-owned or controlled?

4. What is the name and country of the known non-resident ownership in this company?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See answer to Question No. 2,019 answered this day.

INCENTIVE GRANT TO BLUEBIRD BAKERY LIMITED

Question No. 2,037—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion under the Regional Development Incentives Act authorized or provided an incentive grant or grants to Bluebird Bakery Limited and, if so, what is the amount of each grant?

2. Who are the directors and executive officers of the company?

3. To what extent is this company non-resident or foreign-owned or controlled?

4. What is the name and country of the known non-resident ownership in this company?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion and the Dominion Bureau of Statistics as follows: 1. This information was contained in the monthly report tabled in Parliament on the operation of the Regional Development Act.

2. The directors of Bluebird Bakery Limited as of August 31, 1969 were: Mrs. Evelina Boschetto, 11 Harry St., Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario; Mr. Ferruccio Boschetto, 11 Harry St., Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario; Mr. Edo Merini, 15 Arion Dr., Sault Ste. Marie, Ont. The executive officers were: Mrs. Evelina Boschetto, Vice-President, 11 Harry St., Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.; Mr. Ferruccio Boschetto, President, 11 Harry St., Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.; Mr. Richard Boschetto, Secretary-Treasurer, 108 Allard St., Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.

3. Non-residents have no interest in the voting shares of the Company either directly or through other holdings.

4. None.

Questions

INCENTIVE GRANT TO BESTAR LIMITÉE

Question No. 2,038—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion under the Regional Department Incentives Act authorized or provided an incentive grant or grants to Bestar Limitée and, if so, what is the amount of each grant?

2. Who are the directors and executive officers of the company?

3. To what extent is this company non-resident or foreign-owned or controlled?

4. What is the name and country of the known non-resident ownership in this company?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See answer to Question No. 2,019 answered this day.

INCENTIVE GRANT TO POLYÉTHYLÈNE KÉBEC INC.

Question No. 2,039—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion under the Regional Department Incentives Act authorized or provided an incentive grant or grants to Apalache Industries Limited and, if so, what is the amount of each grant?

2. Who are the directors and executive officers of the company?

3. To what extent is this company non-resident or foreign-owned or controlled?

4. What is the name and country of the known non-resident ownership in this company?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See answer to Question No. 2,019 answered this day.

INCENTIVE GRANT TO APALACHE INDUSTRIES LIMITED

Question No. 2,040—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion under the Regional Department Incentives Act authorized or provided an incentive grant or grants to Apalache Industries Limited and, if so, what is the amount of each grant?

2. Who are the directors and executive officers of the company?

3. To what extent is this company non-resident or foreign-owned or controlled?

4. What is the name and country of the known non-resident ownership in this company?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See answer to Question No. 2,019 answered this day.

INCENTIVE GRANT TO TRIPLE E. MOTOR HOMES LTD.

Question No. 2,041—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion under the Regional Development Incentives Act authorized or provided an incentive grant or grants to Triple E. Motor Homes Ltd. and, if so, what is the amount of each grant?

2. Who are the directors and executive officers of the company?

3. To what extent is this company non-resident or foreign-owned or controlled?

4. What is the name and country of the known non-resident ownership in this company?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See answer to Question No. 2,019 answered this day.

INCENTIVE GRANT TO REMBOURRAGE INDUSTRIEL KÉBEC INC.

Question No. 2,042—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion under the Regional Development Incentives Act authorized or provided an incentive grant or grants to Rembourrage Industriel Kébec Inc. and, if so, what is the amount of each grant?

2. Who are the directors and executive officers of the company?

3. To what extent is this company non-resident or foreign-owned or controlled?

4. What is the name and country of the known non-resident ownership in this company?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See answer to Question No. 2,019 answered this day.

GUIDELINES FOR SEIZURE OF BOOKS, ETC. BY CUSTOMS OFFICERS

Question No. 2,044—**Mr. Brewin:**

1. What guidelines do customs officers have to determine if they have grounds to seize books, prints, printed paper, drawings, paintings, photographs or representations of any kind which are of a treasonable or seditious nature or of an immoral or indecent character?

2. What guidelines are used by the authorities in the Department of National Revenue to determine whether the books, prints, printed paper, drawings, paintings, photographs or representations of any kind are treasonable or seditious or of immoral or indecent character?

3. Does the Department of National Revenue keep a record of the specific publications prohibited under Item 99201-1, Schedule C of the Customs Tariff?

4. What are the qualifications and the rank or Public Service classification of those officials of the Department of National Revenue involved in deciding whether material should be prohibited entry under Item 99201-1?

Hon. Herb Gray (Minister of National Revenue): 1. Material is not seized by Customs officers at the time of entry but is detained for further examination. The basic guideline is the Tariff Item itself (99201-1) supple-

mented by internal instructions to port officers. These instructions are based on court decisions under the Customs Tariff Act and under corresponding sections of the Criminal Code. Where a Customs officer considers the material comes within the Tariff Item, it is referred to headquarters for decision.

2. Headquarters is guided by the definitions contained in the related sections of the Ciminal Code and court judgments which have been made under those sections and under the Customs Tariff Act.

3. The ordinary filing system is maintained for all items forwarded and reviewed at headquarters. No separate list of material prohibited under the Tariff item is maintained nor does the department issue such a list.

4. The decisions are made by persons classified as senior executive officers possessing qualifications in accordance with the established standards.

EXPERIMENT WITH TIDAL POWER SCHEMES

Question No. 2,046—**Mr. Coates:**

Has the government given consideration to requesting the National Research Council to undertake the project involving the information provided in the report submitted by the Atlantic Tidal Power Programming Board that would result in the development of a miniature environment, geographically identical to that studied by the Board that would allow the National Research Council to experiment with the Tidal Power Schemes under investigation by the Board as well as the comparison of alternative schemes and if such a request has not been made to the National Research Council, will the government give consideration to making such a request to that Council?

Mr. Barney Danson (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): The Government has not given consideration to requesting the National Research Council to undertake experiments on Tidal Power schemes. It does not intend to do so unless new factors arise which change the circumstances referred to in the report of the Board set up jointly by the Governments of Canada, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia which concluded that "Economic development of tidal power in the Bay of Fundy is not feasible under prevailing circumstances".

REMOVAL OF PONIES FROM SABLE ISLAND

Question No. 2,047—**Mr. Coates:**

Is the government considering any action that would result in the removal of ponies from Sable Island and, if so, what actions are contemplated and for what reason?

Mr. Gérard Duquet (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): No.

*INTERLAKE REGION OF MANITOBA

Question No. 2,048—**Mr. Rowland:**

Is the government developing a contingency plan designed to reduce or eliminate the effects of economic and social dislocation upon the Interlake Region of Manitoba should the processing plant of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation be relocated and, if so, will the appropriate Minister undertake to make a statement on motions informing the House of the nature of the plan once it has been developed?

Mr. Chas. L. Caccia (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the Department of Fisheries and Forestry and the Department of Manpower and Immigration inform that no economic or social dislocation as a result of any relocation of fish processing plant is foreseen for the interlake region of Manitoba.

The Department of Fisheries and Forestry is actively studying proposals for collaborating with the provincial government of Manitoba in various measures designed to counter the decline in yield in recent years of the commercial fishery in the large southern Manitoba lakes. The objective is to achieve better long term use of the resources available to the advantage of the interlake region of the province. Appropriate announcements will be made as soon as practicable.

The Department of Manpower and Immigration, with other federal and provincial agencies, is continuing its considerable efforts to assist the residents of the interlake region. This department provides, amongst other services, occupational counselling, selection and referral to employment, occupational training and upgrading with income replacement allowances, and financial mobility assistance.

FERRY *JOHN GUY*

Question No. 2,049—**Mr. McGrath:**

What was the gross income and operating expenses for the past fiscal year of the ferry *John Guy* between Bell Island and Portugal Cove, Newfoundland?

Mr. Gérard Duquet (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The Canadian Transport Commission advises as follows: Under Section 390 of the Railway Act, the information requested is privileged.

Questions

MAIL SERVICE CONTRACT, BELL ISLAND-PORTUGAL COVE

Question No. 2,050—**Mr. McGrath:**

1. What is the value of the contract for mail service between Bell Island and Portugal Cove, Newfoundland?

2. Who is the holder of this contract?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister without Portfolio): 1. $7,585.43 per annum.

2. Mr. Robert Hussey.

USE OF COMPUTERS—DEPARTMENT OF SECRETARY OF STATE

Question No. 2,052—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of the Secretary of State have the use of a computer in its operations and, if so, to what extent is it utilized?

2. Is the computer programmed 24 hours per day and, if not, for what reason?

3. What is the number of hours planned for utilization of the computer?

4. What has been the annual cost of computer services for each year 1960 to 1970 inclusive?

5. How many programmes are in preparation for the computer at the present time and how will each affect the efficiency of the Department?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): 1. The Department of the Secretary of State utilizes the services of the computer equipment of Central Accounting Division of the Department of Supply and Services, for the purpose of compiling financial reports and records. The information provided is also used by Fiscal Accounting Division and Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

2. Not applicable.

3. Not applicable.

4. The cost of this service is borne by the Department of Supply and Services.

5. One programme is presently being run for financial reports. The information provided allows the staff of the department to prepare meaningful reports to management regarding current financial trends and assists in forecasting future requirements. It also enables speedier reconciliation of departmental records with those of Central Accounting Division and Fiscal Accounting Division of the Department of Supply and the Department of Supply and Services.

[Mr. Duquet.]

[*English*]

USE OF DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT—DEPARTMENT OF SECRETARY OF STATE

Question No. 2,053—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of the Secretary of State have data processing equipment (automatic) and, if so, for how long?

2. What was the initial cost of the equipment?

3. What yearly costs are anticipated for data processing in the Department?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): 1. No.

2. Not applicable.

3. Not applicable.

[*English*]

FARM CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS TO INDIAN FARMERS

Question No. 2,054—**Mr. Gleave:**

Of the 48 Farm Credit Corporation Loans to Indian farmers in Canada (a) how many individuals in each province received such loans (b) what was the amount of each loan to each individual (c) what was the purpose for which each loan was made?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): The Farm Credit Corporation advises that: (a) Loans were made as follows: to individual operators, B.C. seven; Alberta, four; Saskatchewan, fifteen; Manitoba, seven; Ontario, three; Quebec, one. To two operators on same farm, Alberta, two; Saskatchewan, one; Manitoba, one. To three operators on same farm, B.C., one; Alberta, two; Ontario, one. In Manitoba, a loan was made to a farm having four operators and to another having five operators. In Alberta, a loan was made to a Band carrying on farming operations. (b) and (c) These matters are considered by the Farm Credit Corporation to be confidential between lender and borrower, whether on or off reserves. However, of the total amount of $933,700 approved to March 31, 1970, the purposes were as follows: breeding stock, 25 per cent; farm equipment, 22.6 per cent; buildings, 13.2 per cent; other improvements, 3.7 per cent; debt consolidation, 32.6 per cent; miscellaneous, including loan costs, 2.9 per cent.

INDIAN RESERVES—ANDERSON DRILLING OF ASSINIBOIA

Question No. 2,055—**Mr. Gleave:**

1. On which particular Indian Reserves has Anderson Drilling of Assiniboia, Saskatchewan contracted to bore and develop large diameter shallow wells?

2. How many wells have they contracted to develop in each case?

Mr. Judd Buchanan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. and 2. The following is a listing of Indian Reserves in Saskatchewan indicating the number of wells being drilled by Anderson Drilling of Assiniboia, Saskatchewan.

Indian Reserves	No. of Wells
Littlepine	9
Moosomin	5
Poundmaker	7
Red Pheasant	7
Mosquito	5
Sweetgrass	7
Thunderchild	8
Salteaux	4
Onion Lake	14
Water Hen	4
Ministikwan	3
Mudie Lake	3
Bighead	2
Meadow Lake	4
Little Red River	3
Denare Beach	3
Sturgeon Lake	3
Sioux Wahpaton	3
Big River	8
James Smith	8
Moose Woods	3
Piapot	4
Muscowpetung	2
Peepeekisis	5
Okanese	2
Starblanket	3
Little Black Bear	2
Wood Mountain	2
Gordons	4
Poorman	4
Day Star	1
Muskowekwan	6
Fishing Lake	2
Nut Lake	2
Kinistino	1
Total 35	153

USE OF DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT—DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRY, TRADE AND COMMERCE

Question No. 2,058—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce have data processing equipment (automatic) and, if so, for how long?

2. What was the initial cost of the equipment?

3. What yearly costs are anticipated for data processing in the Department?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): 1. Yes, the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce has rented data processing equipment (automatic) since the formation of the Department, April 1, 1969.

2. The rental cost in fiscal year 1969-70 was $114,997.13.

3. The Department is now conducting a comprehensive study to determine its future requirements for computer services. Consequently a firm answer cannot be given at this time.

GRANT BY GOVERNMENT TO MALLETTE-ROY MILLS LIMITED

Question No. 2,059—**Mr. Broadbent:**

Has there been any grant, loan or other form of financial assistance within the past five years by any department of the Government of Canada to Mallette-Roy Mills Limited or a company of a similar name in the vicinity of Timmins, Ontario?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of Privy Council): Yes. The Department of Regional Economic Expansion.

ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES—POSSIBLE AMENDMENT OF CANADIAN TAX STRUCTURE AND REVENUES RECEIVED

Question No. 2,060—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. Is consideration being given to amending the tax structure regarding alcoholic beverages in Canada?

2. Have briefs been sent or representations made to amend this tax structure and, if so, by whom?

3. For each of the past ten years, what have been the revenues from federal taxation on alcoholic beverages?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Finance and the Department of National Revenue as follows: 1. This is a matter of government policy. If the government should decide to propose an amendment to change the taxation of alcoholic beverages it would be announced at the appropriate time.

2. Yes, during 1970 from January 1 to June 17 one brief was received. It was submited by the Association of Canadian Distillers.

3. See reply to part 1 of Question No. 1,999.

Questions

ABORTIONS

Question No. 2,063—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

1. How many letters were received by the Minister of Justice during the period May 1 to June 15, 1970 (a) in favour of liberalizing laws in relation to abortion (b) opposed to liberalizing laws in relation to abortion?

2. What is the estimated number of illegal abortions performed in Canada during the fiscal year 1969-70?

3. How many registered physicians have been brought to trial during the fiscal year 1969-70 on charges involving abortion?

4. How many physicians have been convicted and what have been the penalties imposed in each case?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Justice and the Dominion Bureau of Statistics as follows: 1. (a) 35; (b) 20.

2. The Dominion Bureau of Statistics cannot estimate the number of illegal abortions performed in Canada as statistics are not collected on this. However, the following information is available, but not for the 1969-70 fiscal year: (i) The number of deaths in which the underlying cause was abortion. (ii) The number of cases for which abortion was given as the primary reason for care in hospitals (not broken down into spontaneous and induced abortions) (iii) The number of convictions in Canadian courts for abortions and attempted abortions.

3. and 4. Information not available.

IMPORTATION OF DAIRY PRODUCTS, EGGS AND HOGS

Question No. 2,064—**Mr. Gauthier:**

1. (a) What quantity of butter was imported into Canada in 1969 and from which countries (b) what quantity was imported during the first two quarters of 1970?

2. What quantity of powdered milk was imported into Canada in 1968, 1969, 1970, to date and from which countries?

3. What quantity of margarine entered Canada in 1968 and 1969?

4. How many eggs did Canada import from the United States in 1968 and 1969?

5. How many hogs were imported into Canada in 1968 and 1969?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): The Dominion Bureau of Statistics reports that: 1. (a) The quantities of butter imported into Canada from each country in 1969 appear on the table below:

Butter (class 51-09) January-December 1969

	Quantity (Cwt.)
Australia	6,720
New Zealand	26,880
Total	33,600

(b) In the first four months of 1970 for which data are available, no imports of butter were recorded.

2. Separate statistics are not compiled on imports of powdered milk, these being included in D.B.S. commodity class 51-59 «Milk, cream and by-products, powdered». Data for this class for 1968, 1969 and 1970 to date are listed below:

Milk, cream and by-products, powdered (class 51-59)

1968	Cwt.	1969	Cwt.	1970 (January-April)	Cwt.
Belgium-Lux.	12,010	Ireland	2,582	Ireland	575
Germany, W.	2,202	Belgium-Lux	23,718	Belgium-Lux	10,207
Netherlands	35	Germany, W.	8,671	Germany, W.	1,467
New Zealand	45,491	New Zealand	23,076	New Zealand	5,493
United States	21,376	United States	18,006	United States	4,500
Total	81,114	Total	76,053	Total	22,242

3. The Dominion Bureau of Statistics does not tabulate separate data on imports of margarine. Statistics on this commodity are included in class 120-49 "Shortening". Imports as recorded in this class in 1968 and 1969 are as follows:

Shortening (class 120-49)

1968 (Lb.)		1969 (Lb.)	
Sweden	315,883	Greece	6,570
U.S.	4,575,031	Sweden	386,068
Total	4,890,914	U.S.	5,042,960
		Total	5,435,598

4. Imports from the United States of eggs in the shell amounted to 8,419,559 doz. in 1968 and 8,699,687 doz. in 1969.

5. Statistics on the import of hogs are listed under category 3-49, "Swine". Imports as recorded in this class for 1968 and 1969 are shown below:

Swine (class 3-49)

1968 (No.)		1969 (No.)	
U.K.	9	U.K.	55
U.S.	757	U.S.	4,707
Total	766	Total	4,762

[*English*]

L'ANCIENNE-LORETTE, QUEBEC—TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF BUILDING

Question No. 2,066—**Mr. Godin:**

1. During the past year, has the government called tenders for the construction of a building to be rented as a post office in l'Ancienne-Lorette, Quebec and, if so, how many tenders were received?

2. What are the names and the addresses of the tenderers?

3. What was the respective amount of each tender and who was the successful tenderer?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): 1. Yes. One tender was received after two tender calls.

2. Tremblay & Beausejour, 1106 Avenue Dijon, Quebec 10, Que.

3. $4.22 per square foot per annum for a 15-year period. The tender was accepted.

[*English*]

USE OF COMPUTER—DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Question No. 2,067—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of External Affairs have the use of a computer in its operations and, if so, to what extent is it utilized?

2. Is the computer programmed 24 hours per day and, if not, for what reason?

3. What is the number of hours planned for utilization of the computer?

4. What has been the annual cost of computer services for each year 1960 to 1970 inclusive?

5. How many programmes are in preparation for the computer at the present time and how will each affect the efficiency of the Department?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. Yes. The computer of the Department of Supply and Services is used for the production of various financial statements including cash and budgetary reports. The extent of utilization is unknown.

2 and 3. Unknown, as the computer is under the administrative control of the Department of Supply and Services.

4. Nil, having been provided free of charge by the Department of Supply and Services.

5. In addition to the annual revision of accounting programs, two others are in preparation at the present time. These are designed to impove administrative and operational efficiency and pertain to: (A) The distribution and custodial inventories of equipment on all premises owned and leased by the Department. (B) The storage and retrieval of information concerning local and international matters which are of interest to the Department.

ALCOHOLISM IN CANADA

Question No. 2,070—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. In each of the past ten years, and in each province, how many alcoholics were there in Canada?

2. In each of the past ten years, and in each province, how many gallons of illegally produced alcoholic beverages were seized?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): 1. Information not available.

2. As per Annex A following.

SEIZURES OF ILLICIT SPIRITS—EXCISE ACT

Fiscal Year	Nfld.	P.E.I.	N.S.	N.B.	P.Q.	Ont.	Man.	Sask.	Alta.	B.C.	N.W.T.	Total
1960-61	0	17	92	13	5,282	225	242	254	12	47	0	6,184
1961-62	20	86	49	1	3,987	687	340	110	91	9	0	5,380
1962-63	1	29	60	77	3,417	765	743	81	28	34	0	5,235
1963-64	1	18	38	10	5,211	2,312	296	59	29	70	0	8,044
1964-65	1	9	32	0	6,467	335	177	106	87	72	0	7,286
1965-66	3	4	9	2	4,942	366	347	47	62	32	0	5,814
1966-67	1	7	35	1	5,221	212	683	72	17	44	1	6,294
1967-68	1	3	3	0	2,851	498	356	69	2	116	0	2,999
1968-69	1	4	36	11	4,292	198	411	55	14	100	0	5,122
1969-70	8	5	29	9	7,016	642	420	59	6	96	0	8,290
Total	37	182	383	124	48,686	6,240	4,015	912	348	620	1	61,548

NOTE: The statistics quoted herein do not include minor seizures of less than one gallon which are disposed of under Provincial Liquor Acts.

Questions

BILINGUALISM IN DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS AND POSITION OF GILLES BERGERON

Question No. 2,072—**Mr. Coates:**

1. What position does Gilles Bergeron hold in the Department of Communications, how long has he been associated with the Public Service of Canada, how long has he been in his present position, what are his qualifications and what is his present salary?

2. Is Mr. Bergeron bilingual, is work in his Department carried out in a bilingual manner and has he, at any time, refused to accept interdepartmental communications in the English language?

3. What facilities are available in the Department of Communications for the translation of Departmental business into English and French, and what is the annual cost of securing translation from English to French by private contractors outside the government service?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Communications and by the Department of the Secretary of State as follows: 1. Mr. Bergeron holds the position of Assistant Deputy Minister (Operations) in the Department of Communications. His association with the Public Service dates from 1967 and he assumed his present position on March 10, 1969. Mr. Bergeron was Associate Commissioner, Centennial Commission (Secretary of State) in 1967 and Manager, Project Office for Domestic Satellite Communication Systems (Privy Council) in 1968. From 1963-66 he served as Assistant Deputy Minister in the Quebec Department of Education. Previously his experience was as an Administrative Consultant with the Quebec Government. He holds a Bachelors of Arts, University of Paris, Bachelor of Applied Science, University of Montreal and Master of Applied Science, University of Toronto. He is paid a salary in the range of SX 3, $23,000 to $29,000.

2. Mr. Bergeron is bilingual. Work in his department is carried out in a bilingual manner, and he has never refused to accept interdepartmental communications in the English language.

3. The Department of Communications is served by the Translation Bureau, Department of the Secretary of State, through a Translation Division comprised of three translators and one secretary working with the Department. For the fiscal year April 1, 1969 to March 31, 1970, the Translation Bureau secured translations from English to French for the Department of Communications from free-lance translators outside the Government service at a total cost of $1,361.90.

[Mr. Jerome.]

CANADIAN RADIO-TELEVISION COMMISSION—MRS. GILLES BERGERON

Question No. 2,073—**Mr. Coates:**

Is Mrs. Gilles Bergeron an employee of the Canadian Radio-Television Commission and, if so, what are her qualifications for the position she holds and what is her annual salary?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Radio-Television Commission as follows: Mrs. Gilles Bergeron is not an employee of the CRTC. She is engaged on contract four days a week to work on a temporary assignment. Mrs. Bergeron holds a Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of Paris, a Bachelor of Psychology degree from the University of Montreal and has ten years' experience in the audio-visual field. Mrs. Bergeron is paid $60 a day.

[*English*]

INTEREST INCOME LOST THROUGH HOLDING PART OF FOREIGN RESERVES IN GOLD

Question No. 2,074—**Mr. Kaplan:**

How much interest income has the government lost from January 1, 1970 to date through holding part of its foreign reserves in gold, considering the investment of such part at the average yield upon the balance of the reserves?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Gold is held in the Exchange Fund Account to be available to purchase U.S. dollars should they be needed for intervention in the foregin currency market to protect the Canadian dollar. Because this gold earns no interest, it has been a matter of policy only to hold a certain proportion of Canada's foreign exchange reserves in this form.

The average yield of the Exchange Fund Account's investment portfolio—excluding gold and the obligations of the IMF—for the year 1969 was 5.85 per cent. The exact figure for the first quarter of 1970 is not yet available. Applied to the gold holdings as of 31 May 1970, interest income foregone during 1970, at the yed applicable in 1969 on other assets, could be said to have approximated $21 million.

USE OF COMPUTER IN DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AND CORPORATE AFFAIRS

Question No. 2,075—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs have the use of a computer in its operations and, if so, to what extent is it utilized?

2. Is the computer programmed 24 hours per day and, if not for what reason?

3. What is the number of hours planned for utilization of the computer?

4. What has been the annual cost of computer services for each year 1960 to 1970 inclusive?

5. How many programs are in preparation for the computer at the present time and how will each affect the efficiency of the Department?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): 1. No.

2. N/A.

3. N/A.

4. N/A.

5. No specific programs are in preparation at this time but feasibility studies concerning the possible use of computer services for several functions of the Department are in progress.

USE OF COMPUTER—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Question No. 2,076—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Justice have the use of a computer in its operations and, if so, to what extent is it utilized?

2. Is the computer programmed 24 hours per day and, if not for what reason?

3. What is the number of hours planned for utilization of the computer?

4. What has been the annual cost of computer services for each year 1960 to 1970 inclusive?

5. How many programmes are in preparation for the computer at the present time and how will each affect the efficiency of the Department?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): 1. The Department of Justice shares on a time cost basis the computers of the Canadian Government Printing Bureau, and the Computer Services Bureau, and benefits from certain programmes run by various other federal departments and Canadian universities.

The CSB and CGPB computers are being used by the Statute Revision Commission in order to place the Revised Statutes of Canada on machine readable tape for the purposes of achieving a more up-to-date printing process. The CSB and CGPB computers are being used in the development of the CADEPOL (computer assisted drafting, editing and publishing of legislation) program. The Central Divorce Registry operations use the CSB computer.

The Department receives print outs and other computer outputs for such operations as pay cheques, accommodation and personnel requirement forecasts and PPBS guidelines from various other federal departments. As well, the Department of Justice is participating in the development of jurimetrics in Canada, but this development work is done on university computers.

2 and 3. The Department of Justice does not control a computer and therefore these questions do not apply.

4. The departmental vote for time-costs for the use of CSB and CGPB computers has been

(Apr. 1/69-Mar. 31/70)	1969-70	$ 80,052.00
	1968-69	26,670.01
	before 1968 if any	none
		$106,722.01

5. The only programs in preparation are the above-mentioned computerized Revised Statutes of Canada printing and CADEPOL.

USE OF DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Question No. 2,077—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Justice have data processing equipment (automatic) and, if so, for how long?

2. What was the initial cost of the equipment?

3. What yearly costs are anticipated for data processing in the Department?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): 1. The Department of Justice does not have any automated data processing equipment as such. The Department does have one IBM 026 key punch and one IBM 2741 terminal which in themselves do not process data.

2. This question does not apply.

3. The answer here is the same as above.

USE OF DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT—DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Question No. 2,078—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of External Affairs have data processing equipment (automatic) and, if so, for how long?

2. What was the initial cost of the equipment?

3. What yearly costs are anticipated for data processing in the Department?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. No.

2. Not applicable.

3. Various systems studies in progress strongly imply a role for automatic data processing in the Department and annual expenses for such equipment are estimated at an average of $300,000 on a five year period.

Questions

NUMBER OF SHIPS IN COMMISSION IN CANADIAN FORCES (SEA)

Question No. 2,079—**Mr. Moores:**

1. How many ships are currently in commission in the Canadian Forces (Sea)?

2. What are the names, types, classes and hull numbers of these ships?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): As of June 30, 1970:

1. 39.

2.

Name	Type	Class	Number
HMCS *Bonaventure*	Light A/S Aircraft Carrier	Modified Majestic	22
Cape Scott	Escort Maintenance Ship	Cape	101
Provider	Operational Support Ship	Provider	508
Protecteur	Operational Support Ship	Improved Provider	509
Ojibwa	Submarine	"O"	72
Onondaga	Submarine	"O"	73
Okanagan	Submarine	"O"	74
Rainbow	Submarine	Tench	75
Annapolis	Helicopter Destroyer Escort	Annapolis	265
Nipigon	Helicopter Destroyer Escort	Annapolis	266
Mackenzie	Destroyer Escort	Mackenzie	261
Qu'Appelle	Destroyer Escort	Mackenzie	264
Saskatchewan	Destroyer Escort	Mackenzie	262
Yukon	Destroyer Escort	Mackenzie	263
Chaudiere	Destroyer Escort	Restigouche	235
Columbia	Destroyer Escort	Restigouche	260
Restigouche	Destroyer Escort	Restigouche	257
St. Croix	Destroyer Escort	Restigouche	256
Terra Nova	Destroyer Escort	Restigouche	259
St. Laurent	Helicopter Destroyer Escort	St. Laurent	205
Saguenay	Helicopter Destroyer Escort	St. Laurent	206
Skeena	Helicopter Destroyer Escort	St. Laurent	207
Ottawa	Helicopter Destroyer Escort	St. Laurent	229
Margaree	Helicopter Destroyer Escort	St. Laurent	230
Fraser	Helicopter Destroyer Escort	St. Laurent	233
Assiniboine	Helicopter Destroyer Escort	St. Laurent	234
Granby	Diving Depot Ship	Prestonian Frigate	320
Chaleur	Coastal Minesweeper	Bay	164
Chignecto	Coastal Minesweeper	Bay	160
Cowichan	Coastal Minesweeper	Bay	162
Fundy	Coastal Minesweeper	Bay	159
Miramichi	Coastal Minesweeper	Bay	163
Thunder	Coastal Minesweeper	Bay	161
Porte de la Reine	Gate Vessel	Porte	184
Porte Quebec	Gate Vessel	Porte	185
Porte St. Jean	Gate Vessel	Porte	180
Porte St. Louis	Gate Vessel	Porte	183
Bras d'Or	Fast Hydrofoil Escort		400
Oriole	Training Yacht	Ketch	QW 3.

NEWFOUNDLAND—OLD AGE ASSISTANCE AND OLD AGE PENSION

Question No. 2,080—**Mr. Moores:**

1. How many people are currently receiving assistance under the Canada Assistance Plan in (a) the constituency of Bonavista-Trinity-Conception (b) the Province of Newfoundland?

2. (a) How much money was paid out under the Canada Assistance Plan to residents of the Province of Newfoundland during 1969, and (b) what is the estimate for 1970?

[Mr. Sharp.]

3. How many residents of the Province of Newfoundland are currently receiving the Old Age Pension?

4. How many residents of the Province of Newfoundland are currently receiving assistance and the Old Age Assistance Plan?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. (a) Statistics are not compiled on the basis of federal constituencies. However, it is estimated that in March,

1970, 13,731 persons in Bonavista-Trinity-Conception were in receipt of assistance shareable under the Canada Assistance Plan. This figure includes 6,844 long-term and 6,887 short-term recipients. (b) As of May, 1970, the total number of persons in receipt of assistance was 87,294 of whom 47,075 were long-term and 40,219 were short-term recipients. In the long-term group there were 9,697 family units and 5,575 single person units. In the short-term group there were 6,658 family units and 1,034 single person units.

2. (a) Federal payments to Newfoundland under the Canada Assistance Plan amounted to $20,289,000 for the fiscal year 1969-70. (b) Estimated federal expenditures under the Plan for the fiscal year 1970-71 are $22,966,000.

3. 31,619 as of April 30, 1970.

4. Persons 65 years of age and over who were formerly granted assistance under the Old Age Security Act are now receiving pensions under the Old Age Security Act.

USE OF DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT—DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AND CORPORATE AFFAIRS

Question No. 2,081—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs have data processing equipment (automatic) and, if so, for how long?

Questions

2. What was the initial cost of the equipment?

3. What yearly costs are anticipated for data processing in the Department?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): 1. Yes. From January 1, 1970. The equipment is an IBM 6430 System.

2. As this equipment is being rented, there was no initial capital outlay on it.

3. Expected yearly operating costs for this equipment are for rental fees ($10,800); punch cards ($400) and paper ($200) for a total estimated cost of $11,400. In addition the Director of Investigation and Research rents time on the IBM 360 System, Model 65, operated by the Computer Services Bureau. It is estimated that the yearly expense will be $2,800.

FITNESS AND AMATEUR SPORTS COUNCIL ALLOCATION OF MONEY

Question No. 2,083—**Mr. Robinson:**

How was the money allocated by the Fitness and Amateur Sports Council for Boxing actually spent?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Monies granted to the Canadian Amateur Boxing Association was allocated as follows:

Year	Amount $	Event
1962/63	1,000	International Championships
1962/63	3,377	Pan. Am. Trials
1962/63	3,092	National Championships
1963/64	3,602	National Championships
1964/65	5,846	National Championships
1965/66	5,470	Coaching Clinics
1965/66	5,381	National Championships
1966/67	4,041	National Championships
1966/67	3,004	Pre. B.E.G. Training
1969/70	6,850	Re-organization Conference
1969/70	1,500	Officials to attend National Championships
1970/71	20,000	Supervision and control of amateur boxing in Canada

From the year 1962/63 to 1966/67 inclusive a grant of $500 was awarded each year to help defray the administration costs.

Questions

FITNESS AND AMATEUR SPORT PROGRAM—PER CAPITA ALLOTMENT

Question No. 2,084—**Mr. Robinson:**

What was the *per capita* allotment made to each of the provinces and territories of Canada under the Fitness and Amateur Sport programme?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): During the fiscal year 1969-70 the per capita allotment was as follows:

Province	Basic Allotment $	Allotment per capita $	Total Allocation $
Nfld.	35,000	14,181	49,181
P.E.I.	35,000	3,047	38,047
N.S.	35,000	21,134	56,134
N.B.	35,000	17,339	52,339
Quebec	35,000	165,137	200,137
Ontario	35,000	204,745	239,745
Manitoba	35,000	27,033	62,033
Saskatchewan	35,000	26,618	61,618
Alberta	35,000	42,849	77,849
B.C.	35,000	56,643	91,643
N.W.T.	35,000	859	35,859
Yukon	35,000	415	35,415
Total	$ 420,000	$ 580,000	$ 1,000,000

OXFAM—INFLUENCE ON FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S RHODESIAN POLICY

Question No. 2,085—**Mr. Robinson:**

Does OXFAM have any influence on the federal government's Rhodesian policy and, if so, to what effect?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Although this organization has no specifically identifiable influence on the government's Rhodesia policy, the government, of course, is prepared to listen to the views of this or any other organization interested in international affairs.

AVERAGE CONSUMER INTEREST RATES

Question No. 2,086—**Mr. Robinson:**

For each year 1950 to 1970 inclusive, what was the average consumer interest rate for (a) automobiles, including cars and trucks (b) farm machinery (c) appliances, generally i.e., toasters, vacuum cleaners, etc. (d) tractors (e) boats (pleasure craft and fishing) (f) stoves (g) refrigerators (h) air-conditioning equipment (i) hot water tanks and heaters (j) oil and/or gas furnaces (k) automotive accessories (l) radios and TV sets (m) electrical fixtures (n) aluminum storms and screens (o) prefabricated dwellings such as houses, cottages, garages, outbuildings, boat houses, etc. (p) plumbing fixtures and equipment (q) furniture (home and office) (r) broadloom, drapes, rugs, etc. (s) typewriters, adding machines and office business equipment (t) machines and business equipment generally (u) houses?

[Mr. Munro.]

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): The interest rates asked for in this question are not subject to statutory limitations. Consequently, they may vary from region to region and from merchant to merchant. No information exists in the Department of Insurance that would enable average interest rates to be determined for the various categories specified.

AVERAGE INTEREST RATE, FINANCE COMPANIES, CREDIT UNIONS AND BANKS

Question No. 2,087—**Mr. Robinson:**

What was the average interest rate charged by (a) finance companies (b) credit unions (c) banks, to consumers for each year 1940 to 1970 inclusive?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): (a) Interest rates charged by finance companies are not subject to maximum limitation except as respects loans subject to the Small Loans Act. That Act applied to loans of $500 or less from 1940 to 1956 and applies to loans of $1,500 or less from 1956 to the present time. From 1940 to 1956 the maximum interest rate that could be charged on loans subject to the Act was 2 per cent a month. From 1956 to the present date the maximum interest rate that may be charged is 2 per cent a month on the first $300 of a loan, 1 per cent on the portion of any loan between $300 and $1,000 and ½ of 1 per cent

on the portion of any loan between $1,000 and $1,500. From time to time some companies have charged less than the maximum permitted but the general pattern is for companies licensed under the Small Loans Act to charge the maximum rates permitted. (b) The interest rate that credit unions may charge is established pursuant to provincial legislation in each province. The usual pattern is to fix a maximum interest rate of 1 per cent a month but many credit unions charge less. No information is available in this Department that would permit an average to be calculated. (c) To be answered elsewhere.

GRANTS TO AND FEDERAL CONTRACTS HELD BY CRAWFORD PRATT OR CLYDE SANGER

Question No. 2,088—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Has the federal government and/or any government agency provided funds or grants to either Cranford Pratt or Clyde Sanger to write, edit or publish any material of any kind and, if so, what and how much was paid and what was the nature of the material?

2. Does the federal government have any contract of any kind with either Cranford Pratt or Clyde Sanger to perform a service for the federal government?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): 1. No. However, the Department of External Affairs invited Professor Cranford Pratt to give a lecture on Foreign Policy and in connection therewith absorbed travelling, transportation and living expenses amounting to $94.

2. The Canadian International Development Agency has or has recently had contracts with Cranford Pratt and Clyde Sanger for the performance of service. These contracts are listed hereunder: (1) Cranford Pratt: (a) Contract dated April 1, 1969, to collect data for and prepare a preliminary report on the desirability and feasibility of a Canadian sponsored program of third country training with Tanzania, Kenya and Uganda for the lump sum amount of $1,250, plus $301.13 in travel expenses. Mr. Pratt was already in Africa when this contract was entered into. (b) Contract for two months from April 1, 1970 to May 30, 1970 to study the feasibility of project grants to Canadian universities and colleges as part of CIDA's non-Government organization program and to make recommendations with respect to types of projects, criteria for project grants, and basis of financing projects, at $100 per day for 17 days ($1,700 in fees), plus $487.59 in travel expenses. (2) Clyde Sanger: Contract for one year from September 1, 1970 with Mr. Sanger to act as special adviser on communications to CIDA at the fee of $18,000 per annum. This will entail the carrying out of research, the preparation of materials and the provision of advice and assistance.

ADVICE TO CANADIAN GOVERNMENT ON RHODESIA

Question No. 2,089—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Are Messrs. Cranford Pratt and Clyde Sanger the experts advising the Canadian Government on Rhodesia, and (a) if not, who are the experts (b) if so, what is their background and knowledge on this subject and how long has each resided in Rhosedia?

2. Have either Mr. Pratt or Mr. Sanger prepared any fact or information material for the federal government and, if so, to what extent?

3. How many articles, periodicals, books, etc. about Rhodesia have been written either in full or in part by either Mr. Pratt or Mr. Sanger?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): 1. No. The Government draws advice on this subject from its own officials and from a wide variety of sources in Canada and abroad, including other governments, international organizations and any individuals who offer information and opinions.

2. Professor Pratt is one of a number of Canadian academics who have been invited to discuss developments in various parts of the world with officials of the Canadian Government.

CIDA entered into a contract with Mr. Pratt on April 1, 1969 to collect data for and prepare a preliminary report on the desirability and feasibility of a Canadian sponsored program of third country training with Tanzania, Kenya and Uganda. It also entered into a contract with him for two months from April 1, 1970 to May 30, 1970, to study the feasibility of project grants to Canadian universities and colleges as part of CIDA's non-Government organization program and to make recommendations with special reference to types of projects, criteria and project grants, and basis of financing projects. As to Mr. Sanger, a contract has been entered into with him for a term of one year from September 1, 1970 to act as special adviser on communications. This will entail the carrying out of research, the preparation of material, and the provision of advice and assistance.

3. This information is not available to the Government.

Orders for Returns

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

DEPARTMENTAL PARLIAMENTARY RETURNS BRANCHES

Question No. 593—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. How many departments have a Parliamentary Returns Branch and what is the number on staff in each department providing this service?

2. How many departments do not have a Parliamentary Returns Branch and, in each case, for what reasons are such Branches not required?

3. How many departments have officers doing Parliamentary Returns work as part of their duties?

Return tabled.

SALARY RANGES, DEPUTY MINISTERS AND ASSISTANT DEPUTY MINISTERS

Question No. 952—**Mr. Orlikow:**

For each government department, Crown corporation or agency, what was the salary range of the Deputy Minister and Assistant Deputy Minister or the equivalent position, as of January 1, 1957, 1962, 1967, 1969?

Return tabled.

PROJECTS AND UNDERTAKINGS, RICHMOND CONSTITUENCY

Question No. 1,157—**Mr. Beaudoin:**

For each project or undertaking in which the federal government participated financially since 1965 in constituency of Richmond (a) what was the nature of the project or undertaking (b) what was the amount invested by the federal government in each project or undertaking (c) what was the amount invested by the provincial government in each project or undertaking (d) were other amounts invested and, if so (i) what was the amount (ii) who made the investment?

Return tabled.

FEDERAL PUBLIC SERVANTS

Question No. 1,277—**Mr. Matte:**

1. What is the total number of federal public servants?

2. How many of these public servants come from Québec?

3. How many of these public servants are bilingual?

4. How many of these public servants are French-Canadian?

5. How many of these public servants are working (a) in Québec (b) in each of the other provinces?

Return tabled.

[Mr. Jerome.]

OPINIONS ON COMBINES INVESTIGATION ACT ACTIVITIES

Question No. 1,342—**Mr. Howard (Skeena):**

Since January 1, 1965, have any fees or remuneration been paid to (a) lawyers (b) persons other than lawyers for opinions and/or action arising out of, or related to, any activity pursuant to the Combines Investigation Act and, if so, what are the names and addresses of each such lawyer or other person, the amount of money paid to each and the type of service rendered in each instance with the applicable dates?

Return tabled.

RESEARCH STUDIES, DEPARTMENT OF MANPOWER AND IMMIGRATION

Question No. 1,360—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. What research studies have been carried out by, or on behalf of, the Department of Manpower and Immigration during each year 1960 to 1969 inclusive?

2. What research studies are presently being carried on and/or are contemplated during the next five years?

3. What was the cost of each of the research studies completed in each year 1960 to 1969 inclusive?

4. What is the estimated cost of each of the studies presently in being or contemplated during the next five years?

Return tabled.

CONSULTANTS ENGAGED, DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES AND FORESTRY

Question No. 1,422—**Mr. Robinson:**

How many consultants have been engaged by the Department of Fisheries and Forestry during each year 1950 to 1970 inclusive (a) what was the cost of the consultants (b) how were the consultants utilized (c) for what reasons were the consultants necessary?

Return tabled.

FEDERAL PAYMENTS TO QUEBEC UNDER SHARED-COST PROGRAMS

Question No. 1,514—**Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse):**

What amounts did the federal government pay to the Quebec Government under shared-cost programmes for the years 1966-67, 1967-68, 1968-69 and 1969-70?

Return tabled.

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION GRANTS APPROVED OR REJECTED

Question No. 1,519—**Mr. Skoreyko:**

1. How many grants have been approved, to date, by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion and on what basis under the terms

of the old Area Development Incentives Act or under other legislation?

2. What is the name, the proposed location and the type of industry or other commercial enterprise to which grants were extended and what was the amount involved in each case and in total?

3. How many applications for grants have been rejected by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, to date, and what were the types of business enterprise and place of proposed location involved in such unsuccessful applications?

4. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion any plans to extend or alter the boundaries of the area currently designated as eligible for grants?

Return tabled.

FREE PARKING SPACE, GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Question No. 1,525—**Mr. Mather:**

1. How many free parking spaces does each department, Crown corporation or agency of the government provide for its employees in the National Capital Region?

2. How many parking spaces are provided by each department, agency or Crown corporation that are paid for by employees?

3. What *criteria* are used in allocating free parking spaces by each department?

4. Does the Government of Canada subsidize public transportation in the City of Ottawa in any way?

5. Does the government subsidize employees who use public transportation?

6. Does the government have any plans to subsidize public transportation in cities where they have employees?

7. Has the National Capital Commission estimated the cost of free parking spaces provided by government departments and, if so, what is the cost?

Return tabled.

NOVA SCOTIA—LAWYERS RETAINED BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Question No. 1,530—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys):**

1. What are the names of individuals who have been retained by government departments in the Province of Nova Scotia since June 25, 1968, for the purpose of securing legal services and, in each instance (*a*) what is the name of the firm that individual is associated with (*b*) where is that firm located?

2. How much has each of the individuals in question received in fees and expenses for services rendered?

3. By what means does the government select individuals to undertake legal work and through what department?

4. How many Crown corporations have retained the services of legal representatives in Nova Scotia since June 25, 1968, and in each instance (*a*) what is the name of the individual (*b*) the firm represented (*c*) the location of the firm (*d*) the amount received in fees and expenses?

Return tabled.

PAYMENTS TO LAWYERS AND OTHERS RESPECTING COMBINES LEGISLATION ACTIVITIES

Question No. 1,552—**Mr. Ritchie:**

1. Since January 1, 1967, have any fees or remunerations been paid to legal counsel and/or other persons for opinions and/or action arising out of reports of the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission or for other activities relating to the Combines legislation and, if so, what are the names of (a) the counsel (b) other persons?

2. What amount was paid to each and for what services in connection with what case, in each instance?

Return tabled.

FEDERAL GRANTS TO EMI ELECTRONICS LIMITED

Question No. 1,599—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. For each year 1950 to 1969, what Government of Canada grants, incentives, etc., were awarded to the EMI Electronics Limited of Nova Scotia?

2. For the same period what Government of Canada contracts were awarded to this company?

3. Does the Government of Canada have any knowledge of the extent of provincial government financial assistance to the company and, if so, how much does it provide?

Return tabled.

RESEARCH STUDIES, DEPARTMENT OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Question No. 1,602—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. What research studies have been caried out by, or on behalf of, the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development during each year 1960 to 1969 inclusive?

2. What research studies are now being carried on and/or are contemplated during the next five years?

3. What was the cost of each of the research studies completed in each year 1960 to 1969 inclusive?

4. What is the estimated cost of each of the studies now in being or contemplated during the next five years?

Return tabled.

FOREIGN AID TO LATIN AMERICA

Question No. 1,610—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

1. Of the $7,682,314.75 allocated in 1968-69 for foreign aid to Latin America and not spent (a) what was its designated purpose by item and what

was the proposed cost (b) for what reason was it not expended?

2. Of the $3,317,685.25 that was expended (a) what was the nature of the expenditures, by item (b) what amount of money was expended in Canada (c) what amount of money was expended in the host country (d) what amount of goods or services from Canada was included and what was their cost (e) what amount of money was in the form of grants or loans (f) what were the terms of these grants or loans?

Return tabled.

FOREIGN AID TO COLOMBO PLAN

Question No. 1,612—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

1. Of the $22,347,810.52 allocated in 1968-69 for foreign aid to the Colombo Plan and not spent (a) what was its designated purpose by item and what was the proposed cost (b) for what reason was it not expended?

2. Of the $103,952,189.48 that was expended (a) what was the nature of the expenditures, by item (b) what amount of money was expended in Canada (c) what amount of money was expended in the host country (d) what amount of goods or services from Canada was included and what was their cost? (e) what amount of money was in the form of grants or loans (f) what were the terms of these grants or loans?

Return tabled.

FOREIGN AID TO VARIOUS COUNTRIES

Question No. 1,613—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

1. Of the $2,458,020.01 allocated in 1968-69 for foreign aid to other countries and programmes and not spent (a) what was its designated purpose by item and what was the proposed cost (b) for what reason was it not expended?

2. Of the $7,621,620.74 that was expended (a) what was the nature of the expenditures, by item (b) what amount of money was expended in Canada (c) what amount of money was expended in the host country (d) what amount of goods or services from Canada were included and what was their cost? (e) what amount of money was in the form of grants or loans (f) what were the terms of these grants or loans?

Return tabled.

FOREIGN AID TO FRENCH-SPEAKING AFRICAN STATES

Question No. 1,614—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

1. Of the $9,368,732.55 allocated in 1968-69 for foreign aid to the independent French-speaking African States and not spent (a) what was its designated purpose by item and what was the proposed cost (b) for what reason was it not expended?

2 Of the $14,431,267.45 that was expended (a) what was the nature of the expenditures, by item (b) what amount of money was expended in Canada (c) what amount of money was expended in the host country (d) what amount of goods or services from Canada was included and what was their cost (e) what amount of money was in the form of grants or loans (f) what were the terms of these grants or loans?

Return tabled.

FOREIGN AID TO COMMONWEALTH CARIBBEAN ASSISTANCE PLAN

Question No. 1,615—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

1. Of the $13,006,839.72 allocated in 1968-69 for foreign aid to the Commonwealth Caribbean Assistance Plan and not spent (a) what was its designated purpose by item and what was the proposed cost (b) for what reason was it not expended

2. Of the $9,103,160.28 that was expended (a) what was the nature of the expenditures, by item (b) what amount of money was expended in Canada (c) what amount of money was expended in the host country (d) what amount of goods or services from Canada was included and what was their cost (e) what amount of money was in the form of grants or loans (f) what were the terms of these grants or loans?

Return tabled.

FOREIGN AID TO SPECIAL COMMONWEALTH AFRICAN ASSISTANCE PLAN

Question No. 1,616—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

1. Of the $10,341,270.22 allocated in 1968-69 for foreign aid to the Special Commonwealth African Assistance Plan and not spent (a) what was its designated purpose by item and what was the proposed cost (b) for what reason was it not expended?

2. Of the $15,436,729.78 that was expended (a) what was the nature of the expenditures, by item (b) what amount of money was expended in Canada (c) what amount of money was expended in the host country (d) what amount of goods or services from Canada was included and what was their cost (e) what amount of money was in the form of grants or loans (f) what were the terms of these grants or loans?

Return tabled.

WOMEN EMPLOYEES IN PUBLIC SERVICE

Motion No. 1,626—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. (a) How many women are employed in each branch of the federal government's public service (b) how many of these women are married (c) how many have dependent children (d) how many are the sole support of their families?

2. (a) What are the corresponding figures for men and women employed in the federal public service in the following categories (i) Executive (ii) Scientific and Professional (iii) Administrative and Foreign Service (iv) Administrative support (v) Operational (vi) Technical (b) what is the breakdown for men and women at the various levels within these categories (c) what are the salary ranges for these levels and categories?

Return tabled.

CANADIAN UNIVERSITY RESEARCH SPONSORED BY UNITED STATES

Question No. 1,656—**Mr. Rose:**

Is the Government of Canada in a position to state whether any department or branch of the United States Government is currently sponsoring research in Canadian universities, or individuals using university facilities and, if so (a) what branch of the United States Government (b) what was the general nature of the research for the years 1966, 1967, 1968 and 1969 (c) what Canadian universities or individuals received grants, and what was the total grant for each of the years listed in Part (b), (d) will the appropriate government department provide a list of the specific research projects and the university where each project was undertaken for each of the years listed above?

Return tabled.

CROWN CORPORATION PENSION PLANS

Question No. 1,713—**Mr. Lewis:**

1. Which Crown corporations have pensions plans for their employees?

2. How are such pension plans administered and, in particular, what is the form of administration of the pension fund?

3. What is the breakdown of pension fund investments by type of investment?

4. What criteria are used in appointing pension fund managers (trust companies, etc.)?

5. In each year 1965 to 1969 inclusive, what was the tariff charged by pension fund managers for administration of pension funds?

6. (a) Are employees represented on pension boards of trustees or other bodies (b) in what way are they selected (c) to what extent?

Return tabled.

SHIP CONSTRUCTION SUBSIDIES TO NON-RESIDENT OWNED OR CONTROLLED FIRMS

Question No. 1,717—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. For the fiscal year 1969-70 (a) which and how many non-resident owned or controlled firms have been awarded financial grants or incentives under the Ship Construction Subsidy Program administered by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce (b) in each case, what was the total financial grant or incentive allotted?

2. For the same year (a) which and how many Canadian owned or controlled firms have been awarded financial grants under the Ship Construction Subsidy Program (b) in each case, what was the total financial grant or incentive allotted?

Return tabled.

DEFENCE DEVELOPMENT SHARING GRANTS TO NON-RESIDENT OWNED OR CONTROLLED FIRMS

Question No. 1,719—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. For the fiscal year 1969-70 (a) which and how many non-resident owned or controlled firms have been awarded financial grants or incentives under the Defence Development Sharing Program, administered by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce (b) in each case, what was the total financial grant or incentive allotted?

2. For the same year (a) which and how many Canadian owned or controlled firms have been awarded financial grants under the Defence Development Sharing Program (b) in each case, what was the total financial grant or incentive allotted?

Return tabled.

ORDERS PLACED WITH IBM CANADA LIMITED FOR COMPUTER RENTALS OR SERVICES

Question No. 1,722—**Mr. Brewin:**

In the years 1967, 1968, 1969 and 1970 have orders been placed by the government with IBM Canada Limited for computer equipment rentals or computer services and, if so (a) what are the amounts agreed to be paid by the government or by any department (b) what were the goods and services rented or supplied?

Return tabled.

NEWFOUNDLAND—FEDERAL TAXES COLLECTED AND TAX RENTAL PAYMENTS

Question No. 1,739—**Mr. McGrath:**

1. By category, for fiscal years 1949-1962, what federal taxes were collected in Newfoundland (a) personal income tax (b) corporation income tax (c) succession taxes (d) estate taxes?

2. By category, for the fiscal years 1949-1962, what tax rental payments were made to Newfoundland (a) personal income tax (b) corporation income tax (c) succession taxes (d) estate taxes?

3. By category, for the fiscal years 1963-1969, what federal income taxes were collected in Newfoundland under the federal income tax act (a) personal income tax (b) corporation income tax (c) estate taxes?

4. By category, for the fiscal years 1963-1969, what provincial income taxes were collected in Newfoundland by the federal government as per collection agreement (a) personal income tax (b) corporation income tax (c) estate taxes?

Return tabled.

LEASE AGREEMENTS AMOUNTING TO $10,000 OR MORE

Question No. 1,760—**Mr. Coates:**

1. How many lease agreements were entered into by the federal government in the fiscal year 1969-70 that were for an annual amount of $10,000 or more?

2. (a) What were the names of the individuals or firms providing space (b) what was the annual rental charge in each instance (c) what was the term of the lease in each instance (d) how many square feet of space was involved in each lease?

Return tabled.

Orders for Returns

GRANTS TO CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS 1960-70

Question No. 1,829—**Mr. Robinson:**

How many charitable organizations received grants of public funds during each year 1960 to 1970 inclusive and (a) how much did each receive (b) for what reason was the grant made in each case?

Return tabled.

CONSULTANTS ENGAGED BY DEPARTMENT OF SUPPLY AND SERVICES AND RECEIVER GENERAL

Question No. 1,861—**Mr. Robinson:**

How many consultants have been engaged by the Department of Supply & Services and the Receiver General during each year 1950 to 1970 inclusive (a) what was the cost of the consultants (b) how were the consultants utilized (c) for what reasons were the consultants necessary?

Return tabled.

INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

Question No. 1,864—**Mr. Howard (Skeena):**

With respect to each of the studies mentioned in the answer to Question Number 584, what amount of money was paid for each study and to whom was each payment made?

Return tabled.

NUMBER OF U.S. DRAFT DODGERS IN CANADA —NUMBER OF PH.D's

Question No. 1876—**Mr. Moores:**

1. What is the Department of Manpower and Immigration estimate as to the gross number of United States draft dodgers currently residing in Canada?

2. How many students were studying in Canada on student visas as of April 1, 1970 and from what countries did they come?

3. (a) How many Ph.D.'s, by discipline and university, were granted by Canadian universities during the last five years (b) how many students by discipline and university, are currently registered for Ph.D.'s at Canadian universities?

4. Has the Department undertaken any studies to determine how many Ph.D.'s, by discipline, will be required by the Canadian market during the next ten years and, if so, what reports are available?

Return tabled.

GRANTS TO NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP TRAINING COURSE

Question No. 1,961—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Has the Department of National Health and Welfare been making grants to the National Educational Leadership Training Course and, if so, for how long, and for how much in each year?

[Mr. Coates.]

2. Have the grants been discontinued and, if so, what were the reasons for the change in policy?

Return tabled.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON COMPUTERS AND PRIVACY

Question No. 1,969—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. What role did the Departments of Communications and Justice play in the organization of the National Conference on Computers and Privacy held at Queens University, May 21 to 24?

2. What are the names and addresses of those invited to attend?

3. By whom and what basis was the invitation list compiled?

4. What officials of the Department of Communications participated in the Conference?

5. What was the total cost to (a) the Department of Communications (b) the Department of Justice for the conference?

6. Are there any plans for future conferences of this kind and, if so, what are the dates and the sites?

Return tabled.

ADVERTISING EXPENDITURES FOR STUDENT EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS

Question No. 1,973—**Mr. Nystrom:**

1. What was the expenditure in 1969 on advertising for student employment programs and what is the estimated expenditure this year?

2. What has each department and Crown corportation spent hiring summer students in 1969 and what is the estimated expenditure for 1970?

Return tabled.

RE-ALLOCATION OF FUNDS—ESTIMATES 1969-70

Question No. 1,984—**Mr. Coates:**

1. Were any Treasury Board Minutes involving the re-allocation of funds from one branch of a department to another pertaining to the estimates for the fiscal year 1969-70 approved during the months of March and April, 1970 and, if so, how many?

2. In how many instances was the re-allocation of funds designated for Travelling and Removal Expenses of the department involved?

3. How many departments of government during the fiscal year 1969-70 either estimated accurately the amount required for Travelling and Removal Expenses or over-estimated the amount and which departments under-estimated the amount and in each instance, what was the amount of the estimate and what was the actual amount spent?

Return tabled.

TAX REVENUE FROM SPIRITS, WINE AND BEER

Question No. 1,999—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. For each of the past ten years, what were the tax revenues from (a) spirits (b) wines (c) beer?

2. For each of the past ten years, what were the social costs assumed by the federal government for alcoholism?

3. Does the government intend to establish a tax structure based on taxation of pure alcohol?

4. For each of the past ten years, how many alcoholics were there in each province?

Return tabled.

TIME SIGNAL BROADCAST BY CBC—ORIGINATION AT NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL

Question No. 2,001—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. When was it decided to originate the official time signal, broadcast over Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, at the National Research Council instead of the Dominion Observatory?

2. For what reason was this change made?

Return tabled.

CANALS IN CANADA

Question No. 2,057—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. How many canals are there in Canada?

2. What is the length of each canal?

3. What is the total cost of maintaining each canal?

4. How many wharves and other facilities are there on each canal maintained by the federal government and what is the yearly cost?

5. What fees, if any, are charged to use canals in Canada and is the fee payable to the federal government or someone else and, if so, to whom?

6. Do the fees charged for use of canals and facilities pay the cost of (a) installation of services (b) maintenance of facilities and, if not, what loss was there on the operation and paid by the federal government during each of the years 1960 to 1969 inclusive?

Return tabled.

LOANS TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Question No. 2,061—**Mr. Caouette:**

For each of the past five years (a) in what amount (b) to which country (c) at what rate (d) under what terms, has the federal government made loans to foreign countries?

Return tabled.

GUESTS ON RADIO-CANADA PROGRAM, "FORMAT 60"

Question No. 2,062—**Mr. Rose:**

1. Who have been guests on Radio-Canada program "Format 60" since the beginning of the fall season up to and including Sunday, April 26, 1970?

2. How many were of the federal government?

3. How many were employees of the federal government or of government agencies?

4. How many were of opposition parties?

Return tabled.

• (3:00 p.m.)

MOTIONS TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

ENERGY

SALE OF NATURAL GAS TO UNITED STATES

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave, seconded by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis), to move the adjournment of the House under Standing Order 26 for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely, the recent decision of the federal government to approve the sale of 6.3 trillion cubic feet of natural gas to the United States and the serious consequences this decision will have for the people of Canada.

Mr. Speaker: As required by the provisions of Standing Order 26 the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands has given the Chair notice of his intention to propose this motion for the consideration of the House at this time. The hon. member knows that one of the factors which the Speaker considers in such cases is the probability of an early opportunity to debate the subject matter of the proposed motion. We were informed earlier today that the new session of the current Parliament will open on Thursday of this week. The usual debate on the address should give the hon. member and all hon. members an opportunity to initiate a discussion on the subject to which reference has been made, and in the circumstances it does not appear that the motion should be allowed.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

UNEMPLOYMENT—PROVISION OF SOLUTIONS

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave under Standing Order 26 to make a motion for the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration. I refer to the unacceptably high rate of unemployment which presently exists and to the well-founded forecasts, not denied by the government, that the rate of unemployment will mount

even higher in the winter months which will soon be upon us. I draw attention to the effect of the present rate and of the forecast rate translated into terms of human misery. This is an urgent matter for all of us in this chamber. We should set aside all our business and consider solutions to this grievous problem of unemployment.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: As required by the Standing Order the hon. Leader of the Opposition has provided me with the appropriate notice. This has afforded me an opportunity to give serious consideration to the important question for which discussion the adjournment of the House is desired at this time.

Perhaps I should say at once that the Chair fully appreciates the importance of the matter raised by the Leader of the Opposition. I know it is one which is of concern to all members of this House. In deciding, however, whether or not leave to make a motion under Standing Order 26 should be granted, the Chair must have recourse to the conditions set forth in the Standing Order itself as well as to the precedents and practices which govern motions of this kind. I have thought about this matter very carefully. As has been stated before from the Chair, the test of urgency and, indeed, of emergency, must be met as distinct from the question of the importance of the topic. The Chair must also take into account the explicit language of the Standing Order, which refers to "the probability of the matter being brought before the House within a reasonable time by other means."

I think it fair to assume that an opportunity of this nature will arise within the next few days and on these two grounds, and with regret, I must decline to accept the motion proposed by the Leader of the Opposition at the present time.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

PUBLIC SERVICE

POLICY RESPECTING UNILINGUAL EMPLOYEES

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether the assurance given by the former Prime Minister, Mr. Pearson, that inability to speak both official languages would not prejudice the careers of unilingual Canadians, particularly those of long service, in the Public Service is still valid, binding and in effect?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker, the policy, as originally enunciated in 1966 by the Right Hon. Mr. Pearson and subsequently repeated by myself, is still government policy.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: In view of the statement made by the chairman of the Public Service Commission that the careers of some long-time public servants have been and are being prejudiced, has the government any measures to propose to ensure that the commitment given by his predecessor and repeated by himself today is, in fact, being observed, bearing in mind that it was in the context of this commitment and this assumption that the official languages bill was adopted in this House?

Mr. Trudeau: Did I understand the Leader of the Opposition to say that the chairman of the Public Service Commission had stated that careers were prejudiced?

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Trudeau: That is not my own understanding, but at any rate nothing which the commission has been doing, as far as I can see, has been a departure from government policy. At this stage I can only express my confidence in the way in which the commission is handling a very difficult job.

Mr. Stanfield: I might refer the Prime Minister to the remarks made by the chairman of the commission on television and ask him now whether the government has given the Secretary of State responsibility for implementing the bilingual policy in the Public Service. Could the Prime Minister also tell us whether the government has given the Secretary of State and his department any terms of reference with regard to honouring the commitment made by the former Prime Minister, a commitment which the right hon. gentleman now says is still the policy of the government?

Mr. Trudeau: Those statements are the terms of reference of the Secretary of State who is applying that policy as enunciated by the previous government and as repeated by myself some time ago and again today.

POLICY RESPECTING UNILINGUAL EMPLOYEES —INTRODUCTION OF PROTECTIVE MEASURES IN ACT

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): May I ask whether the government has given consideration to introducing adequate protective measures into the Public Service Employment Act so as to ensure that the kind of protection which was envisaged for unilingual civil servants by the former Prime Minister would be guaranteed by the law and, if not, will the government give consideration to a proposal along these lines?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I am not sure what type of guarantee the hon. member is suggesting. As he knows, the Act presently relating to the Public Service does give the commission authority to set certain standards in respect of residence, age, language qualifications, degrees, training, education and so on, and all these standards are being applied by the Public Service Commission along the lines upon which the commission has been operating in the past and along the lines of policy enunciated in the House.

Mr. Hees: As the chairman of the Public Service Commission has said, and I quote the words he used on television—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member knows he cannot quote the words. However, he can put the question in other terms.

Mr. Hees: I shall not quote, then. The chairman of the Public Service Commission said on television that the commission was not a creature of the government of the day, and gave a clear indication that he does not intend to follow the assurance given by Mr. Pearson in any way close to the letter of the law. I again ask the Prime Minister whether he will make sure that adequate protective measures are introduced into the Public Service Employment Act so as to provide that unilingual public servants are protected by law?

Mr. Trudeau: I do not see how the hon. member could argue that the Public Service Commission should be a creature of the government. Surely the relevant Act was set up in such a way as to ensure that the commission would be independent of the government of the day in order that it would not be obliged to hire or fire people on a patronage basis. This is the whole spirit of the Act. But, of course, the legislation has to be applied, within the rules of the Act itself, and along the lines determined from time to time by the government. The chairman of the Public Service Commission has taken a stand. Of course he cannot disregard the policy statements of the government, nor is he disregarding them.

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Has the Prime Minister spoken to the chairman of the Public Service Commission and been assured that the no-prejudice policy laid down by Mr. Pearson and repeated by himself is to be the policy now?

Mr. Trudeau: No, Mr. Speaker, I have not spoken to him, I try to avoid interfering with the operations of the Public Service Commission. However, I have asked for a report on the subject and I am assured that nothing in either the acts or the words of the chairman of the commission represents a departure from government policy, perhaps with one minor exception when in response to a question on television the chairman said—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am afraid the rule applies to both sides of the House.

POLICY RESPECTING UNILINGUAL EMPLOYEES —CONSULTATION BY TREASURY BOARD WITH COMMISSION ON SELECTION STANDARDS

Mr. E. B. Osler (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Prime Minister. In view of the Public Service Appeal Board's finding that some conflict existed between government policy statements and the policies of the Public Service Commission, as documented in the *Globe and Mail* of July 15, 1970, has the Treasury Board any plans to call for consultation with the commission over selection standards, as it has the right to do under the Public Service Employment Act, section 12(3)?

An hon. Member: Put it on the Order Paper.

Mr. Trudeau: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

POLICY RESPECTING UNILINGUAL EMPLOYEES —HONOURING OF COMMITMENTS MADE IN HOUSE

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. Can the Prime Minister indicate whether or not commitments and statements made in this House while dealing with legislation are being honoured by the cabinet at this time?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the question is very general. If it is a question of law, the hon. member should know that the statute stands by itself, and that statements made in the House or outside the House, if not incorporated into the law, are not binding on the House.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is why civil servants are receiving such bad treatment.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

UNEMPLOYMENT—PROVISION OF WINTER PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. In view of economic forecasts that unemployment is likely to get worse rather than better in the coming months, and in view of the hardship which it is already inflicting on many hundreds of thousands of Canadians, is the government holding any consultations with the provinces, and through them with the municipalities, with regard to any kind of winter works program or public works program which will provide some additional employment during the next year?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we are not reviving the antiquated methods recommended by the leader of the New Democratic Party, but there have been a whole host of measures taken over the past year and indeed in recent months. There have been several announcements made by various ministers, and I could send the hon. member a list if he wants one.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since most of the unemployed will not be very fully satisfied or their hunger assuaged by lists, may I ask the Prime Minister whether the government intends to announce any specific undertakings, intends to increase the money available for housing or intends to enter into any negotiations with provincial governments regarding winter works programs, antiquated or modernized? Has the government any programs to announce at this time to tell the people of Canada that it really is coping with the unemployment situation?

Mr. Trudeau: Just a few weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, we did announce an extra $100 million for housing. If the hon. member had been reading the papers instead of his own speeches he would have known about that.

[Mr. Skoberg.]

DATE OF REVIEW BY MINISTER OF FINANCE

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, it is not exactly a reassurance to us that the Prime Minister is so pleased today with the result of his economic policy, but may I ask the Minister of Finance whether he can give us the date when he proposes to make the extensive review of the economy which he has promised?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I would hope to be speaking during the throne speech debate at the first decent opportunity.

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. When the Minister of Finance speaks during the throne speech debate will he outline to the House of Commons and to the people of Canada the specific steps that the government intends to take to revive the economy which, as the Dominion Bureau of Statistics states, is now at a standstill?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, I will go further than that: I will also indicate the steps that the government has taken and the steps that we plan to take in the near future in order to keep the economy moving forward strongly.

MEASURES TO PREVENT BANKRUPTCIES

Mr. Georges Valade (Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Finance. In view of the numerous bankruptcies across the country as announced recently by the federal Bureau of Statistics, does the minister consider them cause for concern to the government and is he doing something to prevent more bankruptcies in the future?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member is inviting the minister to express an opinion and I do not think the question is acceptable in those terms.

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

EFFECT OF DAIRY POLICY—IMPROVEMENT OF PRODUCERS' POSITION

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Minister of Agriculture feels a little neglected today, so I would like to address a very important question to him.

As the purpose of the government's 1970-1971 dairy policy was to bring about a decrease of dairy production, is the minister in a position to tell us today whether this objective has been reached in part and if so, whether the situation of industrial dairy producers can be expected to improve in the near future?

[*English*]

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, there has been a very substantial improvement in the balance between production and consumption in Canada, as well as an improvement in the sale of some surplus commodities in the international market.

[*Translation*]

DAIRY POLICY—RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF SUBSIDIES

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture.

Considering the important number of milk producers who have abandoned the dairy industry owing to the decrease in subsidies, would the minister be prepared to announce that he will do away with this form of penalization in the near future?

[*English*]

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the government has made the comment many times that the amendment of our policy is designed to improve the income of those people who are in the dairy industry as well as to be helpful in making adjustments respecting the numbers of people in the industry. I think we can look back with some satisfaction on the improvement that has been made during the past few months.

[*Translation*]

Mr. La Salle: Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask another supplementary question.

Considering that nearly 16 to 20 per cent of the dairy producers in my area have withdrawn from the market, could the minister tell us exactly how many producers have been eliminated since he announced his dairy policy?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is asking for statistical information. I do not think that his question is in order.

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ABDUCTION OF SENIOR BRITISH TRADE COMMISSIONER—ROLE OF RCMP IN INVESTIGATION

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. It has to do with the matter that he brought before the House this afternoon. In view of the diabolical nature of the crime which will give Canada a black eye internationally unless immediate action is taken to bring about the arrest and conviction of the wrongdoers, would the minister consider mobilizing, with the assistance of the Montreal police and also the Quebec provincial police, all experienced members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police from across Canada so that there will be the fullest and immediate action taken? The Mounted Police always get their man.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I should like to reassure the right hon. gentleman that the RCMP are mobilizing all their talents in this particular case, and I thank him for his expression of confidence in the force.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, while I realize that security and the need for secrecy are of importance during an investigation such as this, is the minister in a position at this time to say, on the basis of the investigation that has already taken place, that early arrests may be expected or anticipated?

Mr. Sharp: No, Mr. Speaker, I regret that I could not give that statement. I will certainly make an announcement as soon as arrests have been made, but I cannot say anything about that matter until that time.

AGRICULTURE

PROHIBITION OF INTERPROVINCIAL MARKETING—EFFECT OF BILL C-197—REFERENCE TO SUPREME COURT

Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent-Essex): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the present disruption in Canadian agriculture as a result of the interruption of normal trade patterns by the recent action of some provincial governments and the grave doubts now expressed by them that Bill C-197 could ever provide a solution, does the government

intend to present the problem to the Supreme Court at the earliest possible date for a ruling?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the premise on which this question is based is false in that the provincial governments and the federal government have not expressed any doubts as to the efficacy of Bill C-197 in coming to grips with this problem.

Mr. Baldwin: Nonsense! How about British Columbia and Manitoba?

Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Agriculture. Has the government received representations from provincial authorities or any commodity groups to test the constitutionality of the Quebec court ruling affecting provincial trade? If so, what action is contemplated?

Mr. Olson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the possibility of taking that course of action was discussed at the federal-provincial conference held here in Ottawa in September. The considered judgment, or what I might call the unanimous decision of that conference as reported in the press, was that we should seek a solution to this problem by co-ordinating the efforts of provincial marketing boards through a vehicle such as Bill C-197.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, would the minister get a new law professor to instruct him on constitutional law?

Mr. Olson: The advice I have been getting is excellent.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the fact that explanations given to this House and to the Standing Committee on Agriculture do not assure a solution of the problem of trade in agricultural products across Canada, will he undertake to make a statement on motions during this coming week setting out proposed action to deal with this problem?

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, I think I would have to consider very carefully the propriety of doing that because this House has referred the matter of marketing legislation to a committee which is now actively studying the proposal that is before it. It seems to me that is where the debate ought to take place. We hope this study can be expedited as rapidly as possible so the provisions of that bill can be made operational for the benefit of farmers across the country.

Mr. Gleave: Mr. Speaker, is the minister informing this House that decisions on trade between the provinces are to be reached in standing committees rather than by the federal government of Canada?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That is not a question.

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. Is he aware that technically it is impossible, because of the rules of the House of Commons, to have Bill C-197 passed during this session? In light of that, is he now prepared to take this proposal to the Supreme Court to test its validity?

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, I am also aware that if there had been greater co-operation from the hon. member and his colleagues this bill would have been back in this House long ago.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

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

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I understand the hon. member for Crowfoot is rising on a point of order and I will recognize him in a moment. I think I should bring to the attention of hon. members that we really should not have a debate during the question period on a bill which is before a committee of the House at the present time. The hon. member for Crowfoot has risen on a point of order and I will recognize him now.

Mr. Horner: Mr. Speaker, I am rising on a question of privilege. The Minister of Agriculture has imputed motives to my actions.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Horner: Let me make this point abundantly clear. I did everything within my power to co-operate and to solicit information as to the exact way this bill would operate. When the bill came up for second reading and was debated in the House of Commons I made one speech, and one speech only. I was accused then of holding it up. It then went to

the committee. Our party was not consulted on whether that committee should sit when the House was not sitting. We were given very short notice that we must come down here and meet—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The point has been made by the hon. member and I think we ought to go on to another question.

Mr. Horner: No, no. I have a question of privilege and I am not going to be silenced that easily. The minister deliberately imputed motives to my actions, and I have the right to defend myself in this House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Horner: As I was saying, without consultation with any of the other parties, and without consulting the steering committee of the Standing Committee on Agriculture, we were summoned to come here on September 22 to hear witnesses on Bill C-197. We were here and we heard witnesses. Through no fault of mine, we are still hearing witnesses. If the minister wanted to rush the bill through and only hear one or two witnesses, that was his prerogative. I know for a fact that copies of the bill were not available all summer long. I accuse the minister of deliberately keeping the public from knowing the full import of this bill, and I accuse the minister as well—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Obviously we are getting involved in a debate on this bill, and I would suggest that this debate continue whenever we reach this order of business. I recognize fully that perhaps the first question should not have been allowed. I continue to recognize the import of the question and the bill referred to in it, but the hon. member has stated his question of privilege.

Mr. Horner: The minister should withdraw.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has placed an interpretation on the words of the minister. Perhaps the minister might want to make an explanation in one word, because we ought to get back to the question period.

Mr. Horner: I would like to finish my question of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It seems to me that the hon. member has very well enunciated his question of privilege. I understand what his statement is and that the question he has raised is that the hon. Minister of Agriculture has imputed motives. The minister has no right to impute motives and, if he has, I am sure he would want to withdraw. The point having been made by the hon. member for Crowfoot, I think we should hear from the Minister of Agriculture. Then I suggest we go on to another subject.

Mr. Olson: What I said was that this bill could have been back to the House some time ago if it had received co-operation from the hon. member and his colleagues.

Mr. Horner: That is nothing but a lie.

Mr. Olson: I will let the record speak for itself. It is very clear that this bill did not have a chance to progress satisfactorily in the committee because the honourable member—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member for Timiskaming rising on the same question?

Mr. Peters: Mr. Speaker, while I was not named, nor am I a colleague of the hon. member who rose on the question of privilege, as a member of that committee I believe that the minister did not have the right to make his previous statement or the statement he has just made. The committee was called during the recess and it met. The decision to call witnesses was a decision of that committee. We are still hearing witnesses and the committee has witnesses before it. I believe that the minister is not correct in drawing the inference he obviously has drawn. If he draws that kind of inference, he is in effect saying that somewhere along the line there was a delay. The committee is now meeting to hear the witnesses it called. I do not think the minister has the right to draw that kind of inference about the operations of this committee of which I am a member.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Before we hear the minister further, I understand the hon. member for Annapolis Valley is rising on the same question of privilege.

Mr. Nowlan: That is right, Mr. Speaker. I, too, am a member of that committee and I resent without reservation that statement by the minister. There is a fact that has not been put before the House yet. Perhaps the hon. member for Crowfoot intended to mention it but Your Honour rose to try to corral some of the comments that have been made. This very pertinent fact puts the Minister's statement

right into his mouth and he had better withdraw it. Bill C-196, the grains bill, was before the Committee on Agriculture up until the day the House rose for summer recess. As the hon. member for Timiskaming and the hon. member for Crowfoot have said, and as every other member of the agricultural committee knows, once we received notice through the mail, and thank goodness we got it through the mail finally, we came back in September to hold discussions in the committee on Bill C-197. These discussions are continuing. How the Minister of Agriculture can stand in this House and, even by inference, impute motives by saying that we have not been co-operating or that this bill could, through the use of some magic wand, be on the floor of this House for passage today, is beyond my comprehension.

Although there may be a yo-yo system of Parliamentary Secretaries and cabinet committees and a ministers' rotation system under which everything bobs up and down, the plain fact is that everyone on this side of the House does not bob up and down to the tune of the minister or even of the Prime Minister, and it should not happen on that side of the House. The minister should withdraw.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: The minister—

Mr. Nowlan: I suggest he should withdraw.

Mr. Speaker: The minister was given an opportunity to make a statement. He has indicated he did not impute motives.

Mr. Horner: He certainly did. If he wants co-operation he had better withdraw.

Mr. Speaker: The minister indicated he did not impute motives. This is the only thing the Chair can ask. The minister having made that statement, I do not see how a debate can be held now on this piece of legislation which will come up again.

Mr. Horner: Not at this session.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps not at this session, but the point having been made by hon. members I suggest respectfully that perhaps the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre might be given the floor.

[Mr. Nowlan.]

SOCIAL SECURITY

INQUIRY AS TO TABLING OF WHITE PAPER

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of National Health and Welfare may I direct a question to the Prime Minister? In view of the commitment made by the Minister of National Health and Welfare that the government's White Paper on social security would be tabled before the end of the present session, can the Prime Minister say whether it will be tabled tomorrow or Wednesday?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Neither, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): In view of the fact that the commitment to table the white paper at this session apparently is not to be kept, when will we see this white paper?

Mr. Trudeau: Perhaps we will have something to say on this in the Speech from the Throne on Thursday.

FINANCE

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND MEETING—UNDERTAKING TO PEG CANADIAN DOLLAR

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, at the recent meeting of the International Monetary Fund directors, did the Minister of Finance give any undertaking to the directors in respect of pegging the Canadian dollar and, if so, what was the undertaking?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Nothing whatsoever, other than to say that the Canadian dollar would be pegged at an appropriate time.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): May the House be advised, as it is of importance, what the minister means by an appropriate time?

Mr. Benson: The House will be informed when an appropriate time arrives.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION BASED ON COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Veterans Affairs. In order to show real consideration of the needs of war veterans, and with the assurance that the official opposition would co-operate in expediting all

Part I recommendations of the Veterans Committee report, would the minister be prepared to introduce legislation immediately based on the Veterans Affairs Committee report so that passage may be effected before the new session?

Hon. Jean-Eudes Dubé (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my appreciation to my hon. friend for his offer of co-operation. I know his co-operation will be available when we introduce legislation at the next session.

Mr. Marshall: Mr. Speaker, would the minister give a clear indication when that legislation will come before the House?

Mr. Dubé: We will have to wait a few days to see what the order of business will be for the next few months.

FISHERIES

NEGOTIATIONS WITH SOVIET UNION RESPECTING FISHING OFF PACIFIC COAST

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. At what stage are the negotiations between Canada and the Soviet Union in respect of the fishing operations off Canada's Pacific coast and when does the minister expect to make an announcement in the House concerning the outcome of these negotiations?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might answer that question. The negotiations with the representatives of the Soviet Union are continuing this week. An announcement will be made either late this week or early next week about the results of our negotiations.

DEPLETION OF RESOURCES BY FOREIGNERS—CONVENING OF INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister a question. In view of the urgency surrounding the depletion of our marine resources by foreign nationals, namely, the Soviet Union, can he indicate if his department and the government are planning to take immediate initiatives to convene an international conference on marine resources involving discussions on management and conservation of the fishing resources off both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts.

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, we do have a serious problem of overfishing in the North Atlantic. We have two avenues by which we can approach the Russians, for example, and discuss this problem with them. One is the International Commission for Northwest Atlantic Fisheries and we are in continuous contact with member nations including the U.S.S.R. We are also pressing our general approach to shelf matters and fishing in respect of the next Law of the Sea Conference which should be held within the next two years.

Mr. Lundrigan: Can the minister now answer the question whether Canada, in fact, is now prepared to take initiatives to have a specific conference on marine resources in view of the fact that the Law of the Sea Conference is two years away and would get bogged down in discussions about mineral resources, pollution and various other complicated international matters? The question really relates to a conference specifically on marine resources.

Mr. Davis: Well, I think we should use the commission which exists for this purpose. As I said before, we are in continuous discussion with the other North Atlantic Commission countries including the U.S.S.R. in respect of overfishing in the North Atlantic.

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Fisheries. Is the minister prepared to give consideration to expanding the conference currently in progress between the Soviet Union and Canada to include the east coast of Canada?

Mr. Davis: I think not, Mr. Speaker. We have a specific problem on the west coast. We do not have an equivalent in the Pacific of the International Commission for the North Atlantic Fisheries. We have no commission in existence so we are entering into bilateral discussions with the Russians. I think there may be occasions on which we can discuss similar problems on the Atlantic with the U.S.S.R. but as a general rule we would go through the North Atlantic Commission.

Mr. David Anderson (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, could the Secretary of State for External Affairs or the Minister of Fisheries indicate whether the problem of Russian fishing on the west coast, and perhaps the east coast as well, will be discussed by the Prime Minister when he is in the Soviet Union later this fall?

Mr. Davis: I hope so, Mr. Speaker.

Inquiries of the Ministry

URBAN AFFAIRS

INQUIRY AS TO ESTABLISHMENT OF COUNCIL

Mr. S. Perry Ryan (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister without Portfolio responsible for housing, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. Would the Prime Minister tell the House when the government intends to set up its urban council?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this council I believe was mentioned by the Minister without Portfolio but there is no decision as to the date of setting up such a council, if we do set it up. I am sure the minister, during the Throne Speech debate, may have occasion to state some further government steps.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Georges Valade (Sainte-Marie): Would the Prime Minister tell us whether the government intends to create such an agency with regard to housing?

Mr. Trudeau: As I have just said, Mr. Speaker, I believe that, in the course of the debate on the Throne Speech, other measures will be presented to the House and it will be indicated at that time if there is need for what the hon. member suggests.

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON CANADIAN POLICY ON APARTHEID

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. I should like to ask him, in the light of representations made to him recently in the form of a black paper urging specific changes in Canadian policy to make it more consistent with Canada's official abhorrence of apartheid, whether he will make a statement in the House or perhaps before the Committee on External Affairs on this subject dealing with the representations made in this black paper?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in the papers I tabled just before the adjournment the government set forth its policy with regard to apartheid and South Africa. There are some issues under discussion which have arisen since that time or which were under consideration at that time, for example, the extension of the arms embargo to spare parts. Apart from that, however, I do not think it would be necessary for me to make any further statement on this matter.

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): I should like to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of National Defence and to congratulate him on the little role he now plays. In view of the fact that he made a statement or speech criticizing the corporate attitude with respect to racial interests in the Caribbean, I wonder whether the minister would now tell the House when he will make a statement with respect to the government's attitude regarding South Africa?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): I do not really follow the hon. member's question. If he would like to speak to me later and make himself clear, I will be glad to answer his question.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

TORONTO—ACTION TO REMOVE DELAY IN RECEIVING BENEFITS

Mr. Stanley Haidasz (Parkdale): I should like to direct a question to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour. Would he or the minister inform the House as soon as possible as to whether they are aware that several hundred laid-off employees of Massey-Ferguson and other factories in Toronto are experiencing hardship caused by delays of six to eight weeks or even longer in receiving their unemployment insurance benefits, and has any action been taken to solve this pressing problem?

Mr. McGrath: That is only the first shot.

Mr. Ray Perrault (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour): I thank the hon. member for his question. I am sure that the minister will appreciate being made aware of this important and serious difficulty and that he will make sure the matter is properly investigated.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

NATIONAL DEFENCE

FUTURE ROLE FOR CF-5 AIRCRAFT—ADHERENCE TO TENDER PRICE

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington): My question is directed to the Minister of National Defence. I would like to compliment him on

assuming his new portfolio, and I trust he will answer all questions with the same reliability and amiability as did his predecessor.

Will the minister advise the House whether the government proposes to take delivery of the balance of the CF-5 aircraft and what it is proposing to do with those that are in mothballs and those that have yet to be delivered?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): I thank the hon. member for his kind remarks, and I trust the questions will be put in the same way as they were put to the former minister.

I should like to confirm that it is the government's intention to accept delivery of those CF-5 aircraft that have not to the moment been delivered by the manufacturer. As the hon. member knows, there are approximately 45 now in service. What the hon. member said, namely, that a number of them are in mothballs, is not correct. Probably he will have noticed that in a very few days a number of these aircraft will be flying to Germany and the European theatre for tactical trials in that area. At the moment, we have a number of possibilities under consideration to put them to use either in the role for which they were acquired or in some alternative roles. I would hope to be able to announce fairly soon after the current trials are completed how the aircraft will be put to use.

Mr. Hales: Would the minister assure the House that the tender prices have been accepted and that no extras have been paid by the Treasury Board in line with the original tender? Also, does the minister state that the press was wrong in the report that there were some in mothballs or in storage?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I would have to check to see whether or not there were change orders involved from the original contract, which may have affected the ultimate price. The statement in the press that they were in mothballs is not correct.

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): My supplementary question is directed to the Minister of National Defence and it concerns the experiments in Europe. Will fuelling experiments in mid-air be tried in that period?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Not at this time, Mr. Speaker.

Inquiries of the Ministry

YOUTH

VANCOUVER—CLOSING OF HOSTEL—PROVISION OF SHELTER AND EMPLOYMENT

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver Kingsway): My question is for the Secretary of State. In view of the closing of the youth hostel in Vancouver over the past weekend, what action does the government propose to take which will provide shelter and employment for those who are now without either and who come from all across Canada?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. member that out of the 350 persons who were in the hostel on Friday, 175 have already found suitable accommodation and that several private organizations, with the help of representatives from several federal departments, are actively engaged in finding rooms for the remaining 175. They hope to find them within two or three days at the latest.

[*English*]

Mrs. MacInnis: May I ask the Secretary of State whether or not consultation is going on with the provincial government, and through it with the civic authorities, regarding an adequate program of employment which will last through the winter?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pelletier: Mr. Speaker, consultations have been undertaken, pursued, interrupted and resumed, with various results, with provincial as well as municipal authorities. However, the matter of looking after youths in Vancouver throughout winter does not come under the crash project of opening temporary summer hostels which had been entrusted to the Secretary of State Department. Rather, it comes under permanent services such as the Canada Assistance Plan and other services provided by the federal departments in co-operation with provincial authorities.

[*English*]

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON PROVISION OF HOSTEL ACCOMMODATION

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the Secretary of State, either in the few days left in this session or early next session, table a report in the House on the hostel situation indicating how many were involved, the cost

involved, and what the plans are for next year?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, the data related to this program, which was very successfully received throughout Canada, with one or two exceptions, are being sent to us presently. We shall be happy to inform the House about the whole operation when it is completed.

[*English*]

GRAIN

WHEAT—NON-DELIVERY OF FOUR-BUSHEL QUOTA—PROVISION OF DEFERRED QUOTA

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the deferred quotas now being allotted to those farmers who never delivered their four bushel quota in the last crop year, would the minister assure the House and the country that every farmer who did not deliver the four bushel quota in the last crop year will be given an opportunity to receive a deferred quota?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Yes, Mr. Speaker, but I wish to confer with my colleague, the minister in charge of the Wheat Board, with regard to this matter as there are other problems involved. We wish to make certain—and I am sure the hon. member agrees—that any deferred quota will be filled with grain produced by that particular farmer.

CANADA WATER ACT

AGREEMENTS WITH PROVINCES ON ANTI-POLLUTION PROJECTS

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): I have a question for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Has the minister concluded yet any agreement with any province for anti-pollution projects under the Canada Water Act since the Act was passed in June?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that discussions on the agreement with New Brunswick in respect of the Saint John were entered into prior to the final passing of the Act, but I believe the ultimate implementation was under the Act itself. Of course, there are also agreements with Saskatchewan with regard to Qu'Appelle and agreements with British Columbia on the Okanagan which come under the general framework and aegis of the Canada Water Act.

Mr. Aiken: Would the minister make a statement to the House shortly regarding the progress of these various agreements?

Mr. Greene: I will be very pleased to do so. We are certainly continuing discussions with the province of Ontario in respect of the Great Lakes and with Ontario and Quebec in respect of the Ottawa and St. Lawrence. I am extremely hopeful there will be agreements in these areas in the not too distant future.

• (3:50 p.m.)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

SHIPPING CONFERENCES EXEMPTION ACT

EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN PRACTICES FROM PROVISIONS OF COMBINES INVESTIGATION ACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-184, to exempt certain shipping conference practices from the provisions of the Combines Investigation Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Benjamin, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), moves:

That Bill C-184, an act to exempt certain shipping conference practices from the provisions of the Combines Investigation Act, be amended by deleting paragraph (a) from clause 2 and substituting therefor the following:

"(a) "Commission" means the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission."

The hon. member will perhaps suspect that the Chair has some procedural reservations about this particular motion. I have thought about the matter very seriously, and I would be pleased to hear the views of the hon. member and of other hon. members regarding the procedural aspects of the motion proposed by him.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, procedural aspects are not what you might call my long suit. However, the motion has been on the Order Paper since May 19. No one, not even my colleague from Winnipeg North Centre, said a word to me in the intervening time to the effect that it might not be in order, and I must say that I

am caught a bit by surprise despite my labours last night to get a speech prepared. May I submit that the purpose of my amending motion is to make the bill more practical, and that I am trying to be helpful to the government. I am not prepared to say anything about the procedural aspects but will rely on Your Honour and on the suggestions of others.

Mr. Speaker: The point made by the hon. member is a very cogent one and I appreciate that this notice has been on the Order Paper for many months. Of course, the opportunity was not present for the hon. member to be advised that there might be some reservations about the motion that he had put on the Order Paper. He will appreciate that the Chair's reservations have to do with whether this motion, if it carries, would negate the principle of the bill that is before the House. I have some serious doubts about it, but I think it might be the wish of all hon. members that we give the hon. member the benefit of the doubt and that we proceed with the debate on the motion before the House, particularly in view of the assurance by the hon. member that he has worked long and diligently on the preparation of a speech which I know will be appreciated by all hon. members.

Mr. Benjamin: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate very much your willingness to give me the benefit of the doubt. As I understand it, the intent of my motion is not to stray from the principle of the bill and in no way would negate it. I hope that, in my remarks, I can make that clear.

The purpose of the bill is to provide that certain shipping conference practices be exempted from prosecution under the provisions of the Combines Investigation Act. If I may cite the standing committee hearings, No. 26, of May 12, on page 26:15, I wish to point out that the witnesses from the Canadian Transport Commission said the purpose of this legislation is to provide for such exemption and to detail the conditions attaching thereto. If those conditions are not met, then the penalties provided under the Combines Investigation Act would still apply to these shipping conference practices.

In evidence given before the committee, witnesses from the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission and from the Canadian Transport Commission reiterated that unquestionably a shipping conference is a cartel. This is explicit in the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission report of June 15, 1968, which found that these conferences were in breach of the Combines Investigation Act. The Commission also reported that Canada and other countries could see no alternative mechanism available, and that this had impelled all governments, in Canada and elsewhere, to tolerate the system of shipping conferences.

Under the provisions of this bill, the organization that is to be the watchdog and the enforcer of the legislation is the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission. Mr. Henry, the Director of Investigation and Research, is the man who is to have sole responsibility. The Restrictive Trade Practices Commission is to have sole jurisdiction over enforcing the provisions of this legislation when it becomes law.

The reason for the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission having sole jurisdiction—and I think quite properly—is that these conferences have already been found to be cartels and that they do in fact practice collusion. But the commission report concluded that in most aspects this arrangement, which amounts to a restriction of trade, had in no way harmed the public interest, and in certain cases had even been of benefit to it, even though the conferences were acting in collusion.

This bill provides that certain documents and information must be filed in order to establish that a shipping conference is meeting the conditions necessary to be exempt from the provisions of the Combines Investigation Act. Since the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission is the sole organization that has responsibility to see that this information and these documents are filed, and has the sole responsibility to examine such documents and files to see that the conditions are met, I hope the minister will agree it is only logical, and would certainly be more efficient, if these documents and information were filed with the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission, and that the conferences should report directly to that commission.

Another reason for the bill is to lift the veil of secrecy that thus far has surrounded the operations of international shipping conferences, particularly with regard to rates, conditions of carriage and so forth. My amendment is meant to help lift that veil of secrecy. In the committee I sensed that there was some agreement with and approval of my amendment on the part of some of the minister's colleagues, even though they chose not to support my amendment in the committee. Since sole jurisdiction and responsibility rest

with the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission, I repeat that these documents should be filed with that commission. But the bill contains no such provision. According to the terms of the bill these documents must be filed with the Canadian Transport Commission.

Because the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission is the only organization that has jurisdiction and authority, during the committee hearings I inquired why these documents had to be filed with the Canadian Transport Commission. Time and time again, the point was made in evidence that the Canadian Transport Commission has no jurisdiction or authority over ocean transport.

There is nothing in the Canada Transportation Act that gives the Canadian Transport Commission power to exercise jurisdiction over, investigation into, or approval or disapproval of ocean shipping rates. But when I asked members of the Canadian Transport Commission why they should have anything to do with this proposed legislation they were able to cite three reasons which to me do not seem valid, and which certainly are not sufficient to require that members of that commission have their finger in this pie.

One reason commission members advanced was that the word "transport" appeared in the title of the Canadian Transport Commission, and since ocean shipping is transport then they thought the Canadian Transport Commission should be involved in this matter. Another reason given by one of the commission witnesses was that they are very efficient filing clerks. The third reason they gave was that since they were involved in transportation they could interpret these documents and bring them to the attention of the combines investigation people. Mr. Speaker, from what knowledge I have of the combines investigation people they are also competent in knowing something about transportation, and in the past have made numerous investigations into various aspects of transportation.

• (4:00 p.m.)

None of these three reasons put forward by the Canadian Transport Commission is valid. They fly in the face of efficiency and it seems to me they serve to establish the fact that the Canadian Transport Commission wants to be involved in this thing as nothing more than a sort of post office. In my opinion, this would be an obstruction to the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission properly carrying out and enforcing the provisions of this legislation. Bill C-184, providing exemptions from combines legislation, has no effect whatsoever on any legislation having to do with transportation; that comes under the purview of the Canadian Transport Commission. Surely, Mr. Speaker, there is no sense in the Canadian Transport Commission having any say or any part in the implementation or enforcement of this legislation, because they have no authority and no jurisdiction. The Restrictive Trade Practices Commission is the only organization with any authority and jurisdiction in the enforcement of this legislation.

Hon. members may not agree with the validity of my second reason but I think it is valid because of some biases I have concerning the make-up of the Canadian Transport Commission. I, for one, do not believe that this body is noted for its concern with the public interest. It is not a body that has any history of concern for the public, whether in rail transportation or air transportation. It seems to have had interest and concern for the various corporations involved in these fields of transportation but not too much concern in the field of public interest and this is another reason I think my amendment should be accepted.

But there is a further reason. I feel that any time we can withhold jurisdiction from the clutches of the present President of the Canadian Transport Commission we will be rendering a great service to Parliament and the public. I do not see any point in enlarging the kingdom of Jumping Jack, a kingdom he was able to create himself and of which, strangely or maybe not so strangely, was crowned monarch. I feel this is an additional reason for suggesting this amendment, Mr. Speaker.

In my efforts to persuade the minister may I repeat that since the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission is the only organization with any authority and jurisdiction here, surely he will agree that the definition of "Commission" in the bill shall mean the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission and not the Canadian Transport Commission. The Canadian Transport Commission has no place in this legislation whatsoever and will serve as nothing more than a place to file documents. Surely this is an obstacle to the fast and efficient perusal of these documents by the Restrictive Trades Practices Commission. I think if the minister will agree to accept the amendment he will find that the commission that has the authority here will function much more quickly and efficiently in checking

on the international shipping conferences which are being provided with exemptions under the Combines Investigation Act.

Since the amendment does not involve any major upheaval or problems in respect of the rest of the bill, and does not throw any handicap in the way of its immediate implementation—in fact, I think it speeds up its implementation—I hope the minister will agree that the amendment is worthy of his sympathy, attention and consideration and that he will accept it on behalf of the government.

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to speak at any length on the hon. member's amendment in which he expresses a desire to change the meaning of the word "commission" in the definition section of Bill C-184 so that it will mean the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission. I have some doubts about the full effect of his amendment because it is my understanding that the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission operates under the Combines Investigation Act, and the purpose of this bill is to exempt certain shipping conferences from the provisions of the Combines Investigation Act. I doubt whether the amendment is in order to begin with and, like the hon. member, I have some doubt that the Canadian Transport Commission has not shown any real desire up to this time to concern itself with the public interest. I would prefer to take the other avenue suggested in my amendment, that we go further and force the Canadian Transport Commission to concern itself with the public interest.

In my opinion, the two amendments are conflicting and therefore I very much regret that we will not be able to support the amendment for changing the commission to the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission. There seems to be some doubt as to the purport of the amendment itself and I believe it is in conflict with my amendment, which will be dealt with later.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, in supporting the amendment that has been put forth by my hon. colleague, it seems to me very realistic to suggest that those people who were formerly vested with the authority to police the regulations under this particular act should still be given the authority to put some teeth into the regulations. I am sure in the testimony given before the standing committee it was pointed out very well that conferences are cartels and that this is universally recognized. It seems to me that if we are to give any authority the power to deal with the situation, it should be left in the hands of those people who had it previously. It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that there is no suggestion the two amendments now being proposed are in conflict with each other. The amendment proposed by my hon. colleague clearly spells out the fact that it will give jurisdiction over this particular piece of legislation to the Combines Investigation Act and to the commission that would police that particular act.

I think it is only proper that we look at the situation as it has existed. We know the Canadian Transport Commission does not have the tools to police this particular legislation. If they do not have the tools, then we must have some authority vested with the power to impose certain restrictions upon the conferences if we see fit, and particularly if the commission sees fit.

I agree with my colleague that there have been circumstances where we could question whether or not the Canadian Transport Commission is really looking after interests of the people of Canada or the interests of those individual shippers in Canada who are not part of the conferences, and whether they are taking these into consideration when trying to determine the regulations under this particular piece of legislation.

In all sincerity, I believe that the amendment proposed by my hon. colleague is in order and should receive the backing of this House at this time. I am certain that the Combines Investigation Commission could police the regulations and could at least pay particular attention to some of the suggestions coming from the conference. I am frightened to think that the Canadian Transport Commission may police the regulations, as I believe the conference would be able to get to the CTC and in that way do things not in the interests of the general public of Canada or of the shippers of Canada.

• (4:10 p.m.)

I support the amendment 100 per cent, Mr. Speaker. I had hoped the minister would explain to this House why he and the cabinet are not in favour of leaving this piece of legislation under the Combines Investigation Act, but it appears that he is prepared to let the Canadian Transport Commission have jurisdiction even though he may realize they do not have the tools to do the job. They are

not familiar with the particular case before us. The only ones who could really police the regulations are the ones given authority under the Combines Investigation Act.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, as a matter of clarification, would Your Honour be good enough to indicate whether at this point we are debating the merits of the amendment or are we still discussing your Honour's opening comment with regard to the area of doubt concerning its validity?

Mr. Speaker: The merits or demerits of the debate have not been put into question. The decision some minutes ago was that although there were some reservations on the part of the Chair as to the acceptability from a procedural standpoint of the motion proposed by the hon. member, that it should be put and considered by the House. My understanding is that this is the point we have been debating for the last few moments.

Mr. Jamieson: I apologize for having been somewhat confused in that regard. I wish to say a few words about the proposed amendment of the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin). As the hon. member has said, it would have the effect of taking away the responsibility of receiving the documentation as required under this legislation from the Canadian Transport Commission and giving it to the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission.

This amendment is unacceptable to the government. I wish to give some reasons why. The responsibilities of the Canadian Transport Commission under this bill are in keeping with its role under section 14 of the National Transportation Act, that is to perform its function, and I quote from the act, "with the object of co-ordinating and harmonizing the operations of all carriers engaged in transport." This is one of their fundamental duties, to see all developments in transport.

An hon. Member: Ocean transport?

Mr. Jamieson: The hon. member asks if that function relates to ocean transport. There is a good deal of relationship. I wish to illustrate why there is this connection and why it is necessary to have this particular responsibility vested in the Canadian Transport Commission.

I think it is proper to suggest that in the National Transportation Act Parliament set the stage for some of the recently noted Canadian incursions into the complex field of law of the sea and international shipping affairs. While superficially it might seem that the Canadian Transport Commission has little to do under this bill but receive and file certain documents and, if those are the limits, it really would not matter significantly which organization was the recipient of those documents. However, there is an important addition. It will be seen that the knowledge and skills in the field of transportation residing in that body would be vital to the successful and fruitful administration of this measure, and that it would be an integral part of the array of economics, regulatory instruments which Parliament requires the Canadian Transport Commission to administer.

That refers to the comments made by the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Skoberg). It is precisely the reason that he outlined, that there are in fact shippers and customers who are not involved with or related to various shipping conferences and that there is the necessity for all of this to be reposed in the one place. If this particular aspect of it were given to the combines investigation branch, there would not be a mechanism through which the activities concerned in this bill could be compared with and related to those of non-shipping conference related activities.

I want to emphasize that this in no way overlooks the fact that in this measure the sanction for breach of any condition of exemption from the Combines Investigation Act is the application of that act. The Combines Investigation Act is still very much in play in this particular field. Nor does it overlook that the powers of the Director of Investigation and Research, appointed under the Combines Investigation Act to conduct research inquiries into the practices of shipping conferences, are assured by section 11 of the bill.

This is not a question of removing totally the activities, responsibilities or enforcement procedures of the Combines Investigation Act. It merely means that we have determined, in presenting the bill in this manner, that it is better to have the Canadian Transport Commission involved to the degree that the bill permits and at the same time to provide all safeguards which are present in the Combines Investigation Act, and in the manner that I have outlined.

Mr. Benjamin: Will the minister permit a question?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has already spoken. Do I understand he wants to ask a question?

Mr. Benjamin: I wish to ask the minister whether it is correct that for the purposes of this legislation, and this legislation only, the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission is the only body that has any authority to implement the legislation and that the Canadian Transport Commission has none whatsoever.

Mr. Jamieson: In the context in which the hon. member has asked the question, that is correct. However, as I pointed out a few moments ago, we are providing through the filing of the documents with the Canadian Transport Commission that they have detailed background information through the operation of this measure. In that way they can relate it to the other non-conference activities. I think that this combination, as I outlined it, with the powers reposing in the Combines Investigation Act, achieves our purposes in so far as it is possible for us to achieve them.

The government has never indicated total satisfaction with this measure. We have indicated that by providing in the bill that it has to be reviewed within a three year period. I think that the arguments that have been put forward during the earlier debate and in committee show that there is a necessity for this form of exemption, although in the long run this perhaps is not the most desirable approach if one takes the unilateral or individual Canadian requirements into consideration.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): May I ask the minister if there is any obligation on the Canadian Transport Commission which receives these documents to refer them to the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission to see whether there has been any collusion with respect to rates and other matters. Is it left entirely to the discretion of the Canadian Transport Commission or is it left to the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission by separate research to get this information for themselves?

Mr. Jamieson: Without going into the bill in detail, I hope the hon. member will appreciate I am relying on memory, I do not recall what might be described as legal requirements on the Canadian Transport Commission in the manner that has been outlined. At the same time, I think it is implicit in the legislation. I do not think there would be any likelihood of their retaining that information for themselves. There are many many areas in which the Canadian Transport Commission and other agencies operate where they do not have the legal requirement to pass along information or to comment to another agency. It is certainly common practice that they do so. I certainly anticipate this will be the way in which the Commission will function.

Mr. Skoberg: Will the minister permit a further question? Will the minister indicate what machinery has been set up within the Canadian Transport Commission to handle the filing of this type of material and, in particular, what machinery has been set up to ensure that any incidents of collusion by the conference will be submitted to the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission under the Combines Investigation Act?

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Speaker, I have to say to the hon. member that the Canadian Transport Commission would never deem or think about anticipating Parliament.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Jamieson: Therefore, it is obvious until such time as this measure goes through—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Jamieson: —it would be quite improper for them—

Mr. Speaker: I remind hon. members that we are not in committee of the whole at the present time. Questions directed to the minister have been answered. If there are no further contributions, the question might be put. Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said amendment?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Shipping Conferences Exemption Act

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 75(11) the recorded division on the proposed amendment shall stand deferred.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Mr. Jack Horner (Crowfoot) moved:

That Bill C-184, an act to exempt certain shipping conference practices from the provisions of the Combines Investigation Act, be amended by adding thereto, immediately following clause 7 on page 5, the following:

"Approval by Commission

8. For the purposes of this Act, a tariff, patronage contract, arrangement, agreement or contract shall not be valid unless and until approved by an order of the Commission as just and reasonable and in the public interest as defined in section 16 of the National Transportation Act; any tariff, patronage contract, arrangement, agreement or contract so approved shall not continue valid beyond a day six months next following the day the order is made or that day specified in the order as the day of expiration, whichever is the sooner."

and by renumbering subsequent clauses accordingly.

He said: At the outset, Mr. Speaker, I should like to spend some time dealing with the whole subject of shipping conferences and shipping practices as it concerns my amendment. In effect, a shipping conference is a getting together of shipping lines to set prices and establish patronage contracts; in other words, to seek from shippers ironclad contracts guaranteeing that 100 per cent of a shipper's goods will be moved in vessels of the shipping lines meeting at the conference. In further explanation, I should like to quote from the remarks of Mr. Campbell of the Canadian Transport Commission as reported on page 14 of the proceedings of the Transport Committee on May 12 of this year. He had this to say:

A conference is an association of shipping lines serving a precisely defined general cargo ocean trade, established by formal agreement of its members. Under this agreement, members will be required to adhere to a common tariff of rates and charges and, typically, to restrict competition. It will bind shippers to use only conference line vessels by a form of contract known generically as a loyalty arrangement in which the inducement to the contract signatory is that he will have applied to his shipments a schedule of rates which is lower than that applied to non-contract signatories.

Basically, we are dealing with a shipping cartel. The present bill would remove from the compass of the Combines Investigation Act certain people who combine to set rates and to seek ironclad contracts for themselves. Without doubt, this would amount to granting a monopoly in this area. Mr. Campbell makes the position clear when he states, as reported on page 15 of the committee proceedings:

Unquestionably, a conference is a cartel and this is explicit in the findings of the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission which, in its report of June 17, 1965, found that conferences were in breach of the Combines Investigation Act.

The question which naturally comes to mind is this: are these shipping companies Canadian? Do they have the public spirit which prompts them to do good for this country apart from normal business considerations? Do they really wish to see Canadians benefit as a result of these meetings in conference? Mr. Speaker, none of the shipping lines which form this conference are lines operating Canadian ships. At best they are flying flags of convenience. All ships are owned by foreign concerns. So there is no genuine Canadian involvement here; we are dealing with international companies who are taking part in a cartel to set rates which Canadians have to pay.

Anyone who seriously considers this question realizes that when any government whether it is a federal, provincial or even a municipal government, permits a monopoly, it sets up a board to scrutinize the rates set by that monopoly with a view to determining what is fair and proper, bearing in mind the interests of the consumer who is obliged to use the services of the monopoly. This is the principle which is applied in the field of electric power, of pipe lines and of transportation generally. In the case we are considering it is true there is a board which has a certain interest, namely, the Canadian Transport Commission. But the commission does not scrutinize rates. All it does is receive the rates and file them for three years so that they are on record. Thus, the effective length of operation of this bill is three years. Perhaps, after that, some different system will be devised though I am inclined to believe that the measure will simply be extended for a further three years. From my experience of government operations, this is what is more likely to happen.

What has been going on? Mr. Campbell told the committee there had been an investigation which was the subject of a report tabled on June 17, 1968. This report was made under the terms of the Combines Investigation Act by the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission and I should like to read from page three:

Finally, the Director made the following allegations against steamship lines which have participated in shipping conferences in the eastern Canada-United Kingdom trades:

"758. It is my allegation that the following companies have been parties to a combination having relation to those commodities which may be the subject of trade or commerce and which are commonly transported by cargo liners, eastbound and westbound, between ports in Eastern Canada (including Canadian Great Lakes ports and Eastern ports of Canada other than ports in Manitoba and Newfoundland) and ports in the United Kingdom and Eire, by way of actual or tacit consent, agreement or arrangement having or designed to have the effect in relation to such commodities of

(a) fixing common costs of ocean transportation, and

(b) preventing or lessening competition in or substantially controlling ocean transportation,

This is what has been going on. These shipping conferences were designed to fix the costs of ocean transportation and to prevent or lessen competition in, or substantially control, ocean transportation. I emphasize the word "substantially" because from a legal point of view "substantially" does, in essence, mean "unduly". Here, the companies were found to have substantially curtailed competition.

In the bill before us it is proposed to legalize the practice which I have described for a period of three years. For three years, it is proposed to permit the present state of affairs to continue. Again, I wish to quote from the committee proceedings. Mr. Henry of the Combines Investigation Commission said this:

In this particular case the evidence which we had gathered appeared to us to disclose quite clearly an offence against the Combines Investigation Act—an offence that I would in simple terms call price fixing.

The witness referred to the committee report from which I have already quoted and went on to suggest that we were dealing, here, with a cartel—that "cartel" was another word for these conferences. So the evidence is clear. Yet, instead of doing something designed to bring about an improvement in the situation, the government proposes, in this bill, to legalize what has been going on. In considering whether Parliament should, indeed, legalize this practice, I ask the question: what have other countries done in similar circumstances? Let us bear in mind that this is an international problem and one which concerns international shipping lines. As reported at page 16 of committee report No. 26, Mr. Campbell had this to say:

• (4:30 p.m.)

The Committee, Mr. Chairman, might be interested in an observation which appeared in the Economist of April 11 of this year, and I quote:

. . . it is high time that shipping became subject to some kind of regulatory body with the function of ensuring fair competition. This is done in the United States by the Federal Maritime Commission and rather weaker measures to do the same are being introduced in Canada.

I want to re-emphasize the words "weaker measures to do the same are being introduced in Canada" because that statement specifically refers to Bill C-184. My amendment attempts to strengthen the measures proposed in Canada so that that regulatory body will have the power to do something about the cartel that is being given legal sanction by this measure.

It might be of interest to point out exactly what ships are involved in the cartel and how many of them are Canadian ships. In answer to a question put by me in the committee, as reported at page 24 of committee proceedings No. 26, Mr. Henry had this to say:

Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that my colleagues here have the exact figure to answer that question but I am sure it could be obtained. The figure that I have is that at the time we undertook our inquiry, which was back in 1962, the members of the conferences had carried over 80 per cent of eastbound cargo and over 90 per cent westbound. So there is no question about it that the conference lines have the major part of the trading both east and west within Canada, and I think those figures are probably valid now.

So that this bill will apply to practically all shipping serving Canada, both incoming and outgoing; there is no question of that.

I should also like to re-emphasize the statement that none of the ships are Canadian owned, and some are at the most flying flags of convenience.

It is also pertinent to ask how big a monopoly is being set up. How badly do we need a regulatory body to examine the rates that the monopoly is charging? At page 71 of the committee report Mr. McLaughlin, head of the Canada-United Kingdom Freight Conference, was asked a question by the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin) which is as follows:

Well, I gather you are the Canada-United Kingdom Freight Conference.

Mr. McLaughlin: Yes, sir.

Mr. Benjamin: Are there other conferences operating out of Canadian ports to the United Kingdom and Ireland or is yours the only one?

Mr. McLaughlin: No, we are the only one.

So that this bill will be legalizing the creation of an all-inclusive monopoly between Canada and the United Kingdom, to mention only one, a monopoly that will charge whatever rates it likes.

I was interested in the remarks of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson), who said that all the shippers have to do is to file the rates with an important and knowledgeable body, namely the Canadian Transportation Commission. But I ask whether that is good enough. My amendment purports to provide that on filing, the rates must then be approved by the commission. If they are not approved, then the conference is not legally created and the Combines Investigation Branch can take action against it. This would put some teeth into the act.

What has happened over the years? What brought about the investigation that was made by the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission between 1962 and 1965? I should like to quote from page 85 of the commission's report to give the House some idea. I should really read the whole page because the report goes on to outline quite clearly that the conference specifically sought to charge exorbitant rates to the Alcan Company of Canada for moving aluminum out of the Baie Comeau and Saguenay ports.

It appears that the conference wanted to charge $16 a ton, but Alcan formed a subsidiary company called Saguenay Shipping. Consequently, this automatically lowered the rates to about $13 a ton, whereupon the conference indicated it would now lower its rates to $11 a ton if it were guaranteed 25 per cent of the freight. There are many illustrations of abuses that deliberately held up freight and shipping costs. For example, page 87 deals with millfeeds and hides and the shipping rates are gone into very fully. In one particular case where the conference was the only shipper the rate on brans, shorts and middlings was $1.05 per 100 pounds. Then, when a competitive shipper was allowed to move in in the form of another conference line, the rate immediately dropped to 48 cents for middlings, 50 cents for shorts and 53 cents for bran per 100 pounds. In other words, the rates were cut roughly in half when competition came upon the scene. One can examine the pages of the report and clearly ascertain that without competition shipping conferences will charge, and have charged in the past, exorbitant rates.

What does this bill do to control exorbitant rates of the sort charged in the past? In fact, what can be done? A minute ago I said that the bill merely asked that the rates be filed. In case someone doubts that word may I refer to page 113 of the committee proceedings where this question is clearly explained. Mr. Campbell says:

> The bill requires that the form of contract be filed. This is the universal form that applies to all shippers. The shipper simply fills in his name and signs it.

The form is then filed with the CTC. What real strength is there in such a provision?

There is a great deal of talk today about foreign ownership of Canada, about concern by Canadians for Canada. I wonder how many people who attended the recent political convention of a party that declared itself to be concerned for Canada and how many people at the Liberal convention in London at the week end, a party which similarly declared itself to be all for Canada, are really aware that here in Ottawa sits a government that is prepared to grant a monopoly, a cartel, to shipping lines owned completely by foreign companies, lines that transport 80 to 90 per cent of the goods coming into and passing out of Canada?

An hon. Member: Shame!

Mr. Horner: It is a shame indeed. It is also a shame that we established the Canadian Transportation Commission. Bill C-184 would legalize the creation of a monopoly to charge exorbitant rates, and merely asks that monopoly to file their patronage contracts, and I suppose the rates charged, for a period of three years. That is not good enough. What should we do and what can we do? We could work toward the establishment of something similar to the International Air Transportation Association which sets the rates for world wide air traffic. Surely we are not doing that through this bill.

• (4:40 p.m.)

As my amendment suggests, we could give the commission the power to restrict the agreements with shipping conferences if the rates are exorbitant. Nowhere in this bill do we give the shipper the right to appeal. The shipper in no way has an appeal to the Transport Commission, nor can he even suggest that the rates should be lowered.

If one reads the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission reports he will find plenty of evidence which will suggest there are many instances in which people have definitely sought lower rates but were not able to get them because of the monopolistic position of the conference. Without a doubt there is substantial evidence to support the amendment now before the House, and I would urge hon. members who are concerned about the welfare of Canadians and Canadian shippers to support this amendment.

If we cannot export we can hardly survive. There is the old and often made statement, if we cannot receive fair and equitable shipping rates we can hardly compete.

In my opinion this bill legalizes something, which may or may not be termed highway robbery, for three years. This is like burying our heads in the sand and not facing problems squarely. It is high time that Canada said Canadian exporters and importers in international trade markets deserve a fair break. We will not allow Canadians to be subject to exorbitant rates which have in the past tended to limit and control our ability to export. Surely, this again will be a problem if we do not watch very carefully what we are doing.

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, I see no problem in supporting the amendment introduced by the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner). At the same time, I would suggest that there was no real reason the hon. member could not support the original amendment put forward. In fact, all it would do would be to change the authority responsible for the regulations about which we are talking. The amendment now introduced by the hon. member would reduce the time from three years to six months.

It seems highly irregular that we should introduce legislation in this House that attempts to legalize those violations that have been well pointed out by the Combines Investigation branch. I suggest a good analogy could be made in respect of those people who have abortions. The government is not prepared to bring in legislation to deal with that particular problem in this society. Yet, at the same time, the government is willing in respect of these steel monsters of the ocean to bring in legislation which will legalize these violations of the law.

The main function of this House of Commons, and the members here, should be to protect the users of these services. We have heard many submissions recited throughout this country which set out very clearly that users of services and products hauled by these services should be protected. I suggest if we look at the situation in light of this amendment, at least it would be reviewed in a period of six months by this House.

If we look at the transcript of the proceedings of the standing committee which dealt with this at some length we will find this:

> The Canadian Shippers' Council has publicly declared its support of the Bill and appears to feel that it provides a desirable statutory base upon which to establish effective consultative machinery.

Then the report continues:

> If I were to venture an opinion, Sir, it would be that this general acceptance is due to the fact that both sides have had ample time to anticipate the measure and they see in it a framework in which they can promote trade to mutual satisfaction and with minimum disruption.

Whenever I see certain conferences, such as we are dealing with today, refer to having minimum disruptions I wonder whether or not there really is legislation which concerns itself with this particular aspect. I am sure once again if we look at the situation, and consider these flag of convenience ships plying the waters of this country and this world, we would appreciate the fact that there has to be regulation. We must control these flag of convenience ships so we do not have a repetition of those things we have witnessed in the past number of years.

It is not good enough to suggest that conferences will regulate these things. It is absolutely imperative that we bring in legislation which is strong enough to regulate the conferences. I am not necessarily in agreement with the suggestion that too many regulations are particularly bad for any particular industry, because there have to be more rules within which these industries themselves must work. I feel the conference we are referring to here is one in respect of which we must have ground rules, and that there has to be legislation to police these rules to the extent that they mean something to those people who are dependent upon this phase of transportation.

The hon. member for Crowfoot put it very ably. There is a concern on the part of members of this House in so far as our Canadian identity is concerned. There is a particular concern about our national pride in those regulations that we have put into effect to govern the shipping industries to which we have referred.

There are many ship owners who do not belong to the conference, and they are not provided the same type of protection. Without that protection, they can violate the regulations without worrying about repercussions. For these reasons, I should like to suggest that we can support this amendment. It will at least give this bill some teeth in that we will review the situation in a shorter period of time than now suggested. The six month period is realistic, even though it may take time for the necessary machinery to be established.

I am certain that if the original amendment and the amendment now before us both passed, the situation previously referred to

would not again develop. The restrictive Trade Practices Commission is well versed in the policing of regulations. With this change, that commission could again police these regulations and review the situation in six months.

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to rise in support of the amendment submitted by the member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner). For indeed, it was agreed between us that I would second his amendment, but the hon. member for Edmonton East (Mr. Skoreyko) weighed in first.

The reason I support the amendment is that it would put more light on one of life's great mysteries involving ocean shipping rates, particularly that mystery to people of the ports of Saint John and Halifax. For some two dozen or three dozen years, the people there have found that the rates between their ports, admittedly at the eastern end of Canada, to United Kingdom ports have been the same as the rates between ports from Montreal and east on the St. Lawrence River to the same United Kingdom ports. This is a mystery because there is, or at least one would think, a several hundred mile geographic advantage to shippers in Halifax and Saint John. This supposed advantage means nothing to the four dozen odd shipping conferences. It is ephemeral and an illusion. It does not mean a hill of economic beans.

• (4:50 p.m.)

At one time when the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission held its inquiry into the ocean conference rates and practices, the executive secretary of the port of Halifax commission, Mr. Ray March, used this language. I am quoting from the submission to the Commission of Inquiry dated October 2, 1963. It might be noted parenthetically, by the way, that Mr. March is now with the Canadian Transport Commission. He wrote this:

> Because of this shorter distance between Halifax and the United Kingdom, we understand that a steamship line serving this route can make one extra round-trip voyage in a three month period than it could if it were trading between Montreal and the United Kingdom. Yet this advantage is not reflected in ocean rates.

Well, we do indeed have a mystery. In order to get the exact distances on the record perhaps it should be noted that according to the Canadian Ports and Seaway Directory, the distance from Halifax to Liverpool is 2,441 nautical miles. The distance from Montreal to Liverpool is 2,755 nautical miles. The distance from Halifax to London is 2,718 nautical miles and from Montreal to London the distance is 3,094 nautical miles. In each case, the difference is approximately 300 nautical miles.

[Mr. Skoberg.]

Well, sir, I tried to track down the mystery concerning why the rates are the same although the distances are different. I did this when this measure was before the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications on Tuesday, May 12, 1970. My hon. friend from Crowfoot has quoted some of the answers and the Mr. Campbell to whom he referred is the same Mr. Campbell whom I questioned. I asked the following questions, as recorded at page 27 of the proceedings of that date in volume 26:

> Mr. McCleave: Mr. Chairman, one thing that has always puzzled people in Halifax and Saint John is the fact that the ocean rates, as I understand them, are the same to Halifax and Saint John from, say, Liverpool and London as the rates are to Montreal, though I believe the rates to Toronto and Hamilton are a bit higher. Can any of our witnesses explain why this should be a way of life, especially in the light of the fact that there are over 300 nautical miles greater distance from Liverpool or London to Montreal than from those ports to Halifax and Saint John.
>
> Mr. Campbell: I think I could offer a possible explanation, sir. If I might be so bold, I am not sure that the subject of shipping economics is particularly relevant to this bill, but . . .

At this point I interrupted and said:

> Mr. McCleave: Is not the subject of rates particularly relevant to the bill? Are we not dealing with blessing practices which otherwise are outside the law because they are restricted?
>
> Mr. Campbell: We are blessing them subject to conditions; that is correct, sir, yes.
>
> Mr. McCleave: Yes, that is true.
>
> Mr. Campbell: The reason that the transatlantic rates to Halifax might be the same or even in some cases possibly higher than they are to Montreal might well be the same as why they are the same or higher to Toronto. If the bulk of the trade were between Montreal and Liverpool and en route the ship had to deviate to Halifax to pick up more then the ship is actually incurring extra costs in going to Halifax, the point being that if the ship could go from Halifax to Liverpool with full cargoes there would not be any question at all that the rate from Halifax to Liverpool would be lower, or should be lower than the rate to Montreal. But it is a question of the costing of the whole voyage to fill the ship.
>
> Mr. McCleave: There are cases, though, where the ships go directly between Halifax and Liverpool or between Montreal and Liverpool without calling at both Canadian ports. That is the question on which I am putting my emphasis. Why should this be so?
>
> Mr. Campbell: Sir, the question of the economics of ocean shipping is in my experience an extraordinarily complicated one.

By the time this volume is completed at page 135 I did not have an answer and by the time I filed subsequent questions I still did not have my answer. Let me continue outlining my puzzlement. Mr. Campbell continued:

I do not know that I could give you a satisfactory answer, but I think perhaps it should be noted that this bill does not purport to control rates. It requires that they be exposed to public scrutiny but . . .

Then, I said:

Mr. McCleave: Well, then, perhaps this is in Mr. Henry's field since there was a study made, and presumably the study did dig into these rates and I think found out that they were the same though there was that 300-plus nautical mile difference, which would be more than a day's travel for, I suppose, most vessels.

Mr. Henry, who was the director of the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission and of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, came in with this answer:

Mr. Henry: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I do not have the answer with me on that. I will have to get it and refer it to the Committee.

Then, later, on May 14, Mr. Henry writes to the chairman of the committee and in this letter states in part the following:

I find that we have no information on the point and the question could not be answered without further research.

Then, he refers to the proceedings in which Mr. March made his submission. After Mr. March made his statement there were some questions, and Mr. Henry in his letter refers to the following statement by Mr. March:

I know quite well the Conferences have good reason for maintaining the rate to Halifax the same as it is to Montreal. For one thing it is historical. It has always been that way.

Then, he continues the quotation as follows:

The Chairman: Is there any other reason, Mr. March?

Mr. March: It is historical. There may be some good reason for doing it, I don't know. But I am afraid at this time, sir, all I can do is present the predicament to you objectively. I think the solution must come from the Conference.

Mr. Speaker, obviously, armed with the basic question and the type of answer one gets in looking into it, the matter is worthy of further examination which I propose to give at eight o'clock this evening.

Mr. Speaker: It being five o'clock the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business, namely, notices of motions and public bills.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

PENSIONS

MEASURES TO IMPROVE CONDITIONS FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should give consideration to improving the economic and social status of Canada's senior citizens by (a) increasing the income tax exemption to $2,000 for single persons and $4,000 for couples (b) lowering the old age security pension age for women to 60 years (c) exempting old age security pension payments from taxable income (d) supplying the full cost of living increase bonus to old age security pensions and making this bonus effective immediately each time the cost of living index advances by 2% (e) restoring the $500 a year income tax exemption for old age security pensioners at 65 years (f) giving the right to all pensioners receiving the Guaranteed Income Supplement to earn up to $300 a year (g) continuing the pension for a period of six months, following the decease of an old age security pensioner, payable to the survivor (h) increasing the old age security pension to $150 a month.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this afternoon a number of proposals were made to adjourn the House to discuss some matters of urgent and pressing national importance. For the reason Mr. Speaker gave at that time, these were not accepted. I wish to say that in my view the motion we are about to discuss is certainly one of urgent national and pressing importance. I put it forward in the way of a motion in the many parts Mr. Speaker read out so well in the hope that it would do something to meet the emergency of poverty which is engulfing many thousands of our older people. It is estimated, particularly in respect of those on the Old Age Security pension and the supplementary assistance allowance, that there are approximately 800,000 Canadians involved.

• (5:00 p.m.)

The situation in which those people found themselves last year was bad, but the situation in which they find themselves at this time is worse and is getting worse due, on the one hand, to the lessening of the purchasing power of the dollar through inflation and, on the other hand, to the failure of the government to act to increase their pensions. These people are now worse off than they were at the time when the supplementary assistance program was begun. By failing to act and to improve their pension base we are literally taking money out of their pockets at the rate of about $10 a month, and we continue to do

this at a time when at long last we have increased the pensions of our retired civil servants, of the RCMP, and, of course, of ourselves.

The motion in my name calls for the following action to be taken. It reads:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should give consideration to improving the economic and social status of Canada's senior citizens by (a) increasing the income tax exemption to $2,000 for single persons and $4,000 for couples, (b) lowering the old age security pension age for women to 60 years, (c) exempting old age security pension payments from taxable income, (d) supplying the full cost of living increase bonus to old age security pensions and making this bonus effective immediately each time the cost of living index advances by 2 per cent, (e) restoring the $500 a year income tax exemption for old age security pensioners at 65 years, (f) giving the right to all pensioners receiving the Guaranteed Income Supplement to earn up to $300 a year, (g) continuing the pension for a period of six months, following the decease of an old age security pensioner, payable to the survivor, (h) increasing the old age security pension to $150 a month.

This motion follows very closely the brief presented last year at this time to Members of Parliament and to Senators by the National Pensioners and Senior Citizens Federation. The resolutions which I have encompassed in my notice of motion are on all fours with what has been proposed by the provincial senior citizens organizations across Canada.

I urge hon. members not to defeat this motion. The passage of any of its parts could bring the comfort and help to many thousands of homes across the nation which is so badly needed. Members of all parties have at one time or other voiced the opinion that the time is overdue for this House and the government to do something on behalf of old age pensioners, but if there has been one person in the House who, over the years, has spearheaded such an appeal, it has been the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), my colleague. Let me refer to just one of the numerous speeches and references he has made on the necessity of doing something now about old age pensioners. I will paraphrase briefly what he said in the House last May 4.

It should be remembered that the situation of which he spoke then has since deteriorated further as regards so many of our older people. At that time, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre pointed out that there were approximately one and a half million old age pensioners in Canada, and of that number over half, about 785,000, were so poor as to be on the guaranteed income supplement. Of that figure again over half, that is 473,000, drew the full amount of the guaranteed income supplement. To get the full guaranteed income supplement, one has to have literally nothing.

The hon. member also quoted some other figures. While the consumer price index had gone up at that time rather more than 16 per cent, increases in old age pensoners' incomes, in line with the 2 per cent a year increase linked with the cost of living increase, had gone up approximatey 6.1 per cent. So, the old age pensioners have not received a 6 per cent guideline increase in income but have taken what amounts to a 10 per cent cut in their income, and this at a time when so many prices, wages, profits and other incomes have gone up a great deal beyond the 6 per cent that the government recognizes.

It is surely a twist of the economic screw that the very increases in income, profits and prices which the more affluent of us have secured over the last period have added to the cost and the burdens of those people who are least able to support them, that is the old age pensioners. They have lost about $10 out of every $100 they have taken in, and we continue to let them do that.

This motion, if passed or referred for action to a committee, would help to correct that situation. I ask hon. members not to oppose it, and if possible to support it to the extent of sending it for action to a committee.

I hope that spokesmen for the government will not remind me of the study of social security which the government is still conducting. The old age pensioners of Canada are being studied to death.

Mr. P. M. Mahoney (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, this is a very generous and noble resolution. I am moderately amazed that we do not also have a provision to offer free tobacco to old age pensioners in addition to the many other marvellous things we would like to do for them. Certainly, no one could argue with the sentiments or the desirability of providing the various levels of benefits which the hon. member has proposed. One might find it difficult to see how we can achieve this if we adopt some of the rather introverted economic policies that members of his party have advocated for our country in recent days. Nevertheless, the fact is that the government is anxious, and could not be more anxious, to ensure that Canada's senior citizens are able to live in comfort and in dignity. The government is and will continue for many years to

endeavour to assure this comfort and dignity to the extent possible in our economy.

In recent years the government has introduced many measures specificially designed to provide benefits where they are most needed among this group. Examples of these measures are the laws providing for increases in the old age pension in accordance with increases in the cost of living; for the gradual reduction in the age of eligibility for this pension from 70 to 65; and for the guaranteed income supplement for those old age pensioners who have little or no income other than the pension. In addition, benefits are also provided under the Canada Assistance Act. By providing these selective measures rather than providing universal benefits to older persons, the government has been able to ensure the provision of benefits where they are most needed.

This motion was placed on the Order Paper about eleven days prior to the tabling in the House of Commons of the white paper proposals for tax reform, and I suppose it is somewhat appropriate that in a few minutes time we will be asked to revert to another order of business in order to receive the report of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs on the hearings that it has conducted over the period from January 15 to September 11 on the tax reform proposals. The proposals did anticipate to some extent the specific recommendation in the motion before us that income tax exemptions be increased.

• (5:10 p.m.)

Again relying on the exemption system, certainly no one could argue that we would not like to see higher exemptions. If the $1,000 exemption for a single person was valid in 1949, then certainly the $1,400 proposed in the white paper, or indeed the $2,000 proposed in this motion, does not relate arithmetically to the increased cost of living in that 21 year period. But nevertheless there have been many other benefits extended to these people, many other opportunities for a fuller share in the economic well being of Canada, and we cannot simply relate, in terms of arithmetic, the exemption system to the increase in the cost of living over the years.

It is not clear from this motion whether it is intended that the exemption increase would be provided to all taxpayers or only to older taxpayers, although I gather from the spirit of the motion that we are talking about older taxpayers in this case. However, without offsetting changes in the rate schedule, it should be noted that an exemption increase is of greater absolute value to those with higher incomes than to those with lower incomes because it frees from tax those dollars which are subject to the highest marginal rate of tax applicable to an individual's income. For example, under the present tax law taxpayers in Ontario with taxable incomes of $1,000, $7,000 and $20,000 respectively would receive tax relief of $150, $268 and $464 from an exemption increase of $1,000. In other words, it would benefit those older citizens who are well off more than twice as much as it would benefit those with modest incomes. Further, it would not provide any benefit to those individuals who have insufficient income to be taxable.

The hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), who is sitting in the chamber, advocated the tax credit system to avoid this particular problem when he spoke during the hearings of the Finance Committee. Perhaps he will take part in this debate in order further to elaborate his views. We are faced with the anomaly of the exemption system benefiting those who need the help the least, and giving the most benefit to those who are relatively better off. The white paper proposals overcome this to some considerable extent by adjustment in the rate schedules.

The white paper proposal for exemption increases of $400 for single taxpayers and $800 for married taxpayers, as well as the offsetting changes in the rate schedule, will to a large extent offset the revenue loss involved in the exemption increase which is proposed. Certainly, without some considerably greater revision of the rate schedule than is contemplated under the white paper, the increase of exemptions to the extent recommended in this particular motion would result in a considerable drain on the treasury, one for which the government would be hard put to compensate.

Under the proposals, and bearing in mind the $500 special deduction allowed to taxpayers of the age of 70 or more, the exemption increase proposed will ensure that these taxpayers will not pay tax unless the income of the individual taxpayer exceeds $2,000 if he is taxed as a single person and $3,400 if he is eligible to claim married status.

In the motion, it is also proposed that old age security pension payments be exempted from income tax. When the old age pension was introduced in 1952 it was decided that the pension should be universal with no means test, but that it should be partially

recovered through taxation where the recipients also received income from other sources. In that way those individuals with little or no income other than the old age pension retain the full amount of the pension while those with higher incomes pay back a portion of the pension through taxation. Again, the proposal put forward by the hon. member would most benefit those pensioners with higher incomes.

I think it is implicit in the hon. member's motion that the persons who in fact rely entirely on the old age security pension are not likely to be paying income tax, and again we are faced with the anomaly of benefiting most those who need the help least if we exempt old age security pension payments from the income tax law.

Moreover, income in the form of an old age pension is used in the same way and has the same characteristics as other forms of income. It seems most equitable that taxpayers be taxed on the same basis when they are essentially in similar situations, even though their incomes may originate and may be derived from different types of sources.

The motion also proposes lowering the old age security pension age for women to 60 years. I appreciate that this motion was drafted almost a year ago, when perhaps it was policy to treat women somewhat differently from men, but again the hon. member might wish to reconsider this particular aspect of his motion in view of the militant behavior of the female wing of his party in recent days. They might not appreciate this break.

An hon. Member: Wait until they get on your back.

Mr. Mahoney: Well, perhaps money talks.

It is also proposed under the motion that the special $500 deduction allowed to taxpayers of 70 years or more be made available to pensioners at age 65. In 1965 the eligible age for receipt of the old age security pension was reduced from age 70 to age 65. This important change added substantially to the cost of providing that pension. The government decided that, rather than impose new taxes, part of this additional expenditure would be off-set by withdrawal of the special $500 deduction from those individuals under age 70 who received the old age pension. In this way again those most in need of the pension, because they had little or no other income, would receive the full benefit of the pension while those with higher incomes would pay back part of the pension through taxation. All new recipients of the pension, except those with very high incomes, were better off because of receipt of the pension even though they gave up the special $500 deduction.

An individual who became eligible late in the year and so would receive the pension for only one or two months might find that loss or the $500 deduction increased his tax by more than one or two month's pension payments. Such an individual could delay applying for the pension until the beginning of the following year and thus retain the $500 deduction for the year in which he became eligible for the pension.

A deduction based on age is not a very logical or precise way to provide tax relief. Some individuals over age 65 or 70 have large incomes. The attainment of a certain age does not necessarily result in higher expenses or a reduced ability to pay income tax. A deduction of $500 provides a much larger amount of tax deduction for a person with a high income than for a person with a low income.

Mr. Benjamin: Raise your rates then.

Mr. Mahoney: Unfortunately, the motion does not embody the proposition that rates be raised to make up the revenue and the need to create greater equity in the tax structure. The justification for this kind of deduction must be that it will exempt completely from tax a number of older people with low incomes for whom completing a tax form may be a cause of considerable trouble and worry. These difficulties are not likely to be nearly so prevalent at age 65 as they may be at some of the older ages.

The Carter Commission in its report recommended that the special $500 deduction be withdrawn for all taxpayers. The white paper proposes that this deduction be continued for those who have reached age 70.

A great deal of time and talk have been devoted in the Finance Committee and the House of Commons to the white paper proposals, particularly to those dealing with personal income tax, revolving around the relative situations in Canada and the United States. Under the white paper proposals we would have a basic exemption for single status of $1,400 and a basic exemption for married status of $2,800, with additional deductions for each dependant under age 16

of $300 and additional deductions for each dependant over age 15 of $550. Taxpayers over age 69 would be entitled to an extra additional exemption of $500. Of course, there is the standard optional deduction of $100 for taxpayers who do not claim a deduction for charitable donations or medical expenses for this age group as well.

• (5:20 p.m.)

In the United States at the present time the basic exemption for the single taxpayer is $600. This will increase to $625 for the current fiscal year in the next income tax return. When the tax reform measures are ultimately fully adopted in the United States that exemption will be $750. The exemption for the spouse is exactly the same, $600 at the present time and $625 for the income tax return filled in respect of the current taxation year and when their tax reform is fully implemented it will be $750. Dependant deductions in the United States are the same as those for the spouse—$600 increasing to $750. The additional exemption for taxpayers over age 64 is now $600 and will increase to $750. If the spouse is over age 64 and is filing a joint return, the exemption is in like amount.

The standard optional deduction is a rather complicated issue in the United States but admittedly is more generous than ours. Since married taxpayers in the United States usually file joint returns where the income of the husband and wife is combined and regarded as received in equal portions by each, it does not matter for federal U.S. income tax purposes whether the income shown is all received by one marriage partner or partly by each. This fact is quite important in calculating Canadian tax.

Under the white paper proposals we are suggesting $150 employment allowance. With all respect to the hon. member, not all or even the majority of taxpayers of age 65 are unemployed and totally dependant on old age assistance, old age security and so on. Many are employed and this particular benefit will also be available to that age group.

In concluding my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I should like to reiterate that a considerable improvement has taken place in the Canadian old age income maintenance system in recent years. Examples include the introduction of the Canada Assistance Plan, the Canada Pension Plan, the guaranteed income supplement program and several improvements in the old age security program and benefits. In this latter case the minimum qualifying age has been reduced to 65 from 70. In addition, benefits are adjusted in accordance with the index used under the Canada Pension Plan.

I should like to emphasize that the financial implications of this program that already exists have been quite substantial. For example, the federal outlays under the Old Age Security Act alone are expected to amount to over $1.7 billion in the current fiscal year, as compared with total outlays of $927 million in the fiscal year ending March 31, 1966. It is not quite double but close to it in four years.

Mr. Speaker, I should also like to note that the government has announced its intention to issue a white paper on social security.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Did you not hear the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) today?

Mr. Mahoney: It will be tabled, and no doubt discussed in public, in keeping with the government's policy of allowing the fullest possible public debate.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. parliamentary secretary but his time has expired. The hon. member for Gatineau.

[*Translation*]

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

FINANCE, TRADE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

EIGHTEENTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE, TRADE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

Mr. Gaston Clermont (Gatineau): Mr. Speaker, with unanimous consent, would the House revert to routine proceedings?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Clermont: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table the eighteenth report of the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic affairs.

[*Editor's Note: For text of above report, see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

[*English*]

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

PENSIONS

MEASURES TO IMPROVE CONDITIONS FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

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

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should give consideration to improving the economic and social status of Canada's senior citizens by (a) increasing the income tax exemption to $2,000 for single persons and $4,000 for couples (b) lowering the old age security pension age for women to 60 years (c) exempting old age security pension payments from taxable income (d) supplying the full cost of living increase bonus to old age security pensions and making this bonus effective immediately each time the cost of living index advances by 2% (e) restoring the $500 a year income tax exemption for old age security pensioners at 65 years (f) giving the right to all pensioners receiving the Guaranteed Income Supplement to earn up to $300 a year (g) continuing the pension for a period of six months, following the decease of an old age security pensioner, payable to the survivor (h) increasing the old age security pension to $150 a month.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, first of all may I be one of the first to offer my congratulations on your election as Deputy Speaker of this House. I hope your tenure of office will be a happy and fruitful one. It may sometimes be a little rough, since these are not the smoothest seas to sail. As we know, having come back this afternoon after a three month respite, there are areas of sudden squalls in this House but I trust none of these will be deliberately motivated to upset any occupant of the Chair.

The motion that is before us today can almost be characterized as a grab-bag of every possible exaggerated claim that could be made, and the results could be far different from those envisaged by those who put forward such a proposition. I am not going to go into the content of the white paper and what the proposition might be and what the committee said. This is now official and I can speak with more freedom than could the hon. parliamentary secretary, who was skating on thin ice a few moments ago when he referred to some of the things that had been discussed before the committee before the report had been tabled.

If we were to look at the motion before us I think the hon. proposer would agree with me that the government should give consideration to improving the economic and social status of certain of Canada's senior citizens.

[Mr. Clermont.]

He says of all of Canada's senior citizens. The net result of his proposal has been to enunciate the disparities at almost every level because he speaks generally of each class in the same way.

I find it rather strange that the party with which he is affiliated would allow him to put forward a motion of this kind, bearing in mind that their stated purpose in life is to bring about a gradual egalitarianism in society. The net result of this motion, however, is to bring about wider disparity.

First of all, let us look at the increase in income tax exemption of $2,000 for single persons and $4,000 for couples. That means the person who is earning $2,200 and the person who is earning $50,000—very few might be earning $50,000 so let us say $25,000 because there are many in the public service today earning $25,000 a year—would get the same benefit at the marginal rates. The difficulty in increasing exemptions is that the effect is at the marginal rate of the taxpayer. Taxpayers with a 50 per cent marginal rate—in this particular instance a married couple—would receive a benefit of $1,000. A person earning $3,000 or much lower, where the marginal rate is much less—it could be as low as 15 per cent—would receive a mere pittance.

That is why the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Mahoney) stated I have long advocated that greater equity could be achieved through a tax credit system. Unfortunately the government has not seen fit to follow this suggestion. I maintain that greater justice would be achieved with a tax credit system, notwithstanding the fancy arguments advanced by government experts with regard to difficulties in connection with tax credits, and that they could do better by raising the exemptions. I remain unconvinced, as I think most people do, that greater equity would be achieved by increasing the exemption proposed by the government.

• (5:30 p.m.)

All this motion does is widen the gap. There is even greater disparity because we are dealing with much larger figures. I am not dealing with the question of where we would get the revenue and what it would cost the national treasury if there were a general increase in exemptions. This proposal would double the personal exemption. At the present time it might cost approximately $2 billion a year for this one provision.

I will now deal with proposal (b), lowering the old age security pension age for women to

60 years. What will it be in five years' time? Will it be age 55? This is the first time I have seen this proposal made. I do not know why it is put forward at this point. Some people ask for a pension at age 45. Some men have told me they are tired of working and would like a pension at age 50.

Proposal (c), exempting old age security pension payments from taxable income, is another provision whereby the disparity between the middle-income group and the lower-income group would be increased because there is no limitation. A retired judge of the Supreme Court is entitled to 70 per cent of his retirement salary of $26,000 for which he has made no contribution. At the rate of $2,000 or $4,000, since he is the sole taxpayer, he would be exempt from income tax. He would be done a great favour; there are no two ways about it. On the other hand, very little is done for the person with more modest means. The gap is widened even more.

Proposal (d) refers to supplying the full cost of living increase bonus to old age security pensions and making this bonus effective immediately each time the cost of living index advances by 2 per cent. I criticize that proposal. With all automatic cost of living bonuses there is a built-in inflation factor: the more the inflation, the more you give. There is more call for higher bonuses. It is a cancer, if it is tied to the cost of living increase.

The next proposal, (e), suggests restoring the $500 a year income tax exemption for old age security pensioners at 65 years. I agree with this proposal because the exemption was taken away by a sleight-of-hand method. It was part of the old shell game which was used when introducing the guaranteed income supplement.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): It came in at the time of the Canada Pension Plan.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): It came in at the time of the Canada Pension Plan, but it was an increase to allow the changes to age 65 on a five year progression. This was one of the elements used to compensate for the increased cost. It was coincidental with the Canada Pension Plan but not part of it.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): It was not part of the guaranteed income supplement.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): I thank the hon. member for helping the two of us fall into the right alley. Sometimes it takes two people with roughly the same recollection to do this. In any event, in order to pay for the increase in old age pension which was instituted in 1964 and made effective in 1965, the $500 exemption for taxpayers between ages 65 and 70 was removed. I think that was really fiscal double-talk. The taxpayers did not understand what was happening, neither did the old age pensioners. I think that exemption should be restored.

The next proposal is (f), giving the right to all pensioners receiving the guaranteed income supplement to earn up to $300 a year. I wonder about that. Proposal (h) calls for increasing the old age security pension to $150 a month, which would mean $1,800 a year. How on earth could the guaranteed income supplement apply, because that act states that an income shall be $1,260 per annum. If one received the whole of the increased old age security pension there would be no guaranteed income supplement. There would be no need for a guaranteed income supplement. Proposal (f) would be superfluous.

Proposal (g) refers to continuing the pension for a period of six months, following the decease of an old age security pensioner, payable to the survivor. Is this to be a bonus? Is this to be a funeral expense allowance of some sort? I have not heard any argument in favour of this proposal. However, it would be very nice for the survivor to receive this additional pension. Here again, it would be payable to the rich and to the poor. An old age pensioner of 70 or 71, a retired public servant with a pension of $15,000 a year, with a wife of the same age, who unfortunately lost his wife would receive a bonus of six months' pension, or $900, under this proposal since under provision (h) there would be an old age security pension of $150 a month. Should the state pay him solace to this extent for the loss of his wife? I hardly think so. This money would be tax free, because it was asked earlier that old age pension payments should be free of income tax. Therefore you would be giving a $900 tax-free bonus.

• (5:40 p.m.)

While the motivation behind a number of these provisions has been bona fide, the packaging of them together has created a fiscal nightmare. It has certainly created a tremendous bill for the national treasury. The present policy is to make the old age security fund self-sustaining by reason of three points of income tax and one point of sales tax

being applied to it. In order to pay the bill which would be called for by this resolution, I do not know by how much we would have to multiply that three per cent of income tax, and we might have to exact a 5 per cent additional sales tax in order to do it.

There is nothing magical about old age security. It is a special fund which is self-sustaining. There is no claim on consolidated revenue, unless the legislation is changed. It is made a charge on consolidated revenue without reference to the payments which are made by each and every individual. I say each and every individual because I do not think there is a taxpayer in Canada who escapes the effects of income tax, corporate tax or sales tax. To this extent, old age security as we know it is in part a contributory tax: everyone contributes to it. Remember, it is Canadians who will have to pay for these proposals; therefore I cannot in any way support the motion.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, the plight of senior citizens in Canada today is so serious that I had hoped the introduction of this resolution by my hon. friend the member for Surrey (Mr. Mather) would have brought forth positive statements by Liberal and Conservative spokesmen as to what they would do about the situation. Instead we have heard from the new Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Mahoney) and from the financial spokesman for the official opposition exercises in which they have found all the faults they could in the motion presented by my hon. friend.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): It is your motion which is under discussion.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): That is perfectly correct, it is our motion, and the purpose in introducing it is to bring before Parliament the plight of our old age pensioners. I submit that if the hon. gentlemen who have just spoken shared the concern which my hon. friend has expressed, they would have brought forth positive suggestions. But this they failed to do.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): That is a specious argument.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I am ready to admit that there are points in my hon. friend's resolution which require further study so that they can be harmonized with each other. But I point out that in the course of his remarks he expressed the hope that the House would see fit to refer his resolution to a committee for study. In other words, he admitted there were points which ought to be studied further. I would also draw attention to a fact which should be known to all members of this chamber: the various senior citizens' and old age pensioners' organizations in Canada hold conventions from time to time at which they prepare briefs and submit requests to us. The items set out in this motion are the things for which they are asking, and even if some of them go a bit far, even if some of them do not harmonize with each other, I think it is perfectly proper that Parliament should be asked to give consideration to what they have suggested. Hence, in my opinion the proposal that this whole matter be referred to a special committee or to one of our standing committees is an appropriate one.

I was amused by the confidence which the new Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance displayed when he told us that one of these days we would be getting the white paper on social security. I hope that in his new position, even though he has held it for only a few days, he is privy to what goes on and knows whereof he speaks. I have to base my knowledge on what I hear out in the open, and out in the open I know that the question of doing something about social security has been in the Speech from the Throne presented to each of the sessions we have had since the election of this government. I know, also, that much work was put into what was known as the Willard report, or perhaps I should say the Willard reports. I know that for quite a while the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro) said that consideration was being given to making those reports public. But we have never seen them and the tune has been changed two or three times. Instead of getting to see the Willard report or reports, we were told about a year ago that there was to be a government white paper based on the work of Dr. Willard, the Deputy Minister of National Welfare.

When we were first told we would get a white paper, we were promised it would be down soon. Then we were told it would be down some time during the session and for a while this statement was made with the clear implication that we would get it before the House rose for the 1970 summer recess. Later this was modified and the Minister of National Health and Welfare told us we would get it before the House prorogued in October. We pinned him down repeatedly and he respond-

ed straightforwardly by telling the House we would have it before Parliament prorogued in October.

Well, we are now in October and know we shall prorogue the day after tomorrow. But when I asked the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) during the oral question period this afternoon whether this particular commitment would be kept, he in effect said no; he told us there would be no white paper before the end of the present session. However, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance still thinks there will be a white paper, maybe next session or the one after that, or during the election campaign of 1972. I know that when I asked when we were likely to see this white paper, the Prime Minister did not tell me. Maybe it is so white it is blank; so white that there is nothing on it. The Prime Minister said, instead, that the matter might be mentioned in the Speech from the Throne on Thursday. Well, it was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne last year and the year before. I am not encouraged by these references and these promises. The fact of the matter is that nothing is being done.

Another thing I found amusing was the way in which the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance and the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) have stood up the principle of universality. My hon. friend from Surrey, who is a realist, tried to deal with the situation we find today, a hodge-podge of old age security arrangements, in an effort to get something done to help the old people now. The two hon. members who spoke after he sat down did not like that proposal because it would interfere with the pure principle of universality to which they say we were all committed back in 1952.

Mr. Speaker, I could take that line of argument a lot easier if I did not feel the hypocrisy behind it. It is the very government sitting over there which violated that principle by introducing the guaranteed income supplement and telling us we must move from universality to selectivity. Which way does my hon. friend the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance want it? He wants universality when my hon. friend from Surrey tries to do a little patch work, but when we ask for universality we are told that we have to go for selectivity. The net result is that nothing gets done. We have not seen the Willard Report. We have not seen the white paper within the time it was promised we would receive it. All we are given now is the chance to look at the Speech from the Throne on Thursday morning. We will see what we get on Thursday, but I am afraid I have been around here long enough to know that if the election is to be in 1972 there is not going to be very much in a Speech from the Throne in 1970.

• (5:50 p.m.)

This situation, Mr. Speaker, is a serious one. It is said that we are in the affluent age. All sorts of people are getting increases in wages, salaries, pensions and so on. We have done some of that around this place. We did it for the retired civil servants, retired members of the RCMP and retired armed forces personnel. Today a report by the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications was tabled. This is a good report. Indeed, it recommends that the same thing be done for retired employees of Canadian National Railways and calls upon other companies, both public and private, to follow suit. There are 800,000 old age pensioners in Canada today, senior citizens who have made their contribution to the life of this nation, who are so poor and so hard up that they qualify for the guaranteed income supplement. Indeed, there are 400,000 of them who qualify for the full amount, which really means they have virtually nothing at all. If this Parliament and the members in it care for our older people and have any heart at all, it is time to do something about them instead of just nitpicking at this resolution. What our pensioners need is an increase in their pensions to $150 a month, and they need it now.

I commend my hon. friend for bringing this subject before Parliament today and I regret there have not been any positive statements by the spokesmen for the Liberal party and the Conservative party.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gaston Isabelle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) reminds me somewhat of a woman who knows she is going to give birth in a few months. If she gets over anxious, it may happen, under certain circumstances, and it often does, that she will have her child permaturely, with the many difficulties, medical and hospital expenses, that follow.

According to him, it is most urgent to table that famous white paper on social security promised some time ago. If he can wait a few more days, he will be greatly pleased. I know that he has already introduced a motion simi-

lar to that brought in by the member for Surrey (Mr. Mather) this afternoon, asking that old age pension benefits be increased and amended.

I know that today the aged, people over 65, have perhaps been forgotten, as they are want to remind us. This is so true that efforts are made to force them to retire before they are 60. In my opinion, increasing the old age pensions is not enough, nor is granting tax relief at a certain income level. I do not think that the problem will be solved by granting them a supplement when the cost of living goes up. This is only a poultice. The wound is deeper. Our senior citizens deserve more from the government than what they have been getting until now.

These are nothing but stop gap measures. In this country a most important science has been forgotten which is gerontology, the science of old age. The National Research Council is not granting any subsidy to our scientists so as to enable them to find some way of slowing down aging, so that our old people could remain productive in Canada.

This is so true in Canada that people 65 and over made up 8.6 per cent of the population in 1960. Within 10 years this percentage will be 10 to 12 per cent. What are we going to do with these people who are still strong, who can easily be retained, who are able to work and produce? In fact, if these elderly people who can still do some work in Canada are removed from the labour market, Canadian productivity is automatically reduced. And if productivity is reduced, another segment of the population will have to work more in order to provide equal wages or pensions to all.

Today the average life expectancy is 72 years and I am sure that 10 years from now, thanks to medical science, it shall reach 76 or 77 years. These people will enjoy perfect health and will be of use to society.

I think that the whole social security program must be reviewed and if after hearing every request and every grievance the government tried to produce a document based on facts and new data of a modern society, so that we may consider together what exactly must be done, it is because it wished for a solution to the problem of the elderly citizens of our country.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I am sorry to interrupt the Parliamentary Secretary. The hour appointed for the consideration of private members' business having expired, I do now leave the chair, to resume the same at eight o'clock p.m.

[Mr. Isabelle.]

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

SHIPPING CONFERENCES EXEMPTION ACT

EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN PRACTICES FROM PROVISIONS OF COMBINES INVESTIGATION ACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-184, to exempt certain shipping conference practices from the provisions of the Combines Investigations Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, and motion No. 2 (Mr. Horner).

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, when the House went into private members' hour at five o'clock we were left with two cliff-hangers in this debate. The first related to how some 40 conferences could decide on identical rates between Canadian ports on the east coast to British ports and, second—and this is the cliff-hanger of particular interest to me and my area—why the rates from Halifax or Saint John to the United Kingdom should be the same as rates from points on the St. Lawrence east of Montreal, when we seem to have a 300-nautical mile geographic advantage.

I related that attempts had been made, without success, to find out why this should be so when it flies in the face of all reason. I quoted evidence given by the former director of the Port of Halifax Commission. I turn now to remarks made by Mr. Craig S. Dickson, executive manager of the Atlantic Provinces Transportation Commission. He wrote the chairman of the Transport Committee on May 8 and I quote him in part as follows:

> With reference to the proposed legislation set out in Bill C-184, this commission is in general agreement. It does wish, however, to draw to the committee's attention that there is one facet of the ocean shipping conference practices which works against the Maritime ports and exporters and importers of Atlantic Canada. This practice is the assessment of the same ocean rates to or from the

Maritime ports of Halifax, N.S., and Saint John, N.B., as from the inland ports of the St. Lawrence River, Montreal, P.Q., and east thereof. Despite the Maritime ports being geographically closer to most foreign countries than the St. Lawrence ports are, the rates of the ocean shipping conferences give no recognition of this fact.

Subsequently he stated:

The incongruity of this situation is emphasized when by section 16 of the National Transportation Act carriers subject to that act are required not to create through their actions prejudice to the public interest which goes "beyond any disadvantage that may be deemed to be inherent in . . . location". At the same time Bill C-184 regularizes the practices of the shipping conferences including their practice of not recognizing the advantage inherent in the location of Maritime exporters and importers using Maritime ports.

On behalf of Maritime exporters and importers, this commission urges the members of this Standing Committee on Transport and Communications to take whatever steps are open to them individually and collectively to persuade the ocean shipping conferences to recognize the geographic advantage of Maritime ports in their ocean rates to and from these ports.

Such a step would be of material assistance to Maritime exporters in improving their export marketing position to the benefit not only of the Atlantic region but to Canada as a whole. Furthermore, the recommendations made herein do not require the expenditure of federal funds. In fact, by encouraging Maritime manufacturers to increase their participation in export markets through lower ocean rates from Maritime ports, there could be a lesser demand for expenditures under existing transportation programs in Atlantic Canada.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, he is not asking that any money be spent on the problem; he is just asking that a little common sense be exercised in dealing with the problem. As we get nowhere in unravelling this crazy mystery, may I quote a witness from the shipping conferences who appeared before the committee. He is W. J. McLaughlin, chairman of the Canada-United Kingdom Freight Conference. He told the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner):

We admit that the price is uniform and that we agree to the price. We do not deny that.

That statement is taken from the *Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence* of the committee No. 26, and he is referring to the uniformity of the rates as between St. Lawrence ports and Atlantic ports. The hon. member for Crowfoot asked:

In other words, you are saying that if one of your conference members lowered the rate to Halifax he would be breaking the conference rule after the—

Mr. McLaughlin answered:

Basically when a company joins the conference it joins with the full knowledge that it joins a rate-making group for this purpose because there is a wide segment of importers and exporters that demand and require the stability of rates. They prefer this stability of rates.

The hon. member for Crowfoot then said:

You fellows may get the idea that I am against you. I am not. I just admire the way you look after yourselves, because you are certainly not looking after the customers, nor is this bill.

I think my friend the hon. member for Crowfoot summed it up in a nutshell when he said those words. The bill ratifies and applies practices which surely are not in the interest of the Canadian user of shipping services. The other morning I had the horrendous experience of going to a freight handlers' hall in Halifax and seeing that 183 men out of 300 who had shown up for work that morning were disappointed because there was none.

For these reasons I support the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Crowfoot and I reject the philosophy of this bill. Perhaps the only thing that commends the bill to me is that its provisions are for three years and at the end of that period the shipping conferences will have to come here again. I hope at that time they will be able to say why this ridiculous practice is carried on. I hope they will then be able to answer the question that was asked several times that particular day and to which no reply was given.

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): Mr. Speaker, although the minister may not agree with me, I wish this bill had been considered even more extensively in the committee, because like all other pieces of legislation that we deal with in a brief amendment way, it brings in a lot of worms. One of the matters covered by this bill has been dealt with very well by the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave) and I will not go into it again. The hon. member pointed out the objection that the people of Halifax and Saint John have to equality of rates with Montreal vis-à-vis European ports, and that for some mysterious reason this fact has not been explained. For many years the shipping conferences have set rates which are the same, even though from Halifax and Saint John a much shorter ocean haul is involved. We hope that in some way our words will be noted by those in the shipping conferences and that rectification will be made.

• (8:10 p.m.)

I also agree with the remarks made by the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) in a general way concerning this piece of legisla-

tion, and I support his amendment. I cannot make up my mind which would be the better body to which to refer problems of this nature. I do not know whether it would be better to send them to Mr. Henry of the Combines Investigation Branch, or Mr. Pickersgill of the Canadian Transport Commission. I think it is a case of the lesser of two evils.

Personally, I believe the Canadian Transport Commission should be the better qualified body to deal with an examination of the rates which might come under the purview of this bill. I believe that commission has the means with which to deal quickly with a problem and should be able to provide a hearing for injured parties. However, we all know the Canadian Transport Commission and Mr. Pickersgill. I shall leave that point without further comment.

This debate gives me an opportunity to plug once again for greater attention by members of this House to the question of a new marine policy for Canada. I hope the minister and his counterpart, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin), will bring forward at this session legislation that will be of benefit to those like myself who for many years have promoted the idea of a merchant marine for Canada. I do not wish to become involved in detail in this conference question, for the benefit of those who do not understand it, because it is very complicated as has been said.

In order to land its products cheaply in competition with other countries, Canada is dependant upon exporting at cheap ocean freight rates. For example, we must have cheap ocean freight rates to Europe. We do not get the cheap rates that we should, and yet we are involved in a conference which sets rates. In this conference we do not have anybody in power. The way to obtain bargaining power at these conference tables is to have our own ships so that we can back up our talk.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bell: I shall not go into the great statements that have been made by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) and the new Minister of National Defence (Mr. Macdonald) about how necessary it is to have a presence in the north in order to exert our sovereignty. I simply leave the House with the thought that there is only one way to establish our presence in the north, and that is to have our own ships and send our men up there. There is no other way.

[Mr. Bell.]

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, I should like to add a few comments to the discussion of this amendment to Bill C-184. I shall be very brief because I believe the minister wishes to make a few comments. Perhaps he wishes to close out the debate on the amendment. I really cannot see what a man with the perception and political skill of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson), with his political roots in the east, and having such competence would find objectionable in the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner). I will sit down right now if the minister is prepared to stand in his place and say he is prepared to accept the amendment.

Without going into the whole complicated area of shipping conference arrangements and practices as reviewed, diagnosed and defined in the Restrictive Trade Practices report which has already been referred to and tabled, I say very briefly there is no doubt that this is a cartel and that the Shipping Act is proposed to exempt certain of these companies from the Combines Investigation Act. Because cheap transportation is necessary to get Canadian goods to the world markets, I suppose this in part is a move ahead.

The point, however, is that in the east people often hear politicians especially say that the Atlantic and Nova Scotia form the wharf of the Atlantic and that we are in the middle of the deep blue because we are so close to European markets and the markets of Africa and other places. Yet in reality, because of the practices of these shipping conference companies there is no more advantage in being in Halifax than there is in being in Montreal, with all respect to Montreal. So we in the east feel somewhat aggrieved in that internally we have discrimination in respect of distance and externally, when we endeavour to sell our products in markets across the world, we do not have the advantage to which our geography has made us captive.

It is for that reason I cannot understand why the Minister of Transport, be he from any area, let alone one who has roots in the east, would be against an amendment that really does not go too far but, hopefully, would provide a little relief for those who would be greatly affected by the monopolistic and/or discriminatory rates which might be set up. I do not think there is any doubt about what this shipping conference does. I do not intend to read all of it, because the minister must have read part of it, but I want to repeat what the director said. I am refer-

ring to page 3 of the document headed "Shipping Conference Arrangements and Practices." He said, with no qualification, that these companies are parties to a combination in relation to commodities which may be the subject of trade or commerce and—leaving out certain things—that these combinations prevent and lessen competition.

Further on in the paragraph he says that these companies have conspired, combined, agreed or arranged to prevent or lessen unduly competition in the ocean transportation of those articles. The minister himself would be the first to agree that one of the objects, if not the main object, obviously is to set a rate and that one of the adverse effects of an agreement to set a rate is to lessen competition, so that we do not have the free flow on the market by which to define what it is right to have in a given circumstance.

As one who comes from the east I support this amendment which at least would start to shed some light and would, hopefully, make those who conspire to reduce or eliminate competition come before a government somewhere or the Canadian Transport Commission and explain their move. All that is necessary is to read—as the minister and other persons in his department have done—the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission's study of this problem. It reviews the practices in other countries. I shall not take the time of the House to review them tonight. However, the United States and Japan, two very large countries which have a large international trade, have taken government action to see that an international cartel or combination of cartels must file their agreements. In effect, they must substantiate them and if there is any discrimination there is a forum to which the natives of the country can apply for redress. As I understand it, the amendment of the hon. member for Crowfoot does not even begin to go that far, but at least it throws some light on this type of agreement and we would not have what seems to be the fundamental paradox as we struggle into the second half of the twentieth century, of the east having all the disadvantage of distance in our internal trade and having no geographical advantage in our external trade. This is a situation that I find very difficult to accept.

• (8:20 p.m.)

I will close on this note. Agriculture was the subject of a little commotion in the House this afternoon, and quite rightly so because it was caused by a most important matter concerning Bill C-197, with which this House will deal and which came into question this afternoon. I am referring to the feed freight policy. Some members of the cabinet do not believe there should be any such thing as a feed freight policy to haul feed grain across the country so that viable sections of Canada can develop our agricultural products. Fortunately that problem was diverted. We did not have to make a decision in the House last year on the matter, but there is a time limit on this problem which affects our internal trade. Here we are dealing with our external trade, and the east seems to be getting a raw deal. I hope the minister can explain the paradox that we have all the disadvantages, because of our position, in internal trade and none of the advantages that being the wharf of the Atlantic should give us.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I did not anticipate that at this stage of the bill we would be in fact re-covering, as it were, many of the issues that were not only debated at length when the bill was first introduced but were dealt with at considerable length at the committee stage. I am not suggesting there is anything improper about the procedure and the discussion that has taken place tonight, but the fact is that we have been over this ground many times.

I do not want to take the time of the House to comment in detail on the references made by the last two speakers with regard to the apparent disparity that it is alleged exists between Halifax and Saint John, on the one hand, and the port of Montreal, for example, on the other. I can only say that I am somewhat surprised that someone representing the Montreal region has not seen fit to comment on this question. I am delighted to hear it, because the gentle weight of the criticism that has been aimed in my direction recently is that I have altogether favoured the east coast ports as opposed to Montreal. One has only to look at the wide range of comments coming these days from the shipping community and related interests in Montreal to appreciate that their point of view is not shared entirely by the three distinguished representatives from the Maritime provinces who have spoken tonight.

I do not believe it is possible to relate all the problems that are involved, in terms of the setting of rates, to the one issue that is before the House at the present time. The fact is that many of us, myself included, find it exceedingly difficult to understand fully how all forms of transportation arrive at the rate

structures that they have. The examples that have been provided by hon. members from the Atlantic provinces have, of course, been repeated on earlier occasions by the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) in a different context when dealing with freight rates to the Prairie provinces, which do not indeed involve foreign shipping but are confined entirely to Canadian modes of transportation. At the same time they find that the rates, for example between Toronto, Montreal and Regina or Edmonton, are higher than if the same quantity and the same type of goods are shipped to Vancouver. These appear to the laymen to be obvious inconsistencies in the rate formulae which have been established by the various modes of transportation.

I can only say to the House that despite innumerable explorations by committees of the House and various other bodies, and despite a wide variety of royal commissions and studies of one nature or another, they have invariably come back to supporting the various forms of transportation in their rate-setting formulae. I think the National Transportation Act of 1967 made it clear that the competitive factors were to dominate, in terms of the establishment of various rates throughout Canada. Of course, if we are to remove some of what I regard as the inequities in some of the present rate structures, it appears that we will have to use mechanisms other than the National Transportation Act to do it.

However, may I point out with your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, that this is an aside and it is not germane to the matter now before the House. I mention it because, naturally, I share the questioning of members opposite as to why there is this differential in rates. But I do say—and I think they would be prepared to agree—that in recent times we have done a great deal to enhance what the hon. member for Annapolis Valley (Mr. Nowlan) has called the wharf of the Atlantic. I may say that it is now a much better wharf than it was even a few years ago, if one looks at the port of Halifax. Here I think we have to do a little horn-blowing, not as members of the government but indeed as a Parliament and as people from the area, and we have to admit that many tens of millions of dollars are being expended in the Atlantic provinces by the National Harbours Board and other agencies, including, for example, the province of Nova Scotia and Canadian National Railways. In Saint John, New Brunswick, a similar kind of expenditure is being undertaken.

[Mr. Jamieson.]

So I repeat that we do have this inconsistency, which is a perfectly natural one when one considers the areas from which various members of this House come. For my part I am pleased to have had this endorsement, or indeed even criticism from Atlantic Canada, because I can now use it in rebuttal against those in other parts of the country who, quite contrary to what has been said this afternoon or this evening, have maintained that we are ignoring upper Canada in favour of what is undoubtedly the best part of the country. So much for that point.

I want to speak for a moment directly on the amendment of the hon. member for Crowfoot because I understand his position and I am not entirely in disagreement with the principles he is seeking to establish. But I suggest to him that there is a complication, and I think the hon. member will understand why it is not possible to support his amendment. He himself gave one reason for it, and at the same time indicated a certain inconsistency on the part of those who oppose sections of this bill, when he indicated this afternoon that the amendment moved by the hon. member for Regina Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin) was in fact at odds with the one being proposed by the hon. member for Crowfoot, for a very simple reason.

The quandary I face is demonstrated obviously by both these gentlemen. One says, "Let the CTC have absolutely nothing to do with this." He says, "We want to take it out of their hands completely. On the other hand, the hon. member for Crowfoot says, "We will not only keep the CTC in the picture but we want to enhance their responsibility far more than even the government is prepared to do." It is clear that we cannot meet both points of view, and in fact the truth of the matter is that neither point of view is on all fours with the basic objectives of this bill. The hon. member for Crowfoot has made clear what he wishes to have done. His amendment reads:

> For the purposes of this act, a tariff, patronage contract, arrangement, agreement or contract shall not be valid unless and until approved by an order of the commission as just and reasonable and in the public interest—

Here I would like to draw his attention to the following words:

> —as defined in section 16 of the National Transportation Act—

The definition of "public interest" in section 16 (1) (b) of the National Transportation Act reads as follows:

> the expression "public interest" includes, without limiting the generality thereof, the public interest as described in section 1.

If I can now take hon. members through the bill still further, section 1 of the National Transportation Act is a declaration of the national transportation policy, and that policy rejects, within limits, rate approval as a means of regulation. Therefore, the effect of the proposed amendment would be to reverse this aspect of the national transportation policy and so, in effect, frustrate the law. From long experience I have known that the last thing my hon. friend from Crowfoot would wish to do would be to frustrate the law, even in a small way.

• (8:30 p.m.)

Bill C-184 deals with shipping conferences which, as I would like to call to the attention of hon. members, serve Canada's overseas foreign trade. Obviously, in every instance where it is foreign trade of which we are speaking there is at least one other country involved. A statute which, in these circumstances, requires a formal finding of public interest in the various matters cited in the proposed amendment could, because of opposing views at the other end of the route, over which we do not have control, result in grave and unnecessary international difficulties and become an impediment to trade.

I would point out that even the hon. member for Halifax, who made some very sound observations, in the quotations he put forward indicated that some of the chief spokesmen for Maritime Canada had shown they were in agreement with the basic objectives of the bill. I suggest that anyone who has experience with shipping will recognize it is quite impossible, when dealing internationally, to have unilateral power in the hands of an organization such as the CTC, or even the restrictive trade practices agency, to deal with such a matter in the way proposed by the amendment. The proposed amendment would require formal approval by the commission of a very considerable volume of material. I doubt, Mr. Speaker, if hon. members will consider with favour a proposal to create a bureaucracy of major proportions whose time would largely be taken up by disputes and litigation with foreign shipping companies supported by their own national governments, and all to no discernible Canadian purpose.

These matters were thought through very carefully. As I have said from the very first moment I made reference to this measure in the House, I do what I am doing here with a measure of reluctance because this is not the kind of measure that is totally protective of the Canadian interest, or of any other kind of interest.

Mr. Horner: You've said a mouthful!

Mr. Jamieson: We have never denied that for a moment. We have simply conceded the reality of a shipping conference. Hon. members were quite accurate in the quotes which they gave from page 3 of the report on shipping conference practices. But going to page 100 I would like to quote these words of the same commissioner, who said:

> The commission considers therefore that the lines in the Canada-U.K. trades should be allowed to continue such arrangements as are necessary for the efficient handling of Canada's exports and imports, subject to appropriate safeguards for the public interest.

We have put in appropriate safeguards to the degree that it is possible for us to do so. This afternoon the Leader of the New Democratic Party asked me whether there was any requirement for action on the part of the CTC when these various matters were filed with them. I ask him now to recall that I was speaking from memory when I replied. Subsequently I checked into this matter, Mr. Speaker, and I have discovered that in the first instance all such tariffs are available for public scrutiny to anybody who wishes to see them. I also find that there is a responsibility placed on the Minister of Transport himself to report annually on these matters. I could go on to indicate various other ways in which action can be initiated in the event that there is any obvious breach of the intentions of this legislation. From the research I have done since the House rose at six o'clock, I personally am satisfied that the necessary safeguards are in the legislation.

I would also point out, as I indicated previously, that the whole structure of these proposals is designed to ensure that at no time can there be more than a 15 per cent differential between the rates charged by those who are prepared to join up or, in a sense, become captive to a shipping conference and the rates charged by those who choose to go the route of independence. On all these grounds I believe this explanation covers the points made by the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for this information, but is there any person in the government, the minister, the chairman of the CTC, or any other official who has the direct responsibility of asking for an investigation by the Restrictive Trade Practices

Commission where there is at least the appearance of collusion by the shipping companies?

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Speaker, I believe I can answer the hon. gentleman in this way. In the first instance, as I have said, the figures and documents filed with the CTC are a matter of public record. From that point on the CTC, in the normal procedure, would advise the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission. But in any event, this bill does not remove from the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission the major sanctions which are still lying with them. The CTC regulates the filing requirements and may institute prosecutions for breaches of those requirements. They can do that. Then we have the restrictive Trade Practices branch which also is capable of taking action under this new legislation.

At the risk of redundancy, Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier I believe we have protected the public interest to the maximum extent possible. With other Atlantic region members, I do not believe this is by any means a solution to inequalities or differentials in rate structures. This is a matter which is constantly under review and I would be more than pleased at any time to accommodate hon. members in getting more information from both railways and shipping companies as to how rate structures are implemented. I suggest the best time to do that is when these various bodies appear before the appropriate committees of the House.

Mr. Horner: Mr. Speaker, the minister left the impression that there would be only a 15 per cent differential between the rate charged by a shipping company enjoying the patronage of a contract with the shipping conference and the rate charged to a shipper attempting to ship outside the conference. Would there still be only a 15 per cent differential between that rate and the rate charged by a tramp ship?

Mr. Jamieson: I would have to get more specific information on that point. It is not the hon. member's fault that he has not stated his question in a proper way; I am afraid it is the fault of my lack of comprehension. But section 3(b)(ii) states that the premium that may be charged to a shipper who elects not to bind himself to a conference is limited to 15 per cent of the rate applicable to the shipper who does so bind himself.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, may I direct another question to the minister?

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

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member may direct another question if the minister is prepared to reply.

Mr. Benjamin: Is it not correct that for the purposes of this legislation the Canadian Transport Commission has no authority whatsoever except for penalties with respect to failure to file documents, and that for the purposes of this legislation, under the Combines Investigation Act only the Restrictive Trade Practices branch has authority, and the CTC has none?

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Speaker, I think that once again we are reopening the debate. All I can do is repeat what I said earlier this evening. The major sanctions lie with the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission, but it is the CTC that regulates the filing requirements. It determines what the filing requirements are to be and may institute prosecutions for breaches of those requirements. It is true that this is only in the case of a breach of the filing requirements, but I repeat it is the commission which may direct any conference, or take action against any conference, so that the power of the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission is not reduced or obliterated by this legislation. What is provided for here is exactly what the hon. member is proposing in his amendment, except that he says the documents should be filed in the same place. It is our view that since the CTC must deal with both domestic traffic and overseas traffic in terms of their relationship one to the other, the intermodality of the traffic and various other matters of this kind, it is useful to have the CTC play this particular role as laid down in the legislation. If I am not sitting down now, Mr. Speaker, I hereby serve notice that I am about to sit down.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, while it is correct to say that Peace River does not now constitute a port served by shipping lines, such as it might have been had it not been for conspiratorial collusion between the province of British Columbia and a former federal Liberal government, so that it is now very difficult to find enough water there to float any kind of a canoe, I wish to state that I have an interest in this legislation for other reasons.

• (8:40 p.m.)

The eloquence of the minister was effective to justify, probably, the need to introduce legislation of this kind. But at the same time, Mr. Speaker, the minister did not remove

from my mind the doubts which I have had since I first read the bill. There is a need for some safeguard to be left in the bill, a need which I think is fulfilled by the amendment now placed before the House by the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner). I hope to get some support from hon. members opposite, as I am sure does the hon. member for Crowfoot. He has no restrictions and I think he would accept support from anywhere, even from hon. members opposite.

Mr. Horner: Indeed I would.

Mr. Baldwin: He has a different approach from that of the hon. member for Fraser Valley East (Mr. Pringle), who at the committee stage said, as reported at page 26 of the proceedings of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications of Tuesday, May 12, 1970:

—I am quite sure that the act would not be presented to Parliament if there was not deemed to be a real need—

Mr. Speaker, what simple and childlike faith it takes for an hon. member to make this assertion that he is sure the government would not present it if there was not a great need for it! I think this is the simplistic and easy way in which to approach the legislation. I would be as well justified in taking the opposite view, that when this government presents legislation I am automatically suspicious of it, though in the last few sessions they have passed a few bills which justify the time of the House. I hope we will get some support for this very sensible amendment which, as the hon. member for Crowfoot and other of my colleagues point out, provides some real safeguards and securities against the exemption of shipping lines and conferences from the provisions of the restrictive trade practices legislation.

I am sure hon. members of the government party who were at London recently and able to participate in that heady and exhilarating independence which permitted them to pass certain resolutions there—even some of the former Parliamentary Secretaries whose assessment of the leadership of the party is a lot less today than it was when the session ended on June 26—might see fit to give consideration to this amendment. The minister poured scorn on the amendment and the parliamentary motives of the hon. member for Crowfoot when he said that it is an attempt to frustrate the law. Mr. Speaker, this is what we are here for. When we see bad law, we are here to frustrate it and to try to secure change and amendment. If in doing so we bring to the words "public interest" a new concept, a concept which is sensible and desirable, then the hon. member for Crowfoot and those of us who support the amendment are engaged in operating in the public interest. The amendment is a safeguard against the complete removal of the shipping lines from the operations of the combines investigation legislation and regulations.

The minister has made a pretty good case for saying that prima facie it is perfectly logical to suggest that at first blush we do remove the shipping lines and shipping conferences from the operation of the act. I will go along with that, but only if I know that in the legislation there is some provision to protect the retention of the principles, if necessary, of the combines legislation. But this does not appear to be the case, and the hon. member for Crowfoot seeks to make it available through this new section 8. What have we got without it? True enough, Mr. Speaker, under the combines legislation the director is brought in and authorized under certain circumstances and required under other circumstances, to make an inquiry. Such inquiry will operate under section 8 of the Combines Investigation Act or under section 19.

I am not going to burden this House with the details of those two sections, but a simple examination indicates that all that can be done is to make an inquiry. No effective action can flow from holding the inquiry, nor as a result of recommendations which may be made at the conclusion of the inquiry. The director can hold an inquiry and say, "This is not very nice and I do not like what the shipping lines are doing." He can make his report which will appear in due course, maybe six months, a year or a year and a half later. It appears in the annual report and may be read by members of this House and the public. But that is as far as it can go. Nothing can be done. It may well be, under conditions which may exist two, three or four years from now that a situation may arise wherein it would be apparent to hon. members of this House and the public that one shipping line, having filed its rates pursuant to the terms of this legislation, was engaged in practices not in the public interest of the people of Canada. What could we do about it? Without the provisions of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Crowfoot we could do nothing. This is basically why the amendment must be supported.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baldwin: There is no question about it. It is all very well for the minister and others to say that in three years from now we can look at this legislation again. This is not the case at all, Mr. Speaker. All that happens is that the act expires three years from the date it comes into force or at such later date as, before the end of that period, may be fixed by proclamation. What happens to the proclamation? It is laid before Parliament—not for debate or discussion, but simply tabled, and there is nothing we can do about it. If in fact the legislation did expire at the end of three years, or if in fact the proclamation was to be tabled in this House and Parliament as a whole debated the proclamation and decided by a vote following suitable debate that it was proper for the act to be extended, I would not mind. But what is going to happen? Knowing this government and how it operates—and it is quite an operator—some time before the end of three years, very quietly and as secretly as possible a proclamation will be tabled and that will be the end of it.

Mr. Speaker, none of the virtues of which the hon. minister has made so much will be lost by this amendment, it does provide the safety valve that if it appears that the legislation is not operating in the public interest or to the best advantage of the people of Canada, there will be an opportunity for the commission to examine and make its recommendations accordingly. This is the safety feature which we must have.

• (8:50 p.m.)

Under these circumstances I earnestly ask hon. members on the government side, who I hope have come back determined to do their duty with a high sense of privilege and responsibility, to support all good measures. I hope members on both sides of the House will seize this opportunity to support the very useful amendment of the hon. member for Crowfoot.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt motion No. 1, moved by the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

[Mr. Baldwin.]

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The House divided on motion No. 1 (Mr. Benjamin) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alexander
Alkenbrack
Asselin
Baldwin
Barnett
Beaudoin
Bell
Benjamin
Burton
Cadieu
Comeau
Dionne
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Downey
Flemming
Fortin
Gilbert
Gleave
Godin
Hales
Harding
Horner
Howe
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Lambert (Bellechasse)
Lambert (Edmonton West)
La Salle
MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond)
MacInnis (Mrs.)
MacLean
Macquarrie
MacRae
McCleave
McCutcheon
McGrath
McIntosh
McKinley
McQuaid
Marshall
Mazankowski
Monteith
Moore
Nowlan
Nystrom
Paproski
Peddle
Peters
Ricard
Saltsman
Simpson
Skoberg
Southam
Stanfield
Stewart (Marquette)
Tétrault
Thomas (Moncton)—57.

NAYS

Messrs:

Anderson
Andras
Badanai
Barrett
Basford
Béchard
Beer
Blouin
Borrie
Boulanger
Breau
Brown
Buchanan
Caccia
Cafik
Chappell
Chrétien
Clermont
Cobbe
Comtois
Corbin
Côté (Longueuil)
Crossman
Cullen
Danson
Davis
Deachman
Deakon

De Bané
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Duquet
Forget
Francis
Gibson
Gillespie
Givens
Gray
Groos
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Hellyer
Hogarth
Hopkins
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)
Hymmen
Isabelle
Jamieson
Kaplan
Kierans
Lachance
Laing (Vancouver South)
Langlois
Laniel
Leblanc (Laurier)
LeBlanc (Rimouski)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Lind
Loiselle
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacEachen
Mackasey
McIlraith
McNulty
Mahoney
Marceau
Morison
Noël
O'Connell
Olson
Otto
Ouellet
Pelletier
Perrault
Portelance
Pringle
Prud'homme
Richard
Richardson
Roberts
Robinson
Rochon
Serré
Sharp
Smerchanski
Stanbury
St. Pierre
Sulatycky
Thomas (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Weatherhead
Whelan
Whiting—97.

• (9:20 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: The question is now on motion No. 2 (Mr. Horner). Is it the wish of the House to proceed with the division without ringing the bells?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The House divided on motion No. 2 (Mr. Horner) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alexander
Alkenbrack
Asselin
Baldwin
Barnett
Beaudoin
Bell
Benjamin
Burton
Cadieu
Comeau
Dionne
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Downey
Flemming
Fortin
Gilbert
Gleave
Godin
Hales
Harding
Horner
Howe
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Lambert (Bellechasse)
Lambert (Edmonton West)
La Salle
MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond)
MacInnis (Mrs.)
MacLean
Macquarrie
MacRae
McCleave
McCutcheon
McGrath
McIntosh
McKinley
McQuaid
Marshall
Mazankowski
Monteith
Moore
Nowlan
Nystrom
Paproski
Peddle
Peters
Ricard
Saltsman
Simpson
Skoberg
Southam
Stanfield
Stewart (Marquette)
Tétrault
Thomas (Moncton)—57.

NAYS

Messrs:

Anderson
Andras
Badanai
Barrett
Basford
Béchard
Beer
Blouin
Borrie
Boulanger
Breau
Brown
Buchanan
Caccia
Cafik
Chappell
Chrétien
Clermont
Cobbe
Comtois
Corbin
Côté (Longueuil)
Crossman
Cullen
Danson
Davis
Deachman
Deakon
De Bané
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Duquet
Forget
Francis
Gibson
Gillespie
Givens
Gray
Groos
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Hellyer
Hogarth
Hopkins
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)
Hymmen
Isabelle
Jamieson
Kaplan
Kierans
Lachance
Laing (Vancouver South)
Langlois
Laniel
Leblanc (Laurier)
LeBlanc (Rimouski)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Lind
Loiselle
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacEachen
Mackasey
McIlraith
McNulty
Mahoney
Marceau
Morison
Noël
O'Connell
Olson
Otto
Ouellet
Pelletier
Perrault
Portelance
Pringle
Prud'homme
Richard
Richardson
Roberts
Robinson
Rochon
Roy (Timmins)
Serré
Sharp
Smerchanski
Stanbury
St. Pierre
Sulatycky
Thomas (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Weatherhead
Whelan
Whiting—98.

Establishment of Canadian Corporation

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport) moved that Bill C-184, to exempt certain shipping conference practices from the provisions of the Combines Investigation Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: When shall the said bill be read a third time?

Mr. Baldwin: By leave, now.

Mr. Jamieson moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

An hon. Member: On division.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

HUDSON'S BAY COMPANY

ESTABLISHMENT AS CANADIAN CORPORATION

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs) moved that Bill S-25, respecting Hudson's Bay Company, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to rise and say a few words on this momentous occasion. We cannot think of the Hudson's Bay Company without thinking of the magnificent and momentous contribution of exploration and discovery, of development and consolidation, of expansion and growth that has characterized their record in this nation and made it at the same time the record of a nation. The very name Hudson's Bay Company rings a bell of history and progress through the centuries. It is a name that rings like a trumpet of history. Three hundred years in the north and west spans a period of development from the stone age to the space age.

• (9:30 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, one of the great men of the company and one of the great men of Canada, Henry Kelsey, has been honoured this year with a commemorative stamp. No stamp, no posthumous recognition can measure the grandeur of his accomplishments, his travel by winter and summer over the barren and inhospitable tundra, arriving in Edmonton in 1690. He walked all the way from York Fort to get here. Well, if he came in 1970 he might have to walk too, because Air Canada has not improved all that much. Kelsey was the first white man to shoot a musk-ox and the first to see a bison. What he thought of it, history does not say. Remember, that was 40 years before La Verendrye. Then, of course, there was Samuel Hearne and Anthony Henday, to mention only a few of the company's great travellers. Hearne believed there was valuable copper in the Arctic and it took until a couple of years ago to prove him right.

In the long role of the explorers and pathfinders who in the name of the Hudson's Bay Company or the North West Company—after the year 1821 they were amalgamated, and therefore I suppose it is all right to mention the Nor'Westers—roamed and voyaged by land and water in pursuit of the northwest passage, or the objectives of fur trade, there is one common denominator; they all believed in a great future for the north and west of this nation. I am happy that after 300 years the headquarters of the Hudson's Bay Company will be located in Canada. This is a vote of confidence in our destiny. That confidence, that mystic belief in the future of the north and west which inspired the giants of the company's history, is also characteristic of the right hon. gentleman from Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker). To him goes credit for the new discovery of the north which took place in the sixties and which now sees an unparalleled development of our northern resources.

As we work to deal with possible effects of pollution and to preserve our northern ecology, as we send teams and task forces to the Arctic regions, as we casually discuss the building of billion dollar pipeline projects, the right hon. gentleman sees the realization of his dream of the north which was the same dream held by Alexander Mackenzie, Simon Fraser, David Thompson, Henry Kelsey, Samuel Hearne and others whose names and fame are imprinted on the map of Canada imperishably for all time. If Henry Kelsey is to be immortalized on a stamp—if not already by his deeds—then I suggest in all seriousness that the conferring of a similar honour on the Right Hon. John G. Diefenbaker would not be inappropriate.

This company has done much in our time to place before Canadians a realization of the meaning and significance of the priceless asset the north represents, or that Canada's future lies northward. Today as we look back over 300 years we see to what extent Canada's largely forgotten past has been shaped and altered by the work of the servants of the Hudson's Bay Company. Today, once

again, Canada must look northward. Canada's destiny is northward bound. We must unlock the gates of northern opportunity, turn the eyes of Canada northward and say to young Canadians, "Form your snowmobile brigades and go north, young men".

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I cannot match the oratory of my friend the hon. member for Edmonton Centre (Mr. Paproski). I confess I do not feel inclined to try to do so when one realizes that not only has the Hudson's Bay Company played a part in developing this country but has done a fair amount of skinning of our people, both in the past and in the present. Having said that, however, I think I shall confine myself to recognizing that there is a certain historicity about what we are doing. We are in fact agreeing to the transfer of the head office of the company not only from England to Canada but from London to Winnipeg, and not only to Winnipeg but to the heart of Winnipeg North Centre. So I am very happy to indicate our support of this bill.

I suppose one reason we do not take off into flights of oratory is that we realize that merely to transfer the head office is not everything. There is the whole question of ownership and who makes the profit out of an organization such as this. Hon. members who have been following the news of the last weekend would not be surprised if I were to make a speech about the whole question of foreign ownership and the desirability of certain other head offices being transferred to Canada. It is not only a question of transferring head offices but of patriating the ownership of our own resources and economy. If this might be looked upon as a first halting feeble step in this direction, we welcome it. But there is a long way to go.

Mr. Speaker: If the minister speaks now, he will close the debate.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am sure Your Honour and all members of the House have been moved by the eloquence of the hon. member for Edmonton Centre (Mr. Paproski) in the historical narration he gave of the activities of the Hudson's Bay Company. I am sure we are appreciative of his eloquence on this occasion. I am sure, also, that the reference by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) to skinning had reference to the activities of the company as the largest fur trading company in the world.

For the sake of the record I simply wish to outline some of the corporate details of the bill in order to explain briefly what it is intended to do, simply because I will be moving at the appropriate time that there be unanimous consent to deal with the bill in Committee of the Whole this evening. Now that 95 per cent of the assets of the company and 98 per cent of its employees are located in Canada, the company on attaining its 300th birth date has expressed the wish to become a "Canadian company". This calls for a transfer of jurisdiction which is an unusual procedure and, as a matter of fact, we know of almost no precedent. Because the company operated under a royal charter granted some 300 years ago, it was necessary to devise a procedure to cover the present instance. The Privy Council of the United Kingdom, by supplementary letters patent issued on May 29, 1970, revoked all amendments to and all sections of the original charter of 300 years ago except the original incorporating section. These supplementary letters patent permit the company to continue under the authority of the government of Canada. On the same day last spring the Canadian Privy Council issued letters patent under the Great Seal of Canada under the original royal charter.

• (9:40 p.m.)

The effect of that procedure is to continue the English corporate entity into a Canadian one. In Canada our commercial corporations are being administered under a general act of parliament, the Canada Corporations Act. Opportunity was taken at that time in the spring to change the shares of the company from one English pound par value to no par value shares. A number of restrictions are imposed by the letters patent on the transfer of shares. These are provided for in the bill. This has reference to what the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre had to say. Not more than 25 per cent of the shares may be held by non-residents of Canada or the United Kingdom. For a five-year transitional period from May 29, 1970, not more than 10 per cent of the shares may be held by any one person or associated group of persons.

I should mention in passing, Mr. Speaker, that 10 per cent of the outstanding shares are presently held in Canada, 86 per cent in the United Kingdom and 4 per cent in other parts of the world. The purpose of introducing the bill before the House is to bring the company incorporated under special letters patent

granted by Canada under the Canada Corporations Act. As hon. members see, the bill is rather short because very few exemptions from the Canada Corporations Act have been requested by the company.

I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to move into Committee of the Whole and deal with the bill this evening, if it is the will of the House to do so. I thank hon. members for agreeing to deal with this somewhat technical corporate matter at this late day in this session, and I hope we can dispose of it this evening.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed that the motion for second reading be put and that the reference be to the Committee of the Whole, rather than to the Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Bell: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could call it ten o'clock. There has been some discussion on this. We do not plan to hold up the bill, but tomorrow one or two hon. members would like briefly to state their great exultation over this bill.

Mr. Speaker: Is there agreement on the part of hon. members to calling it ten o'clock?

Mr. Basford: I appreciate the spirit in which the hon. member put this suggestion forward, but I wonder whether the hon. members whom he mentioned would be agreeable to speaking on third reading tomorrow, so we could pass the committee stage this evening.

Mr. Speaker: Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Laniel in the chair.

The Deputy Chairman: House in Committee of the Whole on Bill S-25, an act respecting Hudson's Bay Company.

On clause 2—Company continued.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to speak on the bill but I am curious as to what special privileges this type of legislation gives to the Hudson's Bay Company that are not available to other companies. Obviously a company chartered in the early eighteenth century under Queen Victoria—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Charles II.

[Mr. Basford.]

Mr. Peters: I may be out by a hundred years, but a hundred years more or less in the past does not matter. Charles II would give many more concessions to such a company seeking a charter in this manner. I wonder what special concessions this bill gives the company. We are not really dealing with the concessions to which we are agreeing. All we are agreeing to in this bill is the legal paraphernalia of establishing a company with the same privileges as in a charter. We are changing the concessions given by Charles II at that time and continued by Queen Victoria by order of the Privy Council. We are now doing in Canada that which we do not normally do. I am wondering whether we are providing the company with all the old privileges they had as a free trading company almost in a land of their own, or are they bound by all the other considerations that are normally conceded by a company applying for letters patent as a Canadian corporation?

Mr. Basford: That is the reason we have the legislation before the House. The corporate entity was continued by the cancellation of the letters patent by the U.K. Privy Council, as I explained in my statement on second reading. Then the corporation as a corporate entity was continued by the special letters patent issued by the Canadian Privy Council on May 29 of this year. The purpose of this legislation is to ensure that no doubt is left as to what laws govern this corporate entity which is a somewhat unusual one. If the hon. member will refer to clause 2, line 20 he will see the words:

> —for the purpose of continuing the company as a body corporate and politic incorporated by royal charter and subject to the laws of Canada,

So that the corporate entity we are continuing here and providing for under the laws of Canada is subject to the laws of Canada. The only exemptions granted are those exemptions—I will refer to them in a minute—provided for in clauses 4 and 5, which relate to technical matters exempting them from certain sections of the Canada Corporations Act. The purpose of this bill is to continue the company subject to the laws of Canada, as stated in clause 2.

Mr. Peters: I thank the minister for his explanation. I realize that this is a legislative process to enforce a Privy Council order which continued the order of the Privy Council of Great Britain which was similar. When we incorporate a company by legislation we normally ask for certain considerations from

the company. In fact, most of the ones with which I have been familiar over the years have been under the Companies Act. A great many concessions were made which normally would not be made today. I ask whether those concessions are still considered. For instance, when the Queen came to Canada not long ago there was a certain price for the charter, and many concessions have been given every time royalty has come to Canada. Are we still maintaining those kinds of concessions?

Mr. Basford: No, Mr. Chairman. The charter granted by the letters patent passed by the United Kingdom this spring provided that the affairs of the company be regulated in the future and such provision in that regard as may be made by the Queen through the Governor General of Canada by and with the advice of the Privy Council of Canada. So we provided in the letters patent—which I have here if hon. members want to look at them—for the continuation of the company. This bill provides for the kind of exemptions it has, and they are spelled out in the bill. They refer to very technical corporate matters in clauses 4 and 5 of the bill.

• (9:50 p.m.)

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Chairman, in his opening remarks the minister said that 95 per cent of the assets were in Canada and that 98 per cent of the employees of the company worked in Canada. Could he give us a breakdown of the ownership of the company? Is it 100 per cent owned by English people, and does he intend to bring forth any provisions with regard to limiting this ownership, giving Canadians 51 per cent control so that we might be able to control our destiny in this respect? Further, is he contemplating that 100 per cent of the profits will remain in Canada so that we may improve our growth?

Mr. Basford: Mr. Chairman, so far as ownership is concerned, in my speech on second reading I mentioned that 10 per cent of the outstanding shares are presently held in Canada, 86 per cent are held in the United Kingdom and 4 per cent in other parts of the world. There is also provision under the letters patent that not more than 25 per cent of the shares may be held by non-residents of Canada and of the United Kingdom and, further, that for a five-year transitional period from May 29 of this year not more than 10 per cent of the shares may be held by one person or any associated group of persons.

Those are exemptions provided for in clause 5(2), which has reference to section 38 of the Canada Corporations Act, which section of course provides that the shares of a public company shall be freely transferrable. The special provision that no more than 25 per cent of the shares can be held by non-residents, and for the transitional period no person or group can hold more than 10 per cent, is provided in clause 5(2).

Mr. Alexander: Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the minister said that he has the charter issued by the federal government, in order to assist the hon. member for Timiskaming would the minister be prepared to table the charter so that all of us can be apprised of this very significant and important document and its contents?

Mr. Basford: Mr. Chairman, I do not think I can table it while we are in committee. I will be happy to do so when the Speaker returns to the chair.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. The minister cannot table the document while we are in committee. This can be done afterwards, when Mr. Speaker is in the Chair.

Mr. Alexander: I would like to have the assurance of the minister that he will proceed in the manner just stated.

Mr. Basford: The hon. member has that assurance.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, given the complex status of the Hudson's Bay Company, could the minister briefly specify the nature of that status? In other words, does the government feel that it is a proprietary corporation, an agency corporation or a mixed corporation?

[*English*]

Mr. Basford: Mr. Chairman, ministers are not supposed to give legal opinions. However, the view is that after passage of this bill it will be a corporate entity incorporated by letters patent of the Canadian Privy Council, subject to all the provisions of the Canada Corporations Act subject only to the exemptions provided for in clauses 4 and 5 of the bill, which are technical, corporate matters of no great importance. It would be a Canadian company incorporated in Canada under letters patent granted by Her Majesty in right of Canada, subject to the provisions of the Canada Corporations Act.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Chairman, since it is important for the members of this House to know

what is the status of that company, I wonder if the minister could not ask his legal advisers to state, for the information of the members, whether it is a proprietary corporation, an agency corporation or still a mixed corporation.

[*English*]

Mr. Basford: I am not sure I understood the question. I have just explained the status of the company which is provided for in clause 2 of the bill. Through the translation I got the impression that the question was whether it a joint stock company. That is a term not often used any more. It is a limited company with share capital of no par value. This is a public company incorporated by letters patent issued by Canada in the name of Canada, and subject to the Canada Corporations Act.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Chairman, some of my colleagues seem to object to my asking questions, but it seems to me this is a company that has played a vital role in a large part of Canada, even though I would not endorse all the nice remarks that have been made about it. I know that many people are concerned about the privileges which the company had, stemming from the original charter which gave the company half of Canada. It still seems to exercise leasehold rights over a very large area in the Hudson Bay region both in Quebec and in Ontario and operates stores in a very free-wheeling manner, a manner that would be subjected to restrictions if it were established as a normal company.

We are now giving it an exemption from the normal status of a Canadian company by endorsing the Privy Council order from the United Kingdom, and then an order subsequently passed by our Parliament that seems to retain the company's status quo, which was a very definite status quo in the first place. A company factor has the right to marry people, to bury them, and to take up land for various reasons throughout our northern region. I can see how historically we arrived at this situation. If this were a normal incorporation, we might want to see some changes made. That is why I ask whether this bill carries on all those privileges and, if so, are we perpetuating them through passage of the bill?

Mr. Basford: Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill is simply to continue a corporate body. Whether the company is operating under a licence or lease, or something somewhere, is a matter for determination. The sole purpose of this bill is to continue the legal entity and to make sure that it is subject to the laws of Canada, a proposition about which there might have been some doubt—

The Deputy Chairman: Order. It being ten o'clock, shall I rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again at the next sitting of the house?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Progress reported.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, when the House was in committee I undertook, when Your Honour returned to the Chair, to table a document. I would now like to table the document, being a copy of the letters patent granted to the company which is the subject matter of the bill before the committee.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I wish to confirm the business for tomorrow. The first item will be as indicated, a motion for concurrence in the Senate amendments to Bill C-4, to be followed by the continuation and completion, I would hope, of the bill now in Committee of the Whole, to be followed by the report stage of the bill respecting the Canada Grains Act.

Mr. Horner: You won't get her, boy.

At ten o'clock the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, October 6, 1970

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

AGRICULTURE

Fifth report of Standing Committee on Agriculture—Mr. Beer.

[*Editor's Note: For text of above report, see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

[*Translation*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

TABLING OF ORDER IN COUNCIL APPOINTING PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table, in both official languages, the order in council concerning the appointment of parliamentary secretaries, a matter I mentioned yesterday in the House.

[*English*]

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ABDUCTION OF SENIOR BRITISH TRADE COMMISSIONER—POLICE ACTIVITY

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister whether he has anything further to report in connection with the kidnapping of Mr. Cross in Montreal yesterday. I ask him the question because I assume that he is giving the matter his closest personal attention and is in close contact with the authorities in the province of Quebec. Is there anything further that the Prime Minister can report to the House at this time in connection with this terrible incident?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the assumptions of the Leader of the Opposition are correct. There have been close contacts between the governments. I have spoken to the Premier of the province, and there have been several discussions between the Solicitor General and his opposite number in the Quebec government. I am giving the matter my closest attention and, indeed, other ministers are too. At this point I cannot usefully add any other comment.

Mr. Stanfield: Is it true, as reported in the press, that police activity in seeking the kidnappers has been halted? If so, can the Prime Minister tell the House the significance of this?

Mr. Trudeau: Well, Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding, though I did not hear this myself, that an authority in the Quebec government did say that there had been an interruption of police activities in their search for the kidnappers. I am afraid that the Leader of the Opposition will have to draw his own conclusions from that statement.

Mr. Stanfield: I do not wish to pry into something that I ought not to pry into, but I would ask the Prime Minister whether he is indicating that he himself does not know the reason for this report? Is the Prime Minister indicating that he does not know why there has been a halt in or a suspension of police activities?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I am rather disappointed that the Leader of the Opposition would press me on this point. Perhaps he can conjecture a little bit, that if the police do not want the life of Mr. Cross to be endangered they are calling off their activities—or perhaps they are only pretending to. I do not know.

Mr. Horner: Do you know or don't you know?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, would the Prime Minister say whether or not consideration has been given to the federal government associating itself with the province of Quebec in making available a very large and substantial reward for evidence that would lead to the arrest and ultimate conviction of the wrongdoers? I sug-

gest this in all seriousness because my own experience in respect of conspirators is that they suddenly find themselves speaking up when there is the possibility of a substantial reward for doing so.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: I have asked the Prime Minister a question. Silence does not answer a question that cannot interfere to any degree with security in regard to this unfortunate matter.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I was remaining silent only until after the applause had subsided.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is fine.

Mr. Trudeau: I intend to answer the question whether any consideration has been given; the answer is yes.

[*Translation*]

ABDUCTION OF SENIOR BRITISH TRADE COMMISSIONER—SUGGESTED IMPOSITION OF DEATH PENALTY FOR KIDNAPPING

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Prime Minister a supplementary question.

Following yesterday's events, does he intend to recommend to the Minister of Justice that the death penalty be applied in cases of kidnapping, as it is done in the United States, as a deterrent measure?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I do not think that in the past, and particularly in the last 48 hours, the government has considered changing the law to this effect. The matter could perhaps be discussed once this unfortunate matter is concluded.

[*English*]

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): I have a supplementary question. In the hope, as I believe is the case, that the government is doing all within its power in this very unfortunate situation, can the Prime Minister advise whether there will be any communication with the government of Cuba regarding this matter in view of the circumstances?

Mr. Trudeau: Well, it would be helpful to know what the hon. member is suggesting—that we should make a deal with Cuba to receive the prisoners, or what is in the hon. member's mind?

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

[*Translation*]

ABDUCTION OF SENIOR BRITISH TRADE COMMISSIONER—TRAINING OF TERRORISTS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a supplementary question to the Prime Minister. He stated that he has not considered amending the legislation on capital punishment, and everybody understands that he cannot do so today. However, I would like to ask him whether the government is seriously considering the possibility of following more closely the movements of certain lunatics from Quebec who are going to Cuba, Palestine or Jordan to train as professional killers. Does the government intend to watch closely the movements of those individuals?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, once again we would have to know who those people are. If the hon. member has in mind certain persons about whom he has information, it is his duty, in my opinion, to get in touch with the police. But if he is simply thinking of people who are travelling for various reasons, I would of course point out to him that we cannot keep watch on them all.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to make a statement but simply to ask a supplementary question.

Is the Prime Minister aware that not so long ago Mr. Pierre Nadeau, of the CBC, met in Palestine with two terrorists who had gone there in order to train for performing selective assassination in Canada? While our police forces are unable to find such people, newspapermen can. Would he explain this situation to the House?

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

ENERGY

NATURAL GAS—SEQUENCE OF APPROVAL OF EXPORT TO UNITED STATES AND CONSTRUCTION OF PIPELINE

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Did the National Energy Board approve the construction of the pipeline north of the international border to take gas to the United States before the cabinet had authorized the export of 6.3 trillion cubic feet of gas to that country?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, under section 82 of the National Energy Board Act, Parliament has entrusted the National Energy Board with the determination of whether or not there is gas surplus to Canadian needs available for sale and also whether the price is just and reasonable in the public interest of Canada. That decision was made by the National Energy Board at its hearings which lasted many months, and the cabinet ratified the position of that board which has served the public interest for many years very well in this area.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, having had a resumé of the Act, may I ask the minister to answer the question. Did the National Energy Board authorize the construction of the pipeline to take the gas to the United States before the government had authorized the export of the gas to the United States?

Mr. Greene: If the hon. member would familiarize himself with the Act I think it might be helpful to him. The National Energy Board rules on export and the construction of pipelines to facilitate export in their decisions. Then that total decision is brought before the government for ratification or refusal. The government ratified the total decision, with the further injunction by virtue of regulation 11(a) that there be a continuing price review in light of the dynamics of the price structure in the international markets.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): May I ask if the two decisions, the decision to construct the pipeline to the Canada-United States border and the decision to allow the export of gas, were made at the same time or whether one was made prior to the other? Was the decision by the board to approve the construction of the line made prior to the decision to allow export of the gas?

Mr. Greene: I will be glad to send a copy of the decision of the National Energy Board to the hon. member so that he can familiarize himself with the facts before he comes out with public statements on the issue.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Greene: Certainly the decision of the board lent itself to both the export of the gas and the construction of the pipeline. Some decisions were made by the board and ratified by the government earlier this summer for the construction of completely Canadian pipelines to satisfy Canadian markets, particularly the Ontario market, where the Hearne plant in Toronto will be converted from oil to natural gas as an antipollution measure.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): May I ask the minister, since he now has answered in part, how much of the total construction to take the gas to the United States was contained in the construction approval which the minister has just mentioned for the Canadian firms to take gas to the Canadian consumers? Was this construction approved only for gas to be used in Canada or also for part of the gas going to the United States?

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, the approvals that were given earlier in the summer were for purely Canadian consumption of natural gas and to meet Canadian needs. The current decision which has been approved by the cabinet was for both Canadian consumption and for exports.

[*Translation*]

POLLUTION

MEASURES TO REDUCE MERCURY CONTENT IN JAMES AND HUDSON BAYS

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Is he aware that there is some indication that the waters of James Bay and Hudson Bay are seriously polluted? Would the minister tell us if any action will be taken to suppress the causes of pollution in those waters?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I know that some mercury was found in James Bay and that that has had an adverse effect on fishing. Both federal and provincial officers are trying to identify the causes of pollution. I am told that it may be due to waste matters from pulp and paper mills along the coast of James Bay and all such establishments do not come under federal jurisdiction but under the jurisdiction of the provinces.

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

STATUS OF DESTROYER CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—ADDITIONAL COST

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): I have a question for the Minister of National Defence. Can he say whether the destroyer construction program—I refer to the *St. Laurent* class—is on schedule and whether the companies involved have asked for any extras?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): I regret to say that there has been a slippage of approximately one year in the timing of the program. An analysis is under way at the moment to determine to what extent this will affect the delivery dates and the availability of the ships for service. It will also indicate, since time is money, how much additional cost the treasury will be exposed to if the program is to go ahead in the form planned.

Mr. Bell: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. As the minister starts work in his new portfolio will he give every assurance, in view of rumours that the leakage of money may be upward of $20 million, that he will not allow another *Bonaventure* fiasco to take place as did one of his colleagues sitting in the front row not far from him?

MANPOWER

SYDNEY, N.S.—SUSPENSION OF ADULT STUDENTS BY INSTRUCTOR FOR MAKING REPRESENTATIONS CONCERNING ALLOWANCES

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): I have a question for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration with reference to a wire forwarded to him from the Nova Scotia Minister of Labour protesting the suspension of 18 adult students by an instructor of adult training in Sydney, Nova Scotia, because they have made representations about training allowances which have been withheld. Would the minister have an investigation carried out to determine why these men and women have been suspended and immediately have them reinstated without any loss of benefit?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): I appreciate the hon. member's interest and concern in this matter. I will certainly look into the matter and report to him as soon as I have any information.

[Mr. Chrétien.]

Mr. Muir: Would the minister also provide both the House and Nova Scotia's Minister of Labour with an explanation as to why the students would have to apologize to anyone, indeed, as requested by the instructor before being reinstated?

Mr. Lang: After I have looked into the matter I will know whether or not that is appropriate.

Mr. Muir: I have a further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since when has it become necessary for the people of this country to apologize to bureaucrats for making justified representations and protests to elected representatives regarding an injustice?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I apologize to the hon. member but his supplementary question appears to be slightly argumentative.

POST OFFICE

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

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the right hon. Prime Minister concerning amendments to the Government Organization Act. Can he advise whether he contemplates lightening the load and brightening the way for the Minister without Portfolio from Longueuil by terminating the formal and legal role of the Minister of Communications as head of the Post Office Department?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Is the Prime Minister waiting for applause again?

NATIONAL DEFENCE

POSSIBLE DEPLOYMENT OF ANTI-BALLISTIC MISSILES IN CANADIAN NORTH—AWACS PROGRAM—DISCUSSION WITH UNITED STATES

Mr. David Lewis (York South): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence. Are any discussions being carried on between United States and Canadian authorities with regard to the possibility of deploying anti-ballistic missiles in the Canadian north? I imagine the minister has had a slippage and has forgotten he is Minister of National Defence.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): I owe the hon. member an apology. I did not hear his question.

Mr. Lewis: That is what I surmised. I repeat my question. Are any discussions being carried on between United States and Canadian authorities on the possible deployment of anti-ballistic missiles in the Canadian north or in any other part of Canada?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): None at all, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: I have a supplementary question for the minister. I wish to ask him whether the authorities in Washington have kept the Canadian government informed about their ABM future plans and the deployment of anti-ballistic missiles near the Canadian border. While he is answering that question, could he also inform the House whether there have been any discussions with regard to the proposed AWACS program and Canada's possible part therein?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could read the hon. gentleman's questions in *Hansard* and give him a more definitive answer tomorrow or the next day.

ADDITIONAL DETECTION FACILITIES IN CANADIAN NORTH AS PART OF U.S. ANTI-BALLISTIC MISSILE SYSTEM

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of National Defence. May I ask the minister whether any discussions are taking place regarding construction of additional and more refined radar and other detection facilities in the northern or any other part of Canada, which will be connected with the anti-ballistic missile system in the United States, or is construction actually taking place?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): I know of none.

Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek): I wonder if the minister at the same time would inform the House whether any information of this kind is received by the Canadian government from Russia?

LABOUR CONDITIONS

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON INTERNATIONAL UNIONS

Mr. Cliff Downey (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, concern has been expressed in the House today regarding the export of Canadian gas, but my question concerns the export of another commodity. Has the Prime Minister given consideration to the issuance of a statement regarding the matter of international unions in view of the fact that figures have been published which would indicate that over the past six years unions based in the United States have taken from Canadian workers dues that exceeded benefits to the extent of $68 million?

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo.

AIRPORTS

TORONTO—INQUIRY AS TO DECISION ON NEW SITE

Mr. W. M. Howe (Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, I make no apology for the fact that I represent parts of the four most important counties in the province of Ontario. I have a question for the Minister of Transport. It is in connection with the new airport that is proposed to be built north and west of Toronto. Some time ago the minister indicated that a decision would be handed down this fall. In view of the interest in many areas, particularly in my own riding, can the minister advise when we may expect a statement and decision on this very important matter?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): I thank the hon. member for whatever it is—for his question. The situation is as follows: In the first instance the detailed studies referred to in earlier questions and answers have been completed. The data, which is formidable in terms of size, is now being prepared in report form in order to get it down to manageable size. We will be holding discussions with the province of Ontario, as I committed myself to do, as soon as this work is completed, which I would anticipate would be within ten days to two weeks. The nature of our discussions with the province of Ontario will be to see if some mechanism can be devised whereby we can obtain the maximum amount of public participation in this matter before a decision is made. The central problem remains the one I mentioned in June, protection against the possibility of land speculation in advance of our final decision.

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a supplementary question to the minister. Have the proposed sites been narrowed down to three, four or five, and is the area of Beverley township, which is in my riding, one of them?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*Translation*]

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

COST OF FEDERALISM TO QUEBEC

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

Since the Premier of Quebec has confirmed that the report on the cost of federalism in Quebec, extracts of which were published last week in a Montreal newspaper, indicates that there have been neither gains nor losses in the province, I would ask the Prime Minister whether this assessment of Quebec federalism seems correct to him.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. In my opinion the question, as phrased, is hardly acceptable procedurally. The hon. member is inviting the Prime Minister to voice an opinion. I do not believe the question as expressed, to be in order and it might perhaps be rephrased.

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

During the last provincial election campaign, a report was published, emanating from the Fédération libérale du Canada to the effect that Quebec received more from the federal than it contributed thereto.

Therefore, as the Quebec government has also published a report in that connection, I should like to know if—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Maybe the hon. member could rephrase his question. It would be much simpler than to rise on a point of order.

Mr. Asselin: Mr. Speaker, has the Prime Minister read the report of the Quebec government on federalism and the opinion expressed by the Quebec Premier to the effect that no loss and no gain were registered in Quebec because of federalism. Furthermore, I would like to know if the Prime Minister or his government intends to bring in a similar report to properly inform the Quebec taxpayers?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have not read that report. I know that excerpts were published in newspapers but I have neither read nor seen them. However, to my knowledge, it is a report drafted by Quebec government officials, some of whom, by the way, are no longer employed by that government.

If the Quebec government intends to hold these figures as exact and wants to send them to us for debate, we shall be ready to consider them. However, the Quebec government has not yet brought these figures to my attention and I know that they have been communicated neither to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) nor to myself.

I do not see then how I could read a vague document drafted by former civil servants and published, so it seems, by wide-circulation newspapers.

Mr. Asselin: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

As it is an issue which raises a good deal of interest among Quebec taxpayers, would the Prime Minister consider appointing a commission of independent experts who could make an extensive study of the subject and report on it in order to inform the taxpayers?

Mr. Trudeau: As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, I feel it would be an error to try and make such an inquiry. I know it has previously been undertaken, but I do not believe that anyone can accurately measure in terms of dollars and cents the benefits involved in belonging to a united Canada. I believe these benefits are much greater than that.

[*English*]

POWER

SKAGIT RIVER—APPLICATION BY SEATTLE CITY LIGHT COMPANY TO RAISE HEIGHT OF DAM—EFFECT OF INTERNATIONAL RIVER IMPROVEMENTS ACT

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Has Seattle City Light applied to the federal government for a permit to raise the height of the Ross Dam and flood an estimated 6,000 acres of Canadian territory in the Skagit River Valley?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the permit under which Seattle Light is operating is that granted by the International Joint Commission in 1942. To the best of my knowledge no current permit has been applied for. It is my understanding that Seattle Power is operating under the apprehension that no new permit is required.

Mr. Pringle: Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources?

Mr. Harding: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Fraser Valley East has been recognized for a supplementary.

Mr. Jerry Pringle (Fraser Valley East): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Are we, then, to understand that the International River Improvements Act of 1955 does not supersede any agreements made prior to that time?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I regret to suggest to the hon. member that he is inviting an expression of opinion of the minister. I would not think the question is acceptable. The hon. member for Kooteney West on a supplementary.

Mr. Harding: Mr. Speaker, the information we have had from the Secretary of State for External Affairs is that a permit would have to be sought by Seattle City Light. My supplementary question is: Has there been any change in this procedure? If not, what type of investigation will the federal government initiate prior to making a decision on the flooding of the Skagit Valley?

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to give a legal opinion as to what is required, but it appears to me that after the expiry of some 18 years—

Some hon. Members: Twenty-eight years.

Mr. Greene: —28 years, excuse me, and the change in the public ethic as to whether a commercial sale of this nature would be more advantageous than the preservation of the natural resource, we should endeavour to have a new public hearing, and I am attempting to find a manner of so doing.

[*Later:*]

Mr. David Anderson (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I have a question supplementary to earlier questions regarding the Skagit Valley. Has the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources instructed or requested the Canadian section of the International Joint Commission to reopen its 1941 decision on the Skagit Valley?

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, the avenue of achieving a review and a new hearing is being explored, as well as other possibilities which might render an even more expeditious hearing possible.

Inquiries of the Ministry

GRAIN

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL GRAINS ARRANGEMENT MEETINGS

Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration who is responsible to the House for the Canadian Wheat Board. Will the minister take the first opportunity under motions to give the House a full report on the meetings that were held recently at Geneva to make the International Grains Arrangement a more workable instrument? More specifically, will he indicate who represented Canada at these talks and what country or countries were mainly opposing the Canadian formula?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I do not think a statement on motions would be appropriate at this stage. These meetings were preliminary in their nature, with a view to exploring whether negotiations could go forward on a sound basis. Canada was represented by senior officials, including a commissioner of the Wheat Board.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

CLAIMS COMMISSION—INCLUSION OF ABORIGINAL AND TREATY RIGHTS IN TERMS OF REFERENCE

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Inasmuch as the terms of reference of the Indian Claims Commissioner do not include a review of aboriginal and treaty rights, and because of the growing concern over these matters on the part of Canadians of Indian ancestry, will the government revise the terms of reference so that this fundamental issue might be reviewed?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, this question, which has already been raised on several occasions, has been studied by the government.

The Indian Claims Commissioner's office comes under the jurisdiction of the Prime Minister. I think it would be untimely to change the terms of reference now.

[*English*]

Mr. Dinsdale: May I address a similar question to the Prime Minister, since this is his

responsibility. Will he enlarge the membership of the Claims Commission, as was the original intent, so that this vitally important matter may be dealt with?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the terms of reference have been stated and there is no intention in the government's mind to change these terms of reference at this time. The position of the government was stated at the time the minister made known his white paper to the House. At that time I remember that we had the support of all opposition parties. The only complaint was that we had come a bit too late with it but that it was time we came up with it.

Mr. Dinsdale: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

RESIGNATION OF W.C. McNAMARA, CHIEF COMMISSIONER

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Manpower in charge of the Wheat Board.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Gleave: All the more power to the man. In view of reports of the resignation of Mr. McNamara, Chief Commissioner of the Canadian Wheat Board, can the minister inform the House whether there is such a resignation and when it will take effect?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Chief Commissioner of the Wheat Board has resigned. His resignation is accepted with great regret, effective indeed, as of today. The Chief Commissioner of course performed tremendous services for the farming population of Canada in this role and it is therefore with deep regret that we find his period of service coming to a close.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

POST OFFICE

INTRODUCTION OF SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES TO COVER LOSSES CAUSED BY POSTAL DISPUTE

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister without Portfolio in charge of the Post Office whether it is his intention to seek supplementary estimates with regard to the losses of the Post Office associated with the postal dispute? If so, can he indicate to the House the size of the losses associated with the Post Office dispute?

Some hon. Members: Answer!

[*Later:*]

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the President of the Treasury Board whether it is intended to submit supplementary estimates in connection with the Post Office Department having in mind the reported losses as a result of the postal dispute and, if so, what are the losses? There must be somebody in the government who can give the House this information.

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): There has not been a revision of the budget of the Post Office for the balance of the fiscal year and consequently I am not in a position to give the hon. member the figures he seeks.

Mr. Baldwin: Use the contingency fund.

POLLUTION

STATEMENT BY MINISTER OF FISHERIES AND FORESTRY RESPECTING WATER QUALITY STANDARDS, CONTROL AGENCIES AND ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCIL

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. It relates to the speech he made in Langley, British Columbia, on Saturday last, in which he proposed the establishment of national water quality standards, consolidation of pollution control agencies and the establishment, among other things, of a national environmental council. My question is, was the minister expressing government policy when he made his proposals?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member knows that this question may be asked of the Prime Minister and not of the minister who made the statement outside the House.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could direct this question to the Prime Minister.

Mr. Trudeau: What was it?

Mr. Aiken: Perhaps I could repeat it. I hope the Prime Minister will read the speech made by the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry in Langley, British Columbia, during the course of which he proposed the establishment of national water quality standards, the establishment of a national environmental council and the consolidation of pollution control agencies. I was asking whether the minister was stating government policy when he made those proposals.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I would have to look at the speech before I could answer in any definite way. Some of the elements quoted by the hon. member are, indeed, government policy, for example, when he talks about water standards. But other elements are not.

Mr. Aiken: A supplementary question to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. May I ask whether the hon. gentleman consulted with the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources before he made that speech?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I do not think that question is in order.

HOUSING

AVAILABILITY OF MORTGAGE FUNDS FOR PRIVATE HOME CONSTRUCTION

Mr. A. D. Alkenbrack (Frontenac-Lennox and Addington): My question is directed to the hon. gentleman listed on the roster as the Minister without Portfolio responsible for housing, which is a strange but perhaps true definition. It arises out of the futile inquiries made by prospective users of Central Mortgage and Housing services in an attempt to obtain individual family housing. When will there be effective access to mortgage funds applicable to private family housing? At the present time funds are not available in this area.

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): I would need more precise information concerning the location to which the hon. gentleman is referring before I could give him a positive answer. As put, his question is so general that I could give him many indications of circumstances in which this situation might not apply. But I am sure he has a problem and I would be glad to look into it if he will give me the details.

Inquiries of the Ministry

CONFERENCE WITH FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS —AVAILABILITY OF MORE MORTGAGE MONEY

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): My question is a related one concerning the conference the minister held with the financial institutions. Did the minister indicate to the representatives of these institutions that the government rejected both the idea of legislation directed to improving the situation as well as the use of building societies as a means of generating more money for housing?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): No, Mr. Speaker, I did not indicate to the lending institutions when I discussed this subject with them that such measures were rejected.

Mr. Alexander: In view of the fact, as I understand it, that housing starts for the first eight months of this year are down by approximately one-third, and that by the end of the year we shall only reach a total of approximately 175,000 starts, being a decrease of some 15 per cent compared with last year, is the minister in a position to tell the House and the nation what proposals he is prepared to recommend and support in order to generate more money for housing?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I suggest to the hon. member that he is inviting the minister to make a statement which would normally be made on motions.

Mr. Alexander: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

GRAIN

WHEAT—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON FIRM SALES COMMITMENTS

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): My question is directed to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration who is also responsible for the Wheat Board. Bearing in mind the optimistic statement made by the minister that more than 700 million bushels of grain are likely to be sold in the current year, may I ask whether the minister can inform the House concerning the extent of present firm wheat sale commitments?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): It is not normal practice to make known the precise state of commitments at any given point in time; there are a

variety of reasons for keeping this kind of information confidential. However, I can repeat the statement I made that the prospects are now very good for exports at those levels.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Can the minister inform the House when the resignation of Mr. McNamara will take effect and who his successor will be?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order.

BARLEY—AMOUNT OF FINAL PAYMENT TO FARMERS

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): My question is supplementary to that asked by the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville concerning projected sales. Bearing in mind projected sales and sales already confirmed, particularly with regard to feed grain and barley, may I ask whether the minister is in a position to tell us the estimated amount farmers might expect to receive as the final payment for barley? Absence of this information leaves western Canada and the agricultural industry in a great deal of confusion, now knowing what to expect as the final payment on barley. Since he is aware of committed barley sales as far ahead as July, the minister is in a better position to supply this information.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): It is not normal to make a forecast very much ahead of the closing of a pool but I will be glad to investigate whether it might be possible to pick a date for giving some advance information this year.

WHEAT—PRICES OF RECENT SALES

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): I preface my question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration with my congratulations on his having been raised to the elevated position of a full minister. I do this most sincerely.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: Watch out!

Mr. Diefenbaker: There is nothing so sad as those who have developed a capacity for being suspicious. Without endeavouring to secure the exact prices in connection with the wheat sales that have been taking place recently, I would ask the minister whether he is in a position to say that the prices were within the International Grains Arrangement or its successor, even though that agreement was not generally signed, or are these sales being made at fire-sale prices?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): I believe the right hon. gentleman posed in his question two alternatives, neither of which, in fact, reflects the situation. Wheat Board prices are fairly well known and are evident to the public. Prices have been rising steadily but remain below the minimum levels set under the International Grains Arrangement.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The question I particularly asked was: Are these prices at which the wheat is being sold at a fire-sale level, similar to those which were in effect in 1938 when the plug was pulled and the price was anything at all as long as the wheat could be gotten rid of?

Mr. Lang: As I have indicated, the prices are known. Prices have been rising. They have been ranging between $1.71 and $1.77 based on No. 1 northern. These are prices which are competitive in the world. I would have thought the right hon. gentleman and hon. members generally would approve of selling wheat at competitive prices and getting into this market.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A supplementary question to the minister. I recognize there is certain information which the minister cannot give to the House but surely he can tell us what firm commitments there are for the sale of wheat to date in this crop year. Can the minister give us this information today, or undertake to get it and supply it to the House at a later date?

Mr. Lang: It is the global total which I would certainly hesitate to give. Within that global total there are important sales, many of which are made without an identifiable destination at this stage due to the nature of the international wheat business, so this information would not be very helpful, and since I am not prepared to give the global figure there is really no additional information I can make available.

FILMS

GOVERNMENT INVESTMENT IN ALLEGED "NUDIE FLICK"

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister. This is a matter dealing with films and flesh upon which the Prime Minister is an authority. Did the Canadian government invest a substantial amount of public money in a motion picture now being made in Montreal by Cinepix described as a nudie flick and, if so, how does this help Canadian culture?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Paproski: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, recently I received from a number of Edmonton school children signed petitions urging the showing of more family type movies in the theatres. I understand this is only the beginning of a major expression of opinion against the kind of material now being put out—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That is not a point of order. The hon. member will appreciate that the question he asked in the first instance would normally be placed on the order paper. If he believes there is urgency and that the matter should be debated it can be considered at the time of adjournment this evening.

• (2:50 p.m.)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CANADA CORPORATIONS ACT

ADMINISTRATIVE AND CONSEQUENTIAL AMENDMENTS

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs) moved the second reading of and concurrence in amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-4, to amend the Canada Corporations Act and other statutory provisions related to the subject matter of certain of those amendments.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in moving concurrence in the amendments made to Bill C-4 in the other place on the recommendation of the committee on banking, trade and commerce of the other place, I think it appropriate that I say a few words in explanation thereof.

First of all, the amendments made in the other place, and in which concurrence is sought today, make no fundamental change to

Bill C-4—the amendments to the Canada Corporations Act. In fact, in my view and that of the government the amendments made in the other place improve upon the bill as originally drafted and as originally presented and passed by this House. I trust that this afternoon those amendments made in the other place will be acceptable to the members of this House.

As I said, a number of changes were made in the other place, many of them of a very technical nature. I do not propose this afternoon to deal with them all, but it might assist hon. members if I were to refer to those changes which appear to me to be of the greatest significance or importance.

Firstly, amendments were made regarding section 38 of the Canada Corporations Act, the part of the act relating to constrained-share companies. An amendment was put forward in the other place by me that would allow a federally incorporated company which is engaged in the publication of a newspaper to qualify as a constrained-share company so that it could restrict, if it so chose, the transfer of its shares to non-residents.

Such a company, as hon. members know, must maintain a requisite degree of Canadian shareholder participation if the advertising expenses incurred by Canadian taxpayers in the advertising in such newspapers are to be deductible under the provisions of section 12A of the Income Tax Act. The amendment that was made in the Senate is designed to give a newspaper company—that is, a public company—the means to comply with section 12A of the Income Tax Act and, in this way, to protect its necessary qualifications under that act.

Another amendment to the constrained-share company provisions to Bill C-4 which was made in the other place would allow a company incorporated with the objects of investing in the shares of other corporations, and which has a significant or controlling interest in a federally incorporated trust, insurance, loan, small loans or sales finance company, to become a constrained-share company. Although the intention had been from the beginning to cover the situation of these holding companies, the actual wording used in the bill did not extend to them. This has been corrected in the other place, and in my view is a desirable change as a federally incorporated holding company could lose its voting rights in its insurance, trust, loan, small loans or sales finance company if con-

trol of the holding company were to fall into the hands of non-residents.

Hon. members will recall that Bill C-4 contains provisions that would allow a shareholder entitled to vote at a meeting to present a proposal called a shareholder's proposal to a meeting of the company. Upon receipt of the shareholder's proposal the company will have to decide whether it accepts or opposes the proposal. If the management of the company opposes the proposal put forward by the shareholder and makes a solicitation of proxies, the company will be required to include in its information circular a statement to the shareholders of not more than 200 words in support of the proposal.

Bill C-4 as presented to the House and passed contains a number of safeguards against shareholders presenting frivolous or vexatious proposals. An amendment has been made in this respect in the other place adding additional safeguards and providing, in effect, that if a shareholder makes more than two proposals within five years he would be required, when the two first proposals have not been accepted by the shareholders, to deposit with the company a sum of money sufficient to cover the costs of circulating any additional proposal to the shareholders, the money deposited as security being returned by the company to the shareholder.

On the other hand, if the proposal is not accepted the company will reimburse itself of the cost it incurred in circulating the proposal, any surplus being returned to the shareholder. This seems an appropriate addition to the safeguards already in the bill.

Hon. members will recall that the House committee put in additional safeguards against frivolous shareholder proposals in addition to those originally contained in the bill; the other place has put in further safeguards. None of these impairs the right and opportunity of legitimate shareholders to put legitimate proposals before their fellow shareholders.

Amendments have also been made to the provisions regarding the investigation and inspection procedures which involved the attention of the House committee as well as the Senate committee. I do not wish to refer to all of them here; it might be sufficient for me just to mention briefly those that I think are the most important and which have the greatest bearing on the investigation and inspection sections.

Hon. members will recall that an application for an investigation of the affairs of a company could be made to the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission by five or more shareholders holding a specified number of shares in the company, or by the minister on his own initiative. As the bill was originally drafted, such an application for an investigation would have been ex parte or upon such notice to such person as the commission may have required. An amendment made to the bill in the other place would, in effect, turn this around and provide that a notice of the application be given to the company and other interested parties unless—and I think that this is an important proviso—the commission is of the opinion that, in view of the allegations contained in the application, the giving of a notice would unduly prejudice any investigation that might be ordered by the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission.

Turning the onus around and requiring notice to the company and to interested persons unless the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission sees good reason to the contrary better expresses in my view, the intention behind the words of the provision as originally drafted, and will provide some specific guidelines to the commission as to the manner in which it should exercise its discretion as to whether or not a notice of the application for an investigation should be given.

Other amendments made in the other place, and in which concurrence is asked this afternoon, would require an application by shareholders for an investigation to be in the form of a "solemn declaration".

Mr. MacLean: Mr. Speaker, may I just rise on a point of order. I do not wish to interrupt the minister, but I should like to suggest to him that in referring to the amendments he refer to their being made "in the Senate" rather than "in the other place", so that it is clear to readers of *Hansard* what is meant. I think I am correct in assuming that there is no objection under the rules to this practice.

• (3:00 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: I am sure the hon. member is not asking me to make a ruling on this. My understanding is that the other place is referred to as "the other place" in debate, although in practice I suppose it does not make too much difference. The minister may use his own good judgment in this regard.

Mr. Baldwin: When the minister speaks of "the other place" we know what he really has in mind.

Mr. Basford: I am grateful for the intervention. It was my understanding that the other place, as you said, Your Honour, was to be referred to as "the other place". For readers of *Hansard* we will take it as being noted that "the other place" is the Senate.

As I pointed out, this would require an application by shareholders for an investigation to be in the form of a solemn declaration, which means a statutory declaration. This again is designed to deter applicants from making irresponsible or careless statements in an application to the commission for an investigation.

Another amendment would specifically recognize the right of a company and other interested parties to whom a notice of an application for an investigation has been given, to appear before the commission when the application will be dealt with and be heard on the application. This provision would not, of course, apply when the commission will have decided that notice of the application should not be given because the commission is of the opinion that the giving of the notice would unduly prejudice any investigation that might be ordered.

Finally, with respect to the investigation and inspection process, I should mention that some clarification has been brought to the wording of some of the grounds on the basis of which the commission could order an investigation. This is a matter of great concern to the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert). Hon. members will recall that one of these grounds upon which an investigation could take place related to, and I quote from the bill "one or more acts performed in a manner unfairly prejudicial to the interests of any shareholder". This has been slightly changed to read "one or more acts performed wrongfully and in a manner prejudicial to the interests of any shareholder".

Finally, a new section 37 has been added to the bill providing in effect that compliance with provincial legislation, wherever relevant, shall not exempt a company to which the Canada Corporations Act applies from complying with the provisions of that Act. The view was expressed in the other place that it might be useful to have such a provision in the Canada Corporations Act in order to ensure that federal companies will not be under the mistaken assumption that the fact that they comply with the provincial legislation does not relieve them from complying with the federal legislation.

As I said in my opening remarks, the amendments made in the other place—for readers of Hansard in the Senate—do in my view improve the bill, and in no way change it in any fundamental respect. All of them are acceptable to me and to the government. I hope they will commend themselves to members of this House so that this important piece of legislation, first introduced in this House over a year ago and thoroughly reviewed by a committee of this House and a committee of the other place, will before this session ends become the law of the land. I will of course be happy to deal, by way of answer to questions, with any of the specific amendments that have been made in an endeavour to explain them to hon. members. I have simply endeavoured to deal with those I regard as the most important.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-4 has had a long history in Parliament. We first discussed this at second reading on November 10 last. The bill was then brought forward again in January, following which it went to the committee and was ultimately dealt with in this House on June 10. At that time several amendments were put forward and decided upon. The matter then went to the other place.

One must bear in mind that we are now dealing with some 25 amendments, some of which came from the other place. I give three cheers to the other place. They were able to convince the minister in respect of more than one particular point in respect of which he proved to be rather obdurate—I hesitate to use the word obstinate—when he appeared before the Commons committee. He was supported at that time by a majority of government members who refused to see the light of day at that time. It is instructive that both he and those members are now going to support at least the principle of many of the amendments made in the other place.

Mr. Basford: Always an open mind.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Many of these changes were suggested in the Commons committee. Naturally, there may have been some profit obtained in the other place from a reading of the Commons committee reports on this matter. If one reads the House debates of November 10, as I have done, particularly the statement of the minister at that time, one will find that the minister and his officials larded the remarks with their self-satisfaction in the production of what they thought was a pretty good bill.

But experience has shown that 39 pages of amendments were brought before the House

committee on finance. In respect of one part of the bill, I think we received a third version if not a fourth version. One must, therefore, conclude that the original preparation must have been pretty sloppy. Certainly, there could be more changes even now. Personally, I find all of the amendments before us acceptable.

It was my hope that the minister would go a little further in certain areas, particularly with regard to costs. He was eventually reasonable in respect of notice to the parties concerned so that we are not going to have a sort of star chamber inquisition or investigation launched into the affairs of a company without its prior knowledge. This was quite permissible under the original version that was put to us and vigorously defended. We now see that perhaps reason has prevailed.

Let me merely say that on re-reading the remarks of the sponsoring gentleman in the other place on second reading, I find he confirms what I said last November, last June and time and time again in the committee, that it is not so much an amendment to the Canada Corporations Act the minister wants but a sort of pseudo securities act. The minister was not able to answer me positively as to the purpose which the information filed would serve.

These regulations relate really to a securities act. I have in mind information in respect of insider trading, disclosure and so forth. That has nothing to do with an act in respect of the incorporation of companies. The filing of returns and provisions as to the handling of proxies are usually corporate matters. In the province of Ontario, and in most common law provinces, there is a securities act along side this act which deals with those matters aiming to protect the public by greater disclosure.

No one is objecting to greater and better disclosure of corporate information, but this should be done through the appropriate statute. If one intends to protect the public, it should be done under a securities act because shares are going to be placed on the market and people will be invited to invest in those corporations. This has no relation whatsoever to private companies because the public is precluded from any invitation to invest.

Therefore under the new practice, lumping into the same basket private and public companies which are incorporated under the federal corporations act will have the result that few if any persons will want to incorporate either public or private companies under federal charter. It will be much easier and better to incorporate under provincial companies' acts and then avail themselves of foreign registration under the various provincial acts. It is as simple as that.

• (3:10 p.m.)

All this could have been avoided and can be avoided. If the minister and the government were honest with this House they would agree publicly with the many suggestions made from this side. I have been making such suggestions for about three or four years at least. We want a national securities commission, but not one dominated by the federal government because the federal government has neither the machinery nor the interest. Frankly, it does not have the appropriate jurisdiction. It has partial jurisdiction. In this particular case there should be agreement between the federal government and the provinces that there should be a national securities commission, not to be seated here in Ottawa but in Toronto next to the major stock exchange. There could be branches in Montreal and Vancouver or wherever there should be. Then, Canada would have an appropriate national securities commission. However, we in this House do not have the jurisdiction for even a pseudo securities commission under the provisions of this act. The mountain has travailed a great deal and has not even produced a mouse.

Under the provision for disclosure, where statements are put on a file, a fee must be paid in order to obtain any information for say insider trading. There is no machinery or operation under the Corporations Act for compiling and publishing reports about insider trading as there would be under an appropriate securities act. The information will lie in the various files. Anyone who wishes to inquire about an individual corporation would have to pay a fee and look through all the files. What cumbersome machinery that is! The minister knows he does not have either the machinery nor the authority to collate and publish the information. Under the Corporations Act there is absolutely no authority for the minister to publish the information, whereas it could be done under an appropriate securities act. There is no doubt, in respect of a particular file, an individual who is interested can come and have it looked at; that is so. The minister cannot ask any more than he is authorized to do. I defy him to say that he will be able to publish information or files under the authority of the Canada Corporations Act. This authority does not exist.

Yet these are the grounds he gives to justify some other requirements of these amendments. They cannot provide information in the public interest. It is a sham; it is empty.

I need only refer to Senator Urquhart's introduction of this bill at second reading when he spoke about better information for investor protection. If hon. members are interested I can read this into the record, but I think I have made my point. That is not the purpose of the Canada Corporations Act. I do not wish to keep repeating the speeches I made in committee and on other occasions with regard to all of the amendments. So far as these before us are concerned, I think they are an improvement. Some of them are merely consequential and of little import. In paragraph 20, page 53 there is an amendment which changes the word "unless" to the word "but". There may be some requirement for that, but in any event the situation is the same. I know there were some difficulties. Certainly, I agree with the change concerning fraud, misconduct or other misconduct, because the French version, as I subsequently read it, certainly left the whole question wide open. Now, the *ejusdem generis* rule will clearly define the conduct which might be reprehensible and on which there will be appropriate ground for the minister to act.

Having said that, I should like to see this bill pass at this session because we certainly do not want to go through all this again next year. I hope that by then I can convince the minister he should negotiate with the provinces in a meaningful way in order to get an appropriate national securities act and a national securities commission.

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, for reasons which I shall explain, it is our intention to vote against this measure and also to urge government members to support us in voting against this measure—against the amendments. Bill C-4 represents a change that is taking place after five years. The Corporations Act is being amended. These amendments were supposed to correct a great deal of mistrust that had grown up about the marketing of Canadian securities. Canada had a very bad reputation in international areas because of the way in which we handle securities and the way our companies operate. This bill was an attempt to correct some of the existing abuses. In our view, Bill C-4 does not go far enough. In the committee and in the House we objected very strongly to the fact that the disclosure provisions were not adequate. We still feel they are inadequate and will have to be changed.

Nevertheless, there is one thing with which we do agree. The bill had its day in committee. It had its day in the House of Commons. All of us had an opportunity to present our arguments. Unfortunately, our position was not accepted but we cannot say that the democratic process as we now know it was not acceded to, that we did not have a chance to say what we had to say or that the people, through their representatives, were not able to speak either for or against the provisions. It is another thing, however, Mr. Speaker, when we see amendments come in from a chamber that is not representative. It is very difficult for us to understand why amendments from such a chamber should be agreed to in this House. In other countries there are second chambers. I think a case can sometimes be made for such things, provided they are representative or that the members are elected by the people.

One can argue that there are times when such a place would present the views of various minority groups or represent the will of the population. Even in a country like Great Britain with the hereditary House of Lords, some argument can be made for some of the work that is done because of the broadly representative nature of some of the people who are appointed to that chamber. But what argument can possibly be made for agreeing to the amendments that come from the other place. Rather than call it a chamber of sober second thought it often appears to be the chamber of corporate veto. With few exceptions, the people in that chamber do not represent the various and diverse interests in this country but rather corporate points of view.

• (3:20 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member will appreciate that perhaps the Chair should intervene at this moment to remind him that we have before us now a very specific amendment. It appears to the Chair that the hon. member is straying some distance from the principle of the amendment before us. It appears that he is debating for the consideration of hon. members the role and mission of the second chamber in the parliamentary system. I am not too sure that this is what is under review by the House at the present time. It may be that the hon. member's comments are introductory in nature, that in due course he will come to the

motion now before us. I would invite him to bear this in mind.

Mr. Saltsman: Thank you for your advice, Mr. Speaker. I believe that the point I am trying to make will be a little more obvious as I proceed, and I am trying to relate my remarks specifically to the amendments before us in order to point out their significance, their importance and their relationship to the bill. It could be argued that the people who drafted these amendments are experts, and no doubt they are experts when one looks at the directorships that they hold. However, it is very much like asking the generals of a country to make foreign policy, or asking the pulp industry to legislate a reforestation program or the mining industry to create an anti-pollution program or the automobile industry to set down safety standards for cars, or even to have burglars review the Criminal Code in order to improve it. There is no intention on my part, or on the part of anyone in this party, to impute motives to anyone or to make any suggestion that there has been impropriety.

What we are trying to point out is that the composition and the nature of the committee that sent back these amendments makes it virtually impossible for us to take any of their suggestions with any degree of seriousness. The reason is that if we look at the various measures that have come from there, whether they be recommendations on the white paper on tax reform or, to refer to the specific amendments before us, the recommendations of the committee that we are now considering, we can see that in every single case every suggestion that was made was to strengthen corporate power, to prevent disclosure, to make it more and more difficult for the public to come to grips with the corporations in our society. It is difficult for us to understand what special wisdom resides there, particularly when one sees that often the directorships that the members in the other place hold came to them after their appointments rather than before. One wonders whether there is some special magic wand in the Prime Minister's (Mr. Trudeau) office which he waves over them. This gives them some special knowledge and wisdom that they would otherwise not have. Perhaps he anoints them with some special liniment which gives them some special corporate knowledge that they did not possess before.

When we examine the amendments—and in his opening statement the minister pointed out that he is pleased with the amendments—

[Mr. Speaker.]

one remembers that, as the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) pointed out quite correctly, when some of them were suggested to the minister in the committee he raised some very valid arguments against the adoption of some of these proposals. Between the time that he raised those arguments in the committee and the time these amendments arrived from the other place, there has been some change of heart. We are glad to see that the minister is capable of learning in this particular way.

Let us take a look at the amendment on the trust companies which contains a definition of an insider. It is possible now, as a result of the amendments from the other place, for a trust company to circumvent one of the main intentions of the act which was to ensure that no one would have more than 10 per cent of the voting shares without having to declare that he was an insider. The point that was made in the other place was that a trust company, because it had a number of branches, might inadvertently acquire more than 10 per cent of the shares and therefore come afoul of the legislation. This should not be. The question that needs to be asked is whether it is really important whether they do it deliberately or whether it comes about unintentionally. The fact of the matter is that this corporation would have more than 10 per cent of the shares and would be an insider. It would have the power that this legislation originally tried to limit, and yet it is going to be excluded because this particular amendment was introduced on the basis that the corporation has very little control over the situation.

All that is at stake in this insider amendment is that these shareholders be forced to disclose the fact that they are insiders. My reading of the legislation is such that it would seem they are not being asked to divest themselves of their holdings over the 10 per cent. We recognize that they have more than 10 per cent in some cases. They are not being asked to close down an account or to say to a client: I am sorry, we cannot take you on because this will bring our holdings to more than 10 per cent. They are simply being asked to disclose that they have more than 10 per cent. The other place has objected mightily to this provision, and as we go through these amendments we see that in every single instance where it is possible to strike a blow against disclosure, against providing more public information, the other place has done so.

I want to say something about the minister, and it is to his credit. I have been following the work in the other place and as it has proceeded I have also been trying to keep track of the minister who has been running around like a shining little fire engine trying to put down the fire that was developing over there, refusing to agree to some measures and going along with others. He has recognized the potential damage of some of these amendments and he has watered some of them down before they came to us. Nevertheless, he has not been able to put out the fire completely and now, it seems to me, he has had to agree to live with some of these amendments and to legitimize them as he has done today in his opening remarks.

In other areas we see that wherever the other place could confuse, wherever they could insert a word to confuse rather than to clarify, they have done so. It seemed to me that the intent of the bill was quite clear. They put in words such as "willful" which is a lawyer's delight. People can argue for ever as to whether or not an act was willful. The other place added words of that type and they have done so knowingly. This is what comes through in some of these amendments.

In the course of the debate an interesting example was provided of why words like "knowingly" and "willfully" should be inserted. Members of the Senate Committee felt that there were some things that happened in our society which had to be taken into account. I should like to quote from a speech made by the Chairman of the Senate Committee on September 29, as recorded in the committee proceedings, in which he gives a particular example of why these words have to be added. He is talking about the sending out of proxies which have to be sent by prepaid mail. I quote from page 1419:

• (3:30 p.m.)

> This must be sent by prepaid mail. Now, let us assume that the messenger is on his way to the post office to mail this bundle of proxies with the information circulars and he slips on the ice or somebody knocks him on the head, and when he recovers and picks up his bundle, some have fallen out and are lost.

Then, horror, the company is subject to prosecution! I know that is something that happens all the time, with messengers going out, slipping on ice, knocking themselves out and losing bundles. It seems to me people in the other place were really reaching for far-out examples and almost impossible situations in order to justify making this legislation murky, and to hide their intent behind the words they suggest. I for one, Mr. Speaker, do not think we can accept these kinds of amendments put forth for this kind of purpose.

The Senate also proposes an amendment to clause 106H(10). This would seek to limit democratic opportunities within corporations. It is clear enough that today corporations are far from being democratic. Bill C-4 makes a very slight attempt to democratize corporations, giving shareholders an opportunity to voice their dissent or to raise questions, but not satisfied with the already stringent provisions in this respect in the bill as it exists now, members of the other place propose to go further and limit the right of a shareholder with regard to the number of times he can make a proposal, and circumscribe the shareholder in a way that is not necessary. Rather than going in this direction it seems to me that we should be moving the other way, because there are many things about a corporation which people object to today.

It is no longer a matter of just questioning the corporation officers on how much profit they made, or how they conducted the financial affairs of the corporation. Today shareholders are developing a social conscience. They want to know what measures the corporation is taking with regard to pollution. They want to know its labour policies and its attitudes toward society generally. This is an increasing concern on their part. We are starting to see attempts being made by shareholders to get information and make management responsible in these areas.

Any effort that blocks off such avenues, that makes it more difficult for shareholders to question corporation officers is a move in the wrong direction, and is one which I suggest is against the best interests of society. What would we say if someone made that argument about Parliament, or about democracy generally? What if someone said, "Elections are too frequent and people object too much. Each person can put his oar in. People must file a deposit before they can vote, and must file a deposit before they can raise an objection against a politician." We would think that uproariously funny. At a time when we are moving in the direction of making our political institutions more open, more accessible, and more responsive to the needs of our society, we are being asked to accept an amendment to restrict such opportunities within a very important segment of our society.

I am going to ask hon. members of this chamber to reject these Senate amendments,

even though this would mean rejecting a government bill. Despite the minister's apparent full endorsation of the amendments I suspect he is not really that happy about what has happened, and perhaps he will not be angry with Liberal backbenchers if they reject these amendments. We would not look upon such rejection as a motion of no confidence in the government but rather as a motion of confidence in Parliament, in Parliament's right to decide matters of this sort, and in Parliament's right to reject what, in my view, is an improper vehicle from the other place. This is why I ask hon. members for their support in rejecting these amendments.

These proposed Senate amendments do not add to the bill; they do not improve it. In our view they make the bill more difficult, and less democratic and less responsive to society's needs. The minister may reply that if we take such action there will be a delay in implementing needed reform. I acknowledge this argument. But it seems to me that any time we want to assert ourselves in this way, any time we rise in this chamber to say that we do not want to be vetoed, this argument will be made.

This bill, as important as it may be, is not the most important one that could come before us. Far more important than the passage or delaying of this bill at this time is the need for Parliament to assert itself, and for Parliament to reject what is being done with much of the legislation that goes from this House to the other place. I would think that this is the time for Parliament to do that.

Mr. Steven Otto (York East): Mr. Speaker, recently I congratulated the minister on the stand he took in connection with advertising. His was a forward-looking step, not that he had any axe to grind with the advertising industry but what he saw here was a phase of our economy which had gone haywire, where the costs and the benefits of so-called advertising just did not jibe with each other. Therefore, I was quite surprised to hear the minister support these proposed amendments.

You, Mr. Speaker, will recall that at second reading of the bill and resolution stage I said it represented a tiny step towards a cure for our corporate evils. I indicated the purpose of this type of bill was to recognize that our corporate structures have become derelict. They have not kept up with corporate structures in the United States, in Germany, or even in Japan where corporate enterprise is a fairly new thing. In fact, our corporate structures have continued on their own course without any change over a period of 60 or 70 years, and in many cases instead of being a benefit to our economy they have been a hindrance to it. The purpose of this bill was to introduce some measure of reform; first, to make corporation directors more responsible, to do away with inside trading, to give more information to shareholders, and to make sure that they act for the benefit of shareholders and the economy and not just for their own benefit.

[Mr. Saltsman.]

• (3:40 p.m.)

This was the purpose of the bill. The members of this House had that point in mind when examining the bill both here and in committee. The idea was a recognition of the fact that, especially in Canada, the directorships of corporations were far removed from the enterprise involved. As I pointed out to the minister some time ago, the American corporation law protects the minority investor. Most American corporations are controlled by people who make their bread and butter in that corporation. I refer to the vice-president in charge of production, advertising and finance. Fifty-one per cent of most American companies are controlled by people who depend upon that enterprise in order to make a living.

Under the Canadian corporate enterprise one man, the president, is involved with production or the success of that company. Everyone else is using the corporate structure as a big con game. I have been involved in the stock market and corporate structure for 22 years, as have some of my best friends. I often wonder how some of my friends can earn so much money when the corporation only pays them $500 a year to be a director, and I know they only hold a directorship in six or seven companies.

I have found that there is such a thing as subscribing for shares. Mr. Jones, my good friend Joe, is busy subscribing for shares. When he subscribes for a new share he does not put any money down. He does not have to put out a nickel. All he does is put down his name. The directors and their friends subscribe for the two million shares that are to be issued. Not a nickel changes hands until the shares are issued. Who decides when the shares are to be issued? The directors!

When Joe, Jim, Ralph and all the others dispose of their rights to purchase these shares at a profit of approximately $1 each, this amounts to approximately half a million dollars profit, which is not peanuts. When

they dispose of these shares to their brokers they ask Joe, Jim and everyone else if they have disposed of their rights. When they are assured that it is safe, they issue the shares and the directors make a bit of money. That is their main concern. I have no objection to them making money, but I have objection to a corporate structure being loaded from the start with an indebtedness which has not been earned. It is as simple as that.

Inside trading is a problem on all our stock exchanges, who is buying the shares and who is selling them? The members of the provincial governments have said they want this information because in most cases it should be made public so the innocent shareholder will know whether the boys at the top are underselling or overselling the market or whether they are indeed interested in the company. In most cases they are not interested. They are only interested in making a fast buck. This is the trouble with our Canadian corporate enterprise and stock exchange. I see the Leader of the New Democratic Party looking at me. It does not matter how many bills or pieces of legislation we put before this House to try to get Canadians to own Canadian enterprise, I will vote against them at this stage because I think Canadians will take an awful licking.

The first thing we have to do is clean up the corporate structure and reform the whole idea of the corporation and the stock market. If that is not done first, every Canadian who buys a share in a Canadian company will take a licking. It will be the Bay street boys who will make the money. They have done it for a number of years. There is nothing wrong with making money, but where is the priority?

If the priority in any type of corporate enterprise is to make money on the sale of stocks rather than what is being produced for the company, this is bad because all sorts of stories will come forth. While the stock may be a good stock, none of these stories will have any relation to truth. Indeed, it is really a great big con game. It is no good from the point of view of the corporation, the people who are interested in keeping that corporation alive and the shareholders who want to get some dividends.

It is no wonder that most of our money sifts into the United States where the shareholder is protected. In most states the shareholder of a private company is protected. In fact, under the FCC any shareholder may challenge a decision by a corporation, including the president. There are many procedures by which such challenges are sifted. There are priorities and precedents. Most of the American law now gives protection to the syndicate, private company and large public company shareholders. We do not have this in Canada.

In a private or sometimes even a public corporation, by the time a shareholder gets involved in all of the legal entanglements and the courts, he is finally told by the court that everything is done in this country according to a vote and if he does not have a proxy or a vote, nothing can be done.

The purpose of this bill is to try to clean up this mess in some way or another. In our case, we are interested in the economy of the country and in reform. The minister also has this interest. We have listened long enough to him in committee and in this House to know that. However, what was the interest of the Senate? It has become very fashionable for most corporations to have a senator on their board of directors. In some cases, it is a powerful senator and in others a nominal one. These senators are always called to the meeting an hour after it has been adjourned, but nevertheless they do have a certain influence.

The Senate is interested in protecting the status quo. This House and the other place are at cross purposes. An example of this is the amendments proposed. The Senate wants a change in subparagraph (3) of new section 98 so that it does not apply to a trust company that exercises control as a trustee.

Anyone with any experience in law or business knows how difficult it is to define who the trustee is acting for or to try to get information under the Trustees Act. The trustees say they cannot divulge this information because they are trustees. Under the guise of this amendment they can go merrily on in the way they have been going, except that most of the share exchanges will be done through a trustee.

In most of our common law courts a trustee has certain protection. The trustee says, after all I am acting as a trustee. Unless you can show just cause why I should divulge the information, I will not destroy the trust. There is shenanigan after shenanigan. The con game will really grow under the protection of this amendment. It is obvious.

The Senate suggests the phrase "wilfully fails so to do..." The reference is to supplying certain information. Of course, the wording relates to a refusal. Try to define "wilful refusal." If a man says he was in Puerto Rico for the summer, even though he may have

been on the telephone all day, he was away. The word "wilful" is a lawyer's dream. Anyone, including the minister, who wants to get entangled with the meaning of "wilful" will spend five years settling the meaning in the courts. Obviously, the word has been put in to protect the status quo. The Senate says to go ahead with the bill. If we put in these amendments they will not worry about it, but we will be acting under exactly the same situation as we were before.

• (3:50 p.m.)

I might go further, although I will skip some of the other sentences. The amendment indicates that subsections 9 and 10 as listed should be added to the bill. Proposed subsection (9) reads:

> Whenever, pursuant to subsection (8), a company makes an assertion based on matters of law, the directors and officers of the company may, subject to section 1061, rely on an opinion of counsel in making such an assertion.

What is the intention here? The company can say, "We listened to counsel." If counsel tells the company directors to do something which the minister at a later time may forbid by an amendment to a relevant section, the directors can say, "We listened to counsel; we are innocent." Also, you cannot blame counsel. He will say, "I am a lawyer and was merely giving advice." What are you to do? Will you charge counsel?

In line after line these amendments so obviously seek to protect the status quo. They seek to do away completely with the intent of the bill, and I am amazed that the minister has accepted the amendments.

Proposed subsection (10) reads in part as follows:

> A shareholder who, within the five calendar years preceding the meeting at which any further proposal of his is to be presented, has submitted two or more proposals—

In other words, if a proposal has been submitted and turned down, that proposal cannot be made again unless certain conditions are fulfilled. Of course, the majority of the directors and shareholders of the company must accept it. It is a fact of corporate life, and the minister will have to answer questions in this field because I have asked them before. When the directors of a company send out proxies, there is usually involved a cost of $20,000. The established directors of a company do not pay for those proxies; the company pays for them. If I, as a protester or advocate of change, wish to send out documents saying that the company is not doing its job or that other directors will make larger profits for the company, I have to pay for those proxies myself. There are not too many people who will pay between $18,000 and $20,000 consistently. So, the fact of life is that the proxies always support the incumbent directors. Naturally, any proposal coming forward of the sort described will be defeated. The directors can say, "You have brought it forward once or twice; you may do it no more." The proposed amendment seeks to give them five years of peace.

I will not vote against this measure.

Mr. Gilbert: Why not?

Mr. Otto: I support the bill because it is a step, a tiny step, in the right direction. Nevertheless, I am disappointed. The minister is supporting this obvious ruse which will do away with the effectiveness of his own bill. It is a bill which we admired and which most of us supported. The minister supported it.

I am speaking because I wish to ask the minister why he accepted these amendments? What pressure has been brought to bear? I am disappointed. I have tried to point out that if these amendments are accepted the minister will not have accomplished his purpose, the revision of this Act. Instead, he shall merely have introduced some small amendments to the Corporations Act. I urge the minister to examine these amendments. By relying on his own experience in the practice of law and corporation matters he will realize that each one of these amendments is meant to do something: they are meant to destroy the bill, clause by clause. The ones that do not have that intention are insignificant.

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, when the drug bill came before the House some time ago I said that the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford) was the shadow boxing champion of Canada. My reasons for so saying were well founded. As previously indicated, the minister's legislation with regard to drugs has had little or no effect on the prices of drugs across Canada. I also wanted to tag him with the name of shadow boxing champion of Canada because he has done little with regard to combines prevailing in Canada. He will have an opportunity in the near future to do something about bankruptcies. We have waited for a long time for amendments with regard to bankruptcies and failures. We are looking for the protection of creditors and shareholders in this field and look forward to seeing how the minister will act in connection with these

matters. In Bill C-4 the minister is maintaining his title as the shadow boxing champion of Canada because of his manner of dealing with corporate affairs.

The hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Saltsman) set forth our position accurately and clearly when he said that Bill C-4 just does not go far enough with regard to the disclosure of certain information. This was the thrust of our remarks when the bill was discussed at second reading and when it was in committee.

After reading these amendments, we have realized that strong pressure has been exerted on the minister through the Senate with regard to the amendments which came from that House. It disappoints me that a young, bold and courageous man like the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, who speaks loudly and with courage on the hustings about what he intends to do about drug prices, bankruptcies and corporate affairs should, when the legislation comes before the House, fall far short of his original intentions. One can only say that there is a weakness in the minister in these particular fields. He buckles at the knees when he is required to stand up for principles.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that after I heard the speech of the hon. member for York East (Mr. Otto) I thought, that he would do as the hon. member for Spadina (Mr. Ryan) did, disassociate himself from the Liberal party and march across the floor to join the ranks on this side.

An hon. Member: Which ranks?

Mr. Gilbert: After spending 20 or 25 minutes criticizing the minister vehemently, the hon. member said that he would vote for the amendments. That, to me, indicates a lack of boldness and courage on his part, and I am surprised. As I recall, he acted similarly on the matter of pensions. He spoke on behalf of pensioners and the plight they have been placed in by the government; yet, when it came to the crux, after having recorded his convictions he found it difficult to stand in his place and vote against the government. When the hon. member said that corporate enterprises are really a corporate con game, he was probably putting the truth in colourful but accurate language. He went into details to indicate how the great swindle is perpetrated and how directors are able to take advantage of situations and make large sums of money.

I thought he was pleading with the minister for changes which would clean up this situation. I thought he would vote against these amendments and support the position of our party because, in substance, we agree with what the hon. member for York East has said. How eloquently he told us that, cleverly and knavishly, the Senate has inserted the words "wilfully and knowingly" in the bill, making it a lawyer's dream when it comes to trying to determine meanings under certain circumstances which will arise as a result of the passage of this legislation. I am ashamed of the hon. member for York East, and I am doubly ashamed of the minister for permitting himself to fall into this trap concerning the wording of this amendment. One wonders why he did it, why he succumbed to the pressure from the Senate.

• (4:00 p.m.)

It may be that legislation is necessary to curb the enterprises of the members of the other place. When a cabinet minister is appointed from this House he immediately divests himself of all directorships. It is true members are not bound to divest themselves of shares, but in accordance with duty and custom they divest themselves of their directorships. The reverse is true with regard to members of the Senate. When they are appointed senators, directorships are added unto them. This may justify our saying there has been a corporate political pipe-line through to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. They seem to devote themselves to the protection of the corporations, directing their attention to the particular legislation which is forthcoming. Their small reward is their appointment as directors.

Recently a Senate committee brought down a report on the White Paper on taxation. Various explanations could be given for its heavy bias in favour of corporate enterprises, the way in which it ignored Mr. Average Man in favour of Mr. Corporate Man. Our research people have given me information concerning the number of corporate directorships held by members of the Senate, more particularly by members of the Banking and Finance Committee. I shall not take the time of the House by setting forth a list of all the directorships held by these members of the Senate; I shall simply draw attention to the directorships held by the Chairman of the committee to which I have just referred. The Chairman of the committee is a director of: Visking Ltd., Ucar Ltd., Emet Ltd., Ocean Maid Foods Ltd., Canadian Tuna Co., Atlantic Fish Processors Co. Ltd., Anglo-Rouyn Mines Ltd., International Helium Co., Veme Investments Ltd.,

Division

Provincial Service Agency Ltd., Electric Furnace Products Co. Ltd., Scotts Restaurants, Bank of Nova Scotia, Union Carbide Canada Ltd., Park Pen, Acadia Atlantic Sugar Refinery Ltd., United Steel Corporation Ltd., Allied Towers Merchants, Capital Wire Cloth Ltd., Acadia Pulp and Paper Ltd., Dominion Oxygen Co. Ltd., Domet Ltd. and National Carbon Ltd.

That is a list of the directorships the chairman holds. Can it be said he is acting impartially on behalf of the Canadian people when legislation comes before that committee? I could spend the next 15 minutes setting out the various directorships held by members of the Senate who formed the committee which studied this question. Is it any wonder that amendments coming from the Senate should be the type of amendment we have before us this afternoon?

As the hon. member for York East said, an attempt was made by the government in the first instance to deal with these trading and proxy problems in the light of the increasing sophistication of modern corporations. But by the time the legislation had moved from the House of Commons to the committee and back, and into the Senate and back, its original purpose had been defeated. I call upon the strong and free members of the Liberal party to stand up and vote against this bill. Let them pay no attention to the hon. member for York East. Even though he does speak eloquently, he has not the courage or the strength to vote against this measure. But I would expect other hon. members, more especially those from Toronto who know what happens on Bay Street and who are familiar with the corporate chicanery which prevails, to refuse to fall in and follow the weak shadow boxing champion of Canada, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Basford), which was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Alexander
Alkenbrack
Anderson
Andras
Asselin
Badanai
Baldwin
Barrett
Basford
Béchard
Beer
Bell
Benson
Bigg
Blouin
Borrie
Boulanger
Breau
Buchanan
Caccia
Cadieu
Carter
Chappell
Chrétien
Clermont
Code
Comeau
Comtois
Corbin
Côté (Richelieu)
Côté (Longueuil)
Crossman
Danson
Davis
Deachman
Deakon
De Bané
Diefenbaker
Dinsdale
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Downey
Drury
Dubé
Duquet
Éthier
Faulkner
Flemming
Forget
Foster
Gervais
Gibson
Gillespie
Goode
Goyer
Gray
Greene
Grills
Groos
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Guilbault
Harries
Hellyer
Hogarth
Hopkins
Horner
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)
Howe
Hymmen
Isabelle
Jamieson
Jerome
Kierans
Lachance
Laflamme
Lambert (Edmonton West)
Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt)
Langlois
Laniel
La Salle
LeBlanc (Rimouski)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Lind
Loiselle
Lundrigan
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
Macquarrie
MacRae
McBride
McCleave
McCutcheon
McGrath
McIlraith
McIntosh
McKinley
McNulty
McQuaid
Mahoney
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marshall
Mazankowski
Monteith
Moore
Munro
Noble
Noël
O'Connell
Olson
Osler
Otto
Ouellet
Paproski
Peddle
Pelletier
Perrault
Portelance
Pringle
Prud'homme
Ricard
Richard
Richardson
Roberts
Robinson
Rochon
Rock
Roy (Timmins)
Ryan
Serré
Sharp
Simpson
Smerchanski
Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Southam
Stanbury
Stanfield
Stewart (Cochrane)
Stewart (Marquette)
St. Pierre
Sulatycky
Thomas (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Thomas (Moncton)
Thompson (Red Deer)
Tolmie
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Valade
Whelan
Whicher
Whiting
Yewchuk—158.

[Mr. Gilbert.]

NAYS

Messrs:

Barnett
Beaudoin
Benjamin
Brewin
Broadbent
Burton
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Fortin
Gauthier
Gilbert
Gleave
Godin
Harding
Howard (Skeena)
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Lambert (Bellechasse)
Latulippe
Lewis
MacInnis (Mrs.)
Mather
Matte
Nystrom
Peters
Rodrigue
Saltsman
Skoberg
Tétrault
Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley)—28.

• (4:30 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Mr. Robert P. Kaplan (Don Valley): Mr. Speaker—

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

Mr. Kaplan: Mr. Speaker, I would like to record that I was present for this vote.

An hon. Member: Why did you not vote?

Amendments read the second time and concurred in.

HUDSON'S BAY COMPANY

ESTABLISHMENT AS CANADIAN CORPORATION

The House resumed from Monday, October 5 consideration in committee of Bill S-25 respecting Hudson's Bay Company—Mr. Basford—Mr. Laniel in the chair.

The Deputy Chairman: The House again in Committee of the Whole on Bill S-25 respecting the Hudson's Bay Company. When the committee rose last evening clause 2 was under consideration.

Clauses 2 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Bill reported.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs) moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

• (4:40 p.m.)

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): The main purpose of this bill is to continue the company, subject to the laws of Canada, with its head office in Canada. I think that this move has been long overdue. We in Manitoba are particularly pleased that this will mean a transfer of the head office of this company from London, England, to our capital city in Manitoba. I think it is significant also that this move has been made in the year 1970 when Manitobans are celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of their province. I suppose there must also be some significance in the fact that this is the three hundredth anniversary of the company itself.

All of us who have lived in the northern areas have from time to time been very closely associated with the operations of the Hudson's Bay Company. Mention has been made in this House by hon. members to the left of the exploitative nature of the operations of the Hudson's Bay Company with regard to the native people of Canada. I must say that on some occasions I have had the opportunity to discuss these matters with officials of the company in Winnipeg and in other places. I will not spend any time in giving the lengthy history of the company, but I think we should all realize that three hundred years of continuous operation of one company is outstanding in any nation in the world.

In 1670 the company was granted a charter by King Charles II, and in that same year they attempted to establish a fort at the mouth of the Nelson River where it flows into Hudson Bay. However, in 1684 they established York factory which was their base of operations in our western regions for 275 years until that operation was closed in 1957.

At Churchill, on the west coast of Hudson Bay, the company established a fort in 1685, some five miles upstream from the mouth of the river. I believe that that operation only lasted one year. It was destroyed by fire. Then, in 1718 they re-established their operations at Churchill at the mouth of the river.

All of us living in northern areas have had differences of opinion from time to time regarding the operations of this company and their attitude toward the native peoples but, in general, I would say it has been exemplary. We only need to look at the conditions of the local Indian people living at Churchill today

and compare them with the conditions of the same band of people when they were settled some 150 miles away from Churchill at a place named Duck Lake. Their only contact with the outside world was through the Hudson's Bay Company. At that time they lived a very different life from the one they are living today. The conditions in which they are living at Churchill are exceedingly discouraging as compared with the conditions in which they lived at the time when they were living on their own land and hunting and trapping off the resources of the land at Duck Lake. At that time they were under the supervision of the Hudson's Bay Company and the records of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development show that they led a very happy, enjoyable and productive life.

Coming back to the complaints which our friends to the left have voiced regarding the exploitative operations of the Hudson's Bay Company, I need only say that I hope they do not compare them with the general attitude of private enterprise because the same complaints have been made about the free traders, not those of the Hudson's Bay Company, who have been dealing with the native peoples in northern Canada. I also hope that our friends who have been criticizing the policies of the Hudson's Bay Company with regard to the Indian people will talk to the present government of Manitoba and find out about the necessity for making changes in the Manitoba government agency called the Manitoba Development Fund. Recently I approached them to try to secure some capital for an Indian person who was interested in opening up a grocery store in one of the northern reserves in competition with the Hudson's Bay Company. I was told by officials of this Manitoba government agency that they had no money to lend for a proposition of that nature. So we must realize that private enterprise did invest money in the Hudson's Bay Company.

Of course the Hudson's Bay Company received a tremendous grant of land called Rupert's Land, which, I am told, extended from Labrador to the Rockies, from the headwaters of the Red River to Chesterfield Inlet of Hudson Bay. This was a tremendous subsidy to give to any one company. However, one other fact that I think has unfortunately been overlooked by many people in Canada is that were it not for the operations of the Hudson's Bay Company, particularly in western Canada and possibly in the province of British Columbia, the territory that is now part of Canada would undoubtedly belong to the United States.

[Mr. Simpson.]

• (4:50 p.m.)

Had it not been for the Hudson's Bay Company there would have been no "54-40 or fight." It would have been "54-40 for the States and no fight". On behalf of the people of Manitoba, I am pleased that this legislation is being passed by the House today. We Manitobans are pleased to welcome officials and the officers of the Hudson's Bay Company to our province. As one who believes in decentralization, I am only sorry they did not decide to move their head office to one of their older established points in Manitoba, the town of Churchill.

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

CANADA GRAIN ACT

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION, PROVISIONS RESPECTING GRADING, LICENCES, ELEVATORS, ETC.

On the order:

Report stage of Bill No. C-196, an act respecting grain, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Agriculture—Mr. Olson.

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, if I might I would like to rise on a point of order. If you would like to go ahead and present the proceedings on Bill C-196 do so, but I rise on that point.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Would the hon. member for Crowfoot state his point of order?

Mr. Horner: Yes, Mr. Speaker. My point of order is to obtain from you a clear ruling and a clear interpretation of Standing Order 75(3) which says:

The report stage of any bill reported by any standing or special committee shall not be taken into consideration prior to forty-eight hours following the presentation of the said report, unless otherwise ordered by the House.

What I would like clarified is the fact that apparently the government is assuming that this bill was reported to the House on the last day the House sat before the summer recess, Friday, June 26, where in *Hansard* of that date at page 8619 there is a brief notation

that the fourth report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture was tabled.

I think there is a very interesting point developing here due to the fact that in the Standing Orders there is also a rule which suggests that any amendments to be debated on report stage must be filed 24 hours before the subject matter comes up for debate. If we are assuming that the committee report to the House of Commons is the beginning of the 48 hours then we are robbing—I say robbing in the full meaning of the word—the 24 hour period which is now available to Members of Parliament to study the bill on the Order Paper.

This bill came on the Order Paper only on Monday, yesterday. We should have 24 hours to prepare amendments. I argue that it was the original intent of the rules that the bill be on the Order Paper for 24 hours, and in that 24 hour period members could prepare amendments and submit amendments.

After the 24 hours have elapsed, if the bill is to come up 48 hours exactly after it has been placed on the Order Paper, then the bill may come before the House. But if we accept the idea of the 48 hour period as mentioned in Standing Order 75(3), then I say Members of Parliament have to be prepared the very minute a committee brings in its report on a given bill to the House, before they see a reprint of the bill with whatever amendments the committee may have made. If they want amendments to be in order for debate on report stage, they have to file them on that same day.

A very important precedent may be established through this ruling. I contend that it is not fair to the Members of Parliament who sit on the backbenches of any political party that they have to pick up *Votes and Proceedings* for Friday, June 26, which is not even printed yet. On Friday, June 26 the chairman of the committee, or in this case the deputy chairman, brought in the fourth report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture. But *Votes and Proceedings* for June 26 was not printed on June 26. It was printed only on June 27, and it has all the listed amendments. However, the listed amendments are not in their proper place in the bill.

So, we are saying that the 48 hour period mentioned in the rules begins with the chairman bringing in the report, and we are establishing a very interesting precedent. We are also establishing another interesting precedent in the fact that if a government really wanted to hurry things up it might be better to adjourn for a week and come back, because in that intervening period the 48 hours are used up to some extent and members are robbed of their 24 hour period for filing amendments. By coincidence one could argue that that is exactly what happened in this case. If the government wished, it could say that the 24 hour period disappeared in the summer holidays, and that amendments had to be filed on Monday or even before Monday. If this precedent is established, it represents one more erosion of the free expression of thought which must always be available in the House of Commons.

If free expression of thought is not available in the House of Commons, then I say to parliamentarians that they have only themselves to blame for disruptions in the street. Such will happen if you do not give full vent and full opportunity for the expressions of thought by elected representatives in this place. A very important precedent is being established here, and I could not let it go without expressing due warning and concern to the Speaker and to all members of the House.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) has brought up an important procedural question and I think it will be of value to have the guidance of your ruling on this point. As to the substance of the matter I think the hon. member, if I understood him correctly, said that *Votes and Proceedings* for June 26 are not yet available.

Mr. Horner: Not on the 26th.

Mr. Bell: Not on that date.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): It certainly was available on June 27.

Mr. Horner: Where were we then? Where was the House of Commons.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): *Votes and Proceedings* containing the committee amendments, published on June 27, has been available to the hon. member in his office for a period of approximately three months, and so I contend that the hon. member has had a full opportunity to consider and reflect on the committee's work. However, that is not really his contention in this particular case. His contention is a narrower one on the interpretation of the rules.

As a matter of fact I think we have to agree that by the practice of the House over

the years 48 hours has not meant 48 hours, just as 24 hours has not meant 24 hours.

Mr. Horner: It certainly has.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Perhaps the hon. member, who may have something more to say, will let me continue. In other words, it has been long established by precedent—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Five o'clock.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): On a point of order, I point out to the hon. member that it has been established by precedent—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): That does not stop the clock.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I am sorry but I think this is a serious and important point. I hope that the hon. member will participate in the discussion on it, and not prevent me from speaking on it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The suggestion has been made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) that it is five o'clock and perhaps we might go on to private members' business. At the same time a very interesting point of order has been raised by an hon. member.

• (5:00 p.m.)

There may be agreement on the part of hon. members to hear comments of those interested in enlightening the Chair at this point. I might say, in view of the intervention of the hon. member for Crowfoot yesterday, I have given the point a very serious thought in the meantime. I certainly have no intention of making a decision until such time as I have heard the views of very learned and experienced members of this House on such matters. If there is agreement, perhaps we might exhaust the point of order which has been raised by the hon. member for Crowfoot and then go on with the private members hour. Is this agreed?

Mr. Horner: Before it is agreed, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that I have always been a defender of the private members hour and the right of the individual to make full use of the private members hour. Realizing that we have all evening to iron out this legal and technical problem, I am not particularly anxious to tread on private members who may have a subject for debate in this period. I would hate to use their last private members hour to debate a rules question which should be considered during House of Commons time.

[Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale).]

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): On the point of order, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps I could put a question to the hon. member. This has been called as the next item for the business of the House. The Chair would have a better opportunity over the dinner break to study the various points made. It seems a simple logical suggestion and a courtesy to the Chair to put the arguments now so His Honour can consider them and rule on them at eight o'clock. If the hon. member says he will not permit it—

Mr. Horner: It depends on the private members.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Perhaps I could ask whether I could have the indulgence of the House to finish my remarks, which I assure Your Honour will be very brief.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I wonder if I could make a suggestion. I may have to use my most appealing voice after what I have heard recently. I wonder if we could proceed with this question of the point of order raised by the member for Crowfoot and get it settled. Could we not also face the fact that doing this will cut into the private members hour and perchance the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) may just as soon let his bill go and take it up on some other occasion? After all, there is a social event most members are going to during the supper hour. Maybe we will finish this point by half past five at which time we could call it six o'clock.

Mr. Thompson: The hon. member who has just spoken seems to have lost his concern for the rights of the private members of this House. We very rarely get an opportunity to speak. I have been waiting exactly 12 months to bring this bill before the House. It seems we should not take this last opportunity—

Mr. Horner: I do not think there is unanimous consent.

Mr. Speaker: The way things are going now it appears we will be spending the whole hour deciding whether we should take any part of the hour for the procedural matter, five minutes of this very important hour having elapsed already. The hon. member for Red Deer being obviously anxious to get on with the presentation of the matter, we might go on to private members business and hear further on the point of order at eight o'clock.

[*Translation*]

It being five o'clock the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's Order Paper, namely public bills, private bills, notices of motions.

[*English*]

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION ACT

AMENDMENT TO ESTABLISH OFFICE OF PARLIAMENTARY COMMISSIONER FOR ADMINISTRATION

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer) moved that Bill C-40, to amend the Financial Administration Act (Parliamentary Commissioner for Administration), be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

He said: Before speaking to the subject matter of Bill C-40, Mr. Speaker, I have a minor complaint I would like to bring to the attention of Your Honour. I did not realize that I did not have my copy of Bill C-40 in the House. Our copies have been removed due to the summer recess and the fact that we are only sitting for a few days. In the few minutes before five o'clock I desperately tried to get a copy of Bill C-40. I am informed that distribution have none and there are none in the House. While at this late stage of this session such a thing could well be an oversight on the part of distribution, it seems that copies of the bill ought to be available.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the Chair might assist the hon. member by letting him have the Chair's copy of the bill.

Mr. Thompson: I really was not concerned about Your Honour having a copy of the bill. I was concerned about the people on the other side who need to read this bill. I was hoping they might at least study it while I am speaking. I do not think many of them have taken time to read it. It was really of my concern for them that I was speaking, but I do appreciate Your Honour's generosity.

For at least eight years, Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to bring before this House the need for an ombudsman, a parliamentary commissioner, a man who can be concerned with the rights of the private citizen, particularly as they relate to the growing power and ever-increasing dominance of the public service in the normal life and living of the individual Canadian.

Bill C-40 is a little at variance with previous bills I have presented because with this bill the auditor general would have added to his responsibilities, his terms of reference, that of parliamentary commissioner for administration. This does not require the expenditure of any new moneys. It does not require the setting up of a new office. It would merely expand the work which the auditor general already does.

In the month of December, 1964, the auditor general appeared before the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections at which time the committee was concerning itself with the study of a bill which I had the privilege to sponsor. This Bill would have established formally an office of parliamentary commissioner. It is interesting to note that committee gave unanimous support to that bill, passed it, and referred it back to the House of Commons. A few months later in the Speech from the Throne, as the policy of the government of the day, we were assured that an ombudsman would be appointed, during the current year. However, nothing came of it. Neither did a similar promise in the Speech from the Throne which followed the next year.

In those hearings of the committee, the auditor general explained that he spent a great deal of his time acting as ombudsman on matters relating to taxes and financial administration of the country as they reflected down to the individual citizen. At the time he said that he received at least two or three letters a week with regard to this. He usually conferred with the deputy minister of the department involved, basically the Minister of Finance or the Minister of National Revenue. He said it was gratifying to know that many of these complaints had come to him, not because he asked for them, but because of the nature of his office, and that he was able to provide a satisfactory answer.

• (5:10 p.m.)

It was through these hearings and as a result of the government's failure to act on its promises that the idea of administrative ombudsman and this bill was born. Basically, the Auditor General would act as parliamentary commissioner. In that capacity it would "be his duty to investigate the administration, by a power or authority or officer of such power or authority, of any law of Canada whereby any person is aggrieved or, in the opinion of the commissioner, may be

aggrieved." It is interesting to note that under this bill 1.75A(2) the only cases to be submitted to the Auditor General, in this capacity, would be those referred to him by Members of Parliament.

A great deal has been said about our 264 Members of Parliament actually serving as 264 ombudsmen. We cannot challenge that statement, because a good part of our time as M.P.'s is spent doing this type of work, and it is our responsibility to undertake it. I think it strengthens democracy in the eyes of the public if we carry out such functions. However, what concerns me, Mr. Speaker, is that very often problems come to our attention which, under the terms of reference and the authority we can muster, we cannot deal with, even though we wish to make sure that the citizen concerned receives justice in his complaint. We do not have the power of inquiry; we do not have the facilities for research and investigation that an ombudsman would have or that the Auditor General has. It is important therefore, in my opinion, that there be this extension of the work which we admit is our responsibility. I believe it can only be satisfactorily carried out by the establishment of a formal office such as we are speaking about.

There are other points in the bill I wish to bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker. There are one or two matters that are perhaps of prime importance. One of those is this: the auditor, acting as commissioner or as parliamentary commissioner, if you will, "before investigating a grievance shall inform the power or authority or officer of such power or authority administering the law of Canada whereby any person is aggrieved or, in his opinion, may be aggrieved, of his intention to investigate". Thus, this officer acting as ombudsman would be working with the various departments that relate to administration matters. His function would be limited but it would strengthen, in my opinion, not only the work of the department concerned but also the confidence which the public has and must have in its administration. That is vitally necessary if democracy is to be effective. Evidence submitted by the Public Accounts Committee and contained within the reports of the Auditor General shows that there have been many mistakes and non-productive payments. The best known example of these is probably the matter of the *Bonaventure,* so far as a waste of money is concerned.

Mr. Bell: Hear, hear.

[Mr. Thompson.]

Mr. Thompson: If mistakes have been made in the administration as that relates to the spending of the taxpayer's dollar, surely they have been made in defence, public works or other departments of government. How much more likely is it, therefore, that there are many cases of grievance that affect the very lives and rights of Canadian citizens.

The Auditor General has proved his worth over and over again; he has even embarrassed the government in recent years. He has proved the effectiveness of his office. On the basis of existing evidence it seems to me that the office of ombudsman is necessary for the individual Canadian citizen. This bill constitutes the simplest way of bringing this about. The establishment of this office would be the simplest way of correcting administrative errors and mistaken judgments. The ombudsman is equally important for the individual citizen.

I am going to mention two cases which have come to my attention in the last few months. Both cases involve senior citizens who thought they had no redress and whose difficulties seemed insoluble. One case concerned a man who, through a mistake in submitting his income tax in 1969, was assessed $157.17 more tax than he had paid. This man is a senior citizen and not in very good health. When he received the communication from the tax department telling him that failure to reply or respond to its notice within 15 days would result in legal action without further notice, he panicked. He envisioned himself being taken to jail and immediately went out to seek some friend or bank or person from whom he could borrow this money that he was being asked to pay. He did not question in his mind whether he could successfully fight the department. He knew of no way he could appeal. I happened to investigate the case. I learned that he did not have the money to even repay the loan. In going over his income tax return I realized there must have been an error. Mistakes have occurred before now. Perhaps I will be able to correct this mistake. The matter is being investigated at the present time. The point is that if there had been an ombudsman, perhaps the tax officials would have looked over the man's case more carefully. Perhaps the official writing the letter would have been a little more careful or more concerned about the matter.

Another example concerns a man who is 68 years of age. He has been unable to establish his proof of birth. It so happens that he had a stroke about five years ago and his memory

has almost gone. He can remember his name; he knows where he was born; he is a new Canadian and knows the year he came to Canada but does not remember the year he took out his naturalization papers. He doesn't remember what has happened during the past several years and does not have any documentation to show where he was born, or that he is a citizen. He can recall the country in which he was born but not the town or date. For three years this man has been given the run-around by the officials who are supposed to authorize a man's eligibility for a pension. He has spent $50, I think, in having census searches undertaken with the hope that he may be able to find a record of his name. This was done because officials of the Department of National Health and Welfare insisted on it. He even received a letter which I recall and which reads in part something like this: "Obviously, you do not exist." Something is wrong when an employee in a government service makes a statement like that.

The man's problem has been straightened out now and it turned out that the answer was a simple one. I was able to find out that this man had served for a number of years in the armed forces and of course the armed forces kept his records. Nevertheless, the man has lost his pension for three years. He needs it and cannot collect it retroactively. The fact that this happened illustrates that there have been errors. This man has had to go through much merely to prove that he was born.

I have used these illustrations purposely. Perhaps they represent situations that Members of Parliament can successfully find the answer to. Nevertheless, they indicate that very often an individual's rights can be abrogated without there being any redress. It seems to me that it is our responsibility to correct situations like this in Canada which may exist on a larger scale than we suspect. A simple and effective way of dealing with them would be by extending the authority and terms of reference of the Auditor General in order to allow him to act as an ombudsman with respect to administrative matters.

May I mention that Great Britain has taken a step which illustrates the legitimacy of my argument. The man who was appointed Britain's first ombudsman was appointed to investigate grievances against government departments. The man appointed in 1966 to this office was the Comptroller and Auditor-General, Sir Edmund Compton. His title is Parliamentary Commissioner. It does not matter what the title of the office is, but I do believe we ought to expand the terms of reference of the Auditor General so that he can carry out a most important service to the public which is not now being provided.

• (5:20 p.m.)

This bill extends the terms of reference of the functions of the Auditor General to include that of ombudsman, which is the very thing the British ombudsman actually is. I would remind hon. members that the famous Glassco report of 1963, which we have talked about ever since strongly recommended there should be an ombudsman to hear the grievances of the public and attempt to remedy them. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has told us in reply to questions that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) could serve as ombudsman. I know—and the minister knows as well, because he is a friend of mine—that as Minister of Justice we cannot serve as a parliamentary commissioner or as a defender of civil rights as far as the government is concerned. In fact, I am sure the bureaucratic resistance to the ombudsman idea does not come from the Minister of Justice. I do not think it comes from the Prime Minister, either. Rather it comes from those who make up the multifarious boards, tribunals, councils and agencies which largely create the laws they administer and do not want an ombudsman checking up on them. I believe this is the influence which causes the opposition in this House, on the government side.

It is about time we put the rights of Canadian citizens above those who are supposed to serve the Canadian public as far as the civil service is concerned. Time does not permit me to elaborate on this battle with the bureaucracy which continues. With respect to our Canadian Civil Service I believe it is one of the most effective and efficient in the word, but this is an age of big government, an age when the government and its agencies increasingly take over responsibilities which were formerly regarded as being the normal responsibilities of individual Canadians.

One of the historic men as far as the idea of the ombudsman is concerned is Sir Guy Powles who is the ombudsman for New Zealand. He has served in this office in an outstanding way and he is regarded with respect by government officials in his own country and by all those who know what his office means, as well as by the ombudsman who have been appointed in various countries and states since. Over and over again when he appeared before our committee in 1964 he insisted that the little man needed the services of an ombudsman. His argument ought

to be convincing enough. Great progress has also been made in the establishment of the ombudsman office in many areas of the world. The ombudsman idea began in Sweden. The office has been instituted in Denmark, in Norway, in the United Kingdom, in New Zealand and in many other countries and states as well. We now have an ombudsman in Quebec. I believe the worth of the office has already been substantiated. There are also ombudsmen in Alberta, New Brunswick and Manitoba, and bills to establish similar offices are before the legislatures of other provinces. The office also exists in Hawaii as well as in several other states of the United States. It is a very interesting fact that on at least 25 large university campuses there are campus ombudsman. I could list the names of these universities if I had time. Where universities have taken the lead in this direction a very beneficial effect has resulted in the morale of the student population. I could mention other areas in which an ombudsman or an official or agency with similar functions have been established. There is the procurator of justice in the Soviet Union, and the presidential complaints committee in the Philippines; in Japan there is the bureau of civil liberties with commissioners in every precinct and district.

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

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Continue.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Is it agreed that the hon. member may continue his presentation?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Thompson: Thank you very much. I will close with a sentence or two. Even in the United States military, which is plagued with the problem of draft-dodgers and deserters, the Inspector General of the United States army performs a similar duty to that of the military ombudsman in Sweden.

Finally, the Auditor General does now carry a parliamentary responsibility in Canada in relation strictly to financial matters, and his office could be easily expanded to include this office. The rapid expansion of the civil service and the extension of administrative authority demands a means of protection for the individual. Such protection of civil liberties has not kept pace with the growth of bureaucracy. I commend this bill to the favourable attention of the House. I believe that though it is a very small step it is a very vital step. Hon. members are being asked to extend the functions and terms of reference of the auditor general to include the normal duties associated with the office of ombudsman as they relate to administrative matters.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. It is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 4, to inform the House that the questions to be raised at the time of adjournment tonight are as follows: The hon. member for Edmonton Centre (Mr. Paproski)—Films; the hon. member for Brandon Souris (Mr. Dinsdale)—Indian Affairs; the hon. member for Fraser Valley East (Mr. Pringle)—Energy, Mines and Resources.

The House will now pursue its study of Bill C-40, an Act to amend the Financial Administration Act.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION ACT

AMENDMENT TO ESTABLISH OFFICE OF PARLIAMENTARY COMMISSIONER FOR ADMINISTRATION

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Thompson that Bill C-40 to amend the Financial Administration Act (Parliamentary Commissioner for Administration), be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, this is one of the subject matters which came to me in my former responsibility as President of the Privy Council in view of the fact that I shared with the Minister of Justice the responsibility for considering and advising the government on not so much the narrow question of the ombudsman but, really, the process for the review of administrative action which included among other things within my own responsibility, the evolving procedure for examining statutory instruments upon which we shall be having a bill and also a motion for a change in the stand-

ing orders in the next session of Parliament, the consideration of such institutions established in other countries as citizen's advice bureaux, the consideration on the part of my colleague, the Minister of Justice, of the review of federal administrative action in existing tribunals, for example, his reconstruction of the tax appeal board provided for in the tax review board appeal measure which was before the House during the current session and upon which we hope to have further discussion and action in the forthcoming session, and his substantial recasting of the federal court system so as to provide more effective procedures through the regular courts for reviewing administrative action—

An hon. Member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): In the absence of my colleague I have the pleasure of speaking on this question as it relates to my own responsibilities or rather to those of the President of the Privy Council and I shall also be so bold as to say one or two things which may relate to his responsibilities as Minister of Justice.

It does seem to me that notwithstanding the British example the role of the auditor general is not really compatible with the role of an ombudsman which we are discussing. As the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) has said, the responsibility of the auditor general is a financial one. I was a member of the committee at the time to which he referred. I was then parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Justice.

• (5:30 p.m.)

I was a member of the committee at the time Dr. Donald Rowat, Sir Guy Powles and Mr. Henderson, the Auditor General, appeared before the committee. The Auditor General was called, not so much to give evidence with regard to his role as ombudsman as much as to give evidence as an appointee of Parliament and as to the structure of an institution which, by analogy, might enable the committee to make recommendations as to the future role of ombudsman or parliamentary commissioner.

One thing I would say to the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) is that he is persistent in this regard. He and I were both members in 1962, which was when he made his first initiative. I am sure that one of the first points of order he must have argued was the procedural status of a bill which he put forward in that year as a member of the opposition. In this regard he has also had some difficulties with the rules, particularly the rule against imposing a charge upon the Crown. However, in regard to this bill I would have to congratulate the hon. member on his having finally found a way to put the measure before Parliament. It is an important question that he has put before Parliament and it is useful that we discuss it.

The greatest problem at which he is reaching in his bill and which the other measures advanced by my colleague have been reaching by the change in structure of the courts system, the establishment of a House committee on statutory instruments or the establishment of citizen's advice bureaux throughout Canada is the review of administrative action. There is a vast volume of problems in this regard which do not relate to matters financial or even to the substance of the law, which may not be in doubt. They relate to the manner in which the administration is carried out, for example the manner in which a particular federal official may carry out his duties. Then there is the question of the failure on the part of any given official who represents one point of view, namely, the government's, to provide an opportunity to the individuals with whom he is dealing to be heard; in other words, the failure to hear both sides of the question. I agree with the hon. member's assessment of federal public servants in this regard. It is not a question of dishonesty or ignorance or malice but rather of excess of zeal on the part of public servants in the performance of their duties.

With regard to the situation presented by the hon. member, although I recognize the problem his constituent had, there is a remedy for it. There is a tax appeal board, which in my view—I say this as a lawyer—has become too much the province of lawyers. This is why we are now putting forward a tax review board which could deal with such situations.

Mr. Thompson: How could the old man go to the appeal board?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): That is why I was pointing out that we are proposing to restructure the board along more humane lines, making it possible, for example, for the hon. member himself to appear before the board with and on behalf of the gentleman in question. The second example—a common one, as all Members of Parliament know—is the kind of situation in which the advice of an ombudsman is not required so much as the institution of a citizen's advice bureau.

During the Christmas recess I had the opportunity to be in the United Kingdom and while there met with the officials of a private non-profit organization responsible for citizen's advice bureaux, bureaux that are funded in part from public funds. I met the administrators, visited a number of these bureaux and saw them in action. It would seem to me that this might be the sort of institution that could better deal with the kind of problem referred to by the hon. member.

Owing to the very uniqueness of the word, I suppose, "ombudsman" has become a kind of magic phrase which has caught the fancy of editorial writers. As the hon. member pointed out, since he first started his efforts in 1962 the expression has very much caught the attention of legislators around the world. It was about that time that New Zealand was considering establishing an ombudsman. As the hon. member has pointed out, the United Kingdom has an institution of this kind, as well as certain provinces, including his own, New Brunswick and others.

As I have said, we in this House made a very extensive study in the middle 1960's during which the hon. member and I examined the various merits of such an institution. I have already cited the example of New Zealand and I think it is important to point out that both Denmark and Sweden have ombudsmen. I might add West Germany, where I believe the institution is still in existence though it confines its functional responsibilities to questions involving military service. Putting aside the institution in the United Kingdom for a moment—I will deal with that later—let me illustrate the chief characteristics of those communities in which the establishment of ombudsmen has been such a success. Firstly, the community has been, in relative terms, small in population; that is to say, a population of up to approximately eight million. If someone rushes to point to the example of West Germany, may I remind him that their institution does not concern itself with the full panoply of government but, rather, deals solely with questions arising under the German military.

In addition to small population there is a relatively homogeneous population; that is to say, communities where there have not been substantial differences in language and where there is no substantial ethnic difference. Further, the volume of work to be handled by the ombudsman was such that it could be effectively dealt with by one person. The point was particularly emphasized to us, both in the manner of the description of his function by Sir Guy Powles and in the conclusion that one could draw from his experience, that the far most effective weapon which an ombudsman—particularly the one I met, Sir Guy Powles—could bring to his job was not the right to report to Parliament or to take any kind of legal proceedings in regard to administration, but was the impact of his own personality in dealing with the particular administrator involved. Therefore, there is a necessary limit to the number of cases with which an ombudsman can deal on this personal sort of basis.

One of the hesitations that I have about such an institution—a hesitation that can be overcome by various expedients—is the rather different nature of Canada compared with the relatively small, unitary, homogeneous state in which ombudsmen have been really successful. I put aside the case of the United Kingdom, even though it is a unitary state, because I require that their case be further proven. Given the great geographical expanse of Canada and our federal form of government, we have a population of roughly 22 million now, compared with eight to nine million in Sweden, though that figure is subject to correction. We also have ethnic and linguistic differences. Consequently, I do not believe that a single ombudsman could effectively discharge the responsibilities that one would put upon him. Therefore, one would have to think in terms of a panel of ombudsmen, and at that point one approaches the creation of something akin to the conseil d'état of France, which has a panel rather than a single individual. This is not really an ombudsman but, rather, a different type of institution. I shall have more to say about the conseil d'état in a moment.

Different solutions have been adopted throughout the western world for dealing with the problem of excess of zeal on the part of administrators. The ombudsman is one of those institutions which is of Baltic origin and has become recognized as one solution. Then, of course, there is the parliamentary system. In the United States there was passed the Administrative Procedure Act. In France, with various adaptations, particularly since the Napoleonic period, there has been the institution of the conseil d'état.

• (5:40 p.m.)

If I may bring to the debate a certain national bias in favour of one particular institution, I suggest that in terms of the protection of civil liberties probably the partliamentary

system has been the most effective weapon. The question period is part of the political process that focuses attention upon individual problems. The grievance procedures provide a number of ways under the rules both of this Parliament and that of the United Kingdom, of an opportunity for debate and examination of questions of supply. This provides an opportunity for bringing clear to the public eye individual grievances. Because this opportunity is there the administration is made conscious of the fact that arbitrary action can in due course be subject to some kind of review in Parliament. The parliamentary system has provided excellent protection through that opportunity for review and examination, and it has been entirely through a political rather than a legal process. I think if one looks across the full range, going back several centuries, one can claim that our own system has had a very considerable measure of success.

The fact that we have this bill before us today, the fact that the United Kingdom has a parliamentary commissioner, and the fact that a number of Canadian provinces, which also have the parliamentary system, have created an office which is comparable to that of an ombudsman, is recognition that there is a limitation in our parliamentary system and that the system has not been fully capable of satisfying the requirements. I think this limitation would have to be recognized, as the hon. member has done. Even if we had the greater facilities for individual Members of Parliament to which he referred, for example, the facility of a secretary and a constituency office where during a member's absence while in Ottawa his constituents would have the right to recourse to him by message being passed on, and what is often more important a facility at this end—because as hon. members know, it is all very well to talk of a problem during a 15 minute interview with a constituent but this may involve up to two hours telephoning trying to track it down with the public service—there is a limit on what 264 members can do. I take it that for this reason other jurisdictions have adopted the ombudsman system as an institution. The hon. member has put in his bill a connecting link so as to establish and make clear the primary responsibility of Parliament with regard to the institution and the fact that the parliamentarian has to be the initiator of action rather than the parliamentary commissioner.

Having described what I regard as one of the most satisfactory systems, let me say a few words about what I think is one of the least satisfactory systems, that is, the Administrative Procedure Act of the United States. Even with my professional bias I can say this has been a cardinal example of how badly things can be done from time to time by lawyers. I think one would have to say, in defence of the members of my profession, that the United States Administrative Procedure Act arose not so much through a professional bias of that kind, but—I think I am correct in saying this—out of a necessity to meet the requirements of the United States constitution and the ultimate right under the Bill of Rights to have recourse to the courts system. I suggest that the APA, as it is known, makes this case of administrative procedures the least satisfactory one due to the nature of formal litigation which is expensive and time consuming. It has had the effect of a denial of the process of administrative review through the courts. There has to be a big question, there have to be funds behind the individual and he must have time if he is to obtain ultimate and effective recourse under the Administrative Procedures Act.

We too are to a degree establishing that kind of system in Canada and we are to a degree reconstituting our own court procedures so as to provide better procedural access and a better basis for administrative law than has existed in the past. There is, no doubt, the kind of situation which an administrative system can handle with the necessity of a rather formal proceeding. What is required is a less legalized proceeding which an individual can follow such as, for example, that which an ombudsman is designed to handle. This brings me to the institution for which I have particular admiration—the institution in France to which I referred earlier, the conseil d'état. As the parliamentary system and common law has been evolved in Anglophone countries, so the conseil d'état is a unique institution which has evolved from an entirely different institution. The French started off as we did, with an institution of one kind, but procedure has caused it to be adapted in another way.

I had the opportunity, when I was Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice, of visiting the conseil d'état in Paris and of talking to the secretary of that august body. I had an opportunity of observing the scale and nature of the problems with which they deal. I must say that that institution as such has great appeal to me. It seems to me it is one of particular success in France since it was

established. During the period of the Algerian war it gained the enviable reputation of being the protector of individual rights. The conseil d'état also has been particularly effective in areas in which, for example, the courts system has often failed, in providing quick action at a very limited cost to particular applicants. The value of the conseil d'état as opposed to the ombudsman is that it is a fairly substantial body. It is, incidentally, a body drawn from the upper cream of the French public service. The relationship between the adjudication of problems and the administration is indicated in a sense by the fact that a conseiller d'état may be on leave of absence working with a particular department or agency of the French public service. They may work back and forth between them.

The essential thing involved in an effective administrative procedure is, first, humanity and fairness to the individual involved and willingness to listen to the problem. But probably most important of all, an institution like the conseil d'état must have the full respect of the administrators, just as the administrators in our country have full respect for the courts, just as they have for Parliament. In France one of the great secrets of success of the conseil d'état has been the respect in which it has been held.

I think we should always hesitate to adapt to our own country an institution of another state. These are often very delicate institutions founded in the national psychology of circumstance and individual need.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the minister, but his time has expired.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the House would allow me to make a few more remarks. I will undertake to desist after that.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Is the House agreeable to giving the minister an extension of time?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I was making the point that I think we have to be careful in adapting particular institutions to our own body politic without a very full understanding of the underlying mentality of the body politic from which they are adapted. They have to be fully understood, and understood in a much deeper sense than just knowing the rules involved. With that view, I think it is important that we should reflect deeply upon the institution of an ombudsman as it might apply in Canada as a federal state of broad expanse which has by definition and by rule a non-homogenous population. Secondly, we should think very hard and long about the adaptation of an institution here, particularly when thinking in terms of the kind of institution that might develop.

I agree, as I know my colleague would agree, that it is important to try to evolve a good means of administrative procedure and to try within the framework of our courts and parliamentary systems to deal with these problems. I think this debate has provided a useful opportunity to put some of these problems forward and I hope we will be able to resolve them in this Parliament.

Mr. Alastair Gillespie (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I commend the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) for his persistence and for the thoughts which inspired his Bill C-40. In a very few minutes I have been able to familiarize myself with some of the background of this bill. I have been able to review, for instance, Bill C-13 and some of the debate which took place earlier this year.

• (5:50 p.m.)

On that occasion it seemed to me there was a very full debate on some of the key issues, many of which have been touched upon by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Macdonald). I was touched by some of the examples given by the hon. member for Red Deer. I can well imagine the frustration of the individual who was seeking proof of his birth. The suggestion which came back via the bureaucracy, or the computer, that he did not exist and could not be alive reminds me of the story of the individual who upon reading in the newspaper of his untimely death, when speaking to friends said, "The news of my demise has been greatly exaggerated".

I think we all feel the kind of frustration the hon. member for Red Deer articulated this evening and which indeed, as I have indicated, inspired his bill. I refer to the frustration of the individual in dealing with the government. Let us face the fact that big government will get bigger. As our society becomes more complex and more sophisticated, the problem of remoteness and alienation which exists between the individual and the institutions of this government will grow; it will not become less.

The Minister of National Defence touched upon some of the ways in which we might bring an immediacy to government and to the people. In particular he referred to the possibility of constituency offices and their use. If I have time at the end of my remarks I shall comment on that suggestion. At this time, however, there are three points I should like to make to the hon. member for Red Deer. I accept the proposition of the shrinking individual relative to the growing government. But I seriously question whether the ombudsman system—and that, after all, is what we are talking about—would work at the federal level. I seriously question whether the Auditor General is the appropriate person, even in the event it should be found possible that an ombudsman system might work at the federal level. I think the issue here is that of the independence of the Auditor General vis-à-vis Parliament and Members of Parliament.

I question the timing of this bill. During May and June of this year the Public Accounts Committee spent many hours dealing with the role and status of the Auditor General. In the report that was tabled before Parliament on June 26, one of the recommendations was that the duties of the Auditor General of Canada as spelled out in the present legislation are satisfactory. In its report No. 34, the Public Accounts Committee dealt in some detail with the recommendations of the Auditor General's department. This was done after many meetings, many of which were attended by the Auditor General himself who participated as a witness. At the present time the government of Canada is considering the recommendations of this committee. For that reason I think it would be inappropriate for the House at this time to refer this bill for further study in committee.

Let me say a word or two about the federal-provincial aspect of an ombudsman's function. The Minister of National Defence has already indicated the difficulties and dangers of embracing an institution suited to other jurisdictions and adopting it with little or no change to our jurisdiction. He pointed out in his remarks, as did the hon. member for Red Deer, that four provinces, Alberta, Manitoba, Quebec and New Brunswick have adopted the ombudsman system. Surely it is far easier to adopt in a limited jurisdiction where the geography lends itself to the type of contact that is essential between the individual and the ombudsman. The hon. member for Red Deer in his remarks referred to universities and the fact that some of our universities had adopted the ombudsman system. Here again I suggest the geographical and homogeneous nature of a constituency lends itself to this arrangement.

One or two items in the hon. member's bill worry me from the point of view of the independence of the Auditor General. This is my second point. For instance, it would appear that any aggrieved party could initiate action provided he or she obtained the concurrence of a Member of Parliament who would then process the grievance. It is made clear that the commissioner, the ombudsman, shall act only at the instance of a member of the House of Commons, as the elective, representative body in Parliament, and on complaint of personal injustice suffered by a complainant. This, surely, raises real questions about the independence of the Auditor General, because the bill provides that the Auditor General could refuse to process or investigate a grievance. Surely no stretch of the imagination is required to visualize the situation he would be in if he should refuse to do so, having first accepted the task at the instance of a Member of Parliament.

The Auditor General could be subject to all sorts of party or individual political pressure, which I think would spoil the essential independence of his office. Nor does the bill make clear whether it would be at the instance of an individual or of Parliament, that is, at the instance of an individual acting separately or Parliament acting collectively.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. It being six o'clock, the hour appointed for the consideration of private members' business has expired and I do now leave the chair, to resume the same at eight o'clock p.m.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ABDUCTION OF SENIOR BRITISH TRADE COMMISSIONER—STATEMENT BY MINISTER

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I understand that the Secretary of State for External

Affairs (Mr. Sharp) seeks leave of the House to revert to motions. Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I announced to the House the news of the kidnapping of James Cross, senior British Trade Commissioner in Montreal. Hon. members asked to be kept informed of developments in this case. I now have a further statement to make.

Shortly after I spoke yesterday, I was given a summary of the document containing the terms demanded by Mr. Cross's captors for his safe release. The document itself is in the form of a statement or communiqué. It is not addressed directly either to the federal government or to the Quebec government, nor was it delivered directly. The communiqué confirms that Mr. Cross is in the hands of the Front de Libération de Québec and sets seven conditions for his safe release. These conditions can be summarized as follows:

1. The police investigation is to be stopped;

2. Wide press and television publicity is to be given to a so-called political manifesto of the FLQ;

3. Over 20 prisoners are to be released;

4. Facilities for their transportation by plane to Cuba or Algeria are to be arranged;

5. The LaPalme workers are to be rehired on the terms and conditions set out by the union before the breakdown of negotiations;

6. A ransom of $500,000 in gold is to be paid;

7. Public disclosure is to be made about an alleged informer in the FLQ.

The communiqué demands that these conditions be met within 48 hours from the time of the issuing of the communiqué. Clearly, these are wholly unreasonable demands and their authors could not have expected them to be accepted. I need hardly say that this set of demands will not be met. I continue, however, to hope that some basis can be found for Mr. Cross's safe return. Indeed, I hope the abductors will find a way to establish communication to achieve this. All the authorities concerned are dealing with this case on the basis that we have the double responsibility to do our best to safeguard Mr. Cross and at the same time to preserve the rule of law in our country. The House can be sure that everything possible is being done. I trust that hon. members will not ask me to go into this delicate matter further at this moment.

[Mr. Speaker.]

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CANADA GRAIN ACT

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION, PROVISIONS RESPECTING GRADING, LICENCES, ELEVATORS, ETC.

The House resumed consideration on the order:

Report stage of Bill No. C-196, an act respecting grain, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Agriculture—Mr. Olson.

Mr. Speaker: I believe that when the House rose at six o'clock the Minister of National Defence had the floor on a point of order which had been raised by the hon. member for Crowfoot. The Chair would like to know whether there are additional submissions to be made for the guidance of the Chair in this respect.

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, in the unavoidable absence of the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Macdonald) who was replying to the points raised by the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner), may I at least try to give my opinion which perhaps will be helpful to you in considering the point of order raised by the hon. member.

The hon. member referred to Standing Order 75. He maintained that 48 hours notice was required before a report from a standing committee could be considered by the House. We have no argument with that point, but we do contend that since this report was made to the House and recorded in *Votes and Proceedings* of June 26, that requirement has in fact been met in all respects: the time that has elapsed is in fact three months.

We do not contest the point argued by the hon. member, that there may be some provisions within that report which have amended the bill in a major way, but we are also aware that members of the House, through the mailing facilities and the distribution office, have in fact received a copy of all the amendments that the committee considered and recommended to the House in the report. If my information is correct, that document was in fact available to all members in July. Indeed, the bill was reprinted some time in July and was made available to hon. members. It seems to me that it is not valid to argue that in view of the fact that the House was in recess hon. members were not in receipt of or aware of the mail that was sent to their offices during the period of recess.

The hon. member also argued the principle of the 24 hours notice. I think it is a very important principle. I submit for your consideration, Mr. Speaker, that the 24 hours rule, which appears many times in the Standing Orders, has already been established. It is one that has been used by the government on many occasions. It has also been used by the opposition. It states that any notice of an amendment or other business that is provided for under all of the Standing Orders that is filed with the table by six o'clock on the day preceding the proceedings is, in fact, deemed to have been filed 24 hours in advance of that sitting.

To add weight to that argument let me say it is well known—I am sure the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) and the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) know this—that on the days when the opposition have the privilege or the right to give 24 hours notice of a motion under the rules, the 24 hours requirement is considered to be met if the text is filed with the table by six o'clock the day before the sitting. Of course, in considering the notices that have been given, the rule has been complied with as far as Bill C-196 is concerned.

• (8:10 p.m.)

It seems to me that if we were to argue otherwise—and the hon. member for Crowfoot did argue otherwise—we would be changing a long-established principle. For that and a number of other reasons including, in my view, the need to get on with this bill, I hope that the hon. member and you, Mr. Speaker, will agree that all the requirements that are long-established have indeed been met both with respect to the 48 hours notice and the 24 hours notice.

Mr. Horner: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has already made his argument on the point of order, if this is on the same point of order. I would hope we would not get involved in a situation wherein everyone would speak two or three times on the same point of order. I do not want to be unfair to the hon. member; I recognize it is an important matter. If he wants to speak briefly, to add to the points he has made, the Chair has no objection to hearing him, with the agreement and consent of the House. Then perhaps we should hear other contributors and I will try to give the ruling in due course.

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): I appreciate your concern, Mr. Speaker, with regard to hearing new thoughts and receiving new guidance with respect to the ruling. I appreciate the position you are in, and I do not want to take the place of any member who may want to speak on this point of order. But you will bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, the fact that when instigating the point of order I rose somewhat hesitantly to suggest that this is a precedent and requires clarification of the rules under which we are now operating. Therefore, I did not make all my argument respecting clarification of the rules of the House but I made enough to entice other hon. members to contribute to the debate.

There are further suggestions that you, sir, and the House should hear respecting a full understanding of the rules. But before speaking on the rules I wish to say that after hearing the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) make his statement I felt rather small, as a member of the House, and felt that my problems were rather small in light of the problems confronting the government—in fact, confronting Canada—in this grave situation. Having said that, I would refer to Standing Order 75(8) which reads as follows:

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

The particular phrase to which I would direct your attention is, "when the Order of the Day for the consideration of a report stage is called." We are now at that point; we are now calling for presentation of the report stage of Bill C-196. I may have referred to Standing Order 75(5) before the supper hour, but for clarification and continuity I wish to read it now:

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

So I say to you, sir, that without any shadow of a doubt 24 hours notice must be given before amendments at the report stage of a piece of legislation can be debated in the House of Commons. Standing Order 75(3) reads:

> The report stage of any bill reported by any standing or special committee shall not be taken into consideration prior to forty-eight hours following the presentation of the said report, unless otherwise ordered by the House.

I contend that the intent and the meaning of subsection 3 bear a direct relationship to the meaning and clarification in subsections 5 and 8 of the same Standing Order, because the stated principle is that the report stage commences 48 hours after a committee has reported, that is, 48 hours after the committee's report has been tabled and published in the Orders of the Day and not from the instant that the report is tabled in the House. *Hansard* for June 26, at page 6819, simply records as follows:

Fourth report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture—Mr. Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean).

That is all it says, but more is recorded the next day in *Votes and Proceedings*. You frown, Mr. Speaker, but you and everybody in the House of Commons knows that *Votes and Proceedings* are printed the following day, so that 24 hours have elapsed before members are given notice of what took place in a committee. I happen to be one of those fortunate members who knew full well what took place in the committee because of my active participation in the work of the committee. But there may come a day when I may not be a member of that committee, when other members may not be serving on it, and we will not know what took place.

You, sir, should gauge the precedent which will be established by your ruling. As an example I suggest it would be very wise for all committees' chairmen and vice-chairmen to present committee reports on a Friday and not on a Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday. Then we gain the advantage of a lapse of 24 hours, because in most cases the House does not sit again until the following Monday and on that Monday between 2 p.m. and 6 p.m. members who may want to move amendments at the report stage must file them—

Mr. Olson: It is an advantage.

Mr. Horner: —or their amendments will not be considered on Tuesday if the government decides to proceed with the report stage on the Tuesday. In essence, the difference between 48 hours and 24 hours is really boiled down to four hours, the period from 2 p.m. until 6 p.m. on a Monday. This is a grave difference.

• (8:20 p.m.)

We in this country are gravely concerned about the desire, will and expression of the people which is being vented in demonstrations, parades and bombings. I shudder to even mouth the words that it may be even going as far as the Secretary of State for External Affairs suggested tonight. It may be going that far because the freedom, desire, expression and will of the people is not being expressed in this place.

The reduction from 24 hours to four hours is duly noted on this occasion. I say to the new House Leader that it is a suppression of the free desire and free will of the citizens of this country through their elected representatives. I give that warning to the new House Leader. This is a suppression and a reduction of the free feeling and free expression which is so very important in today's society. We are knowingly, after I have clearly enunciated these words, suppressing the feeling of the people, whether that feeling is being expressed by a minority, a racial group or a group of a different colour.

We are establishing a precedent in this House of Commons. The reduction of the 48 hours notice to 24 hours is really a reduction of 24 hours to four hours. I say that with a great deal of meaning and care. I want Your Honour and the members of this House to fully appreciate what has taken place today, because hon. members will rue this day.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, as hon. members of this House know, and I am sure that my friends in the Progressive Conservative Party will confirm this, when a fellow member of the opposition raises a point of order and feels aggrieved, if I think he is wrong I usually stay in my seat. I reserve my fighting on points of order for the other side. Accordingly, I am reluctant to get into this debate tonight because it is a member of the opposition who feels aggrieved. But in my view, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) is confused in his thinking about this matter. Indeed, if his contention were accepted by Your Honour, we would have a great deal of confusion in the House.

Mr. Horner: No, we would not. We would have a great deal of clarification.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I point out first, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Crowfoot contends, in decibels that I cannot match, that we are doing something new by this procedure in deciding that 48 hours means the second sitting day after notice is given. I can certify from my experience of nearly three decades that it has been done that way for a long, long time. I suggest that as far as the 24-hour notice is concerned, despite what the Minister of Agriculture (Mr.

Olson) said, we have had 24-hour notice provisions only since the last revision of the rules.

Mr. Horner: I agree.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The 24-hour provision, since it came into effect, has meant one day from the point at which the notice was given until the matter was debated.

Mr. Simpson: How much is ten feet of flooding?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On the Red River it is a lot. I think the basic point of confusion of the hon. member for Crowfoot is that he thinks that the requirement for written notice mentioned in two or three places in Standing Order 75 is the same thing as that notice appearing on the Order Paper. I invite him to face this fact, that written notice is something that a member writes out and hands to the Clerk at the table before six o'clock on any day. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that is not just an assertion of mine but that it is spelled out clearly in Standing Order 42. The last sentence of Standing Order 42 (1) reads:

> Such notice shall be laid on the table before six o'clock p.m., or before five o'clock p.m. on a Friday, and be printed in the *Votes and Proceedings* of that day.

When a member has given notice in writing to the table on any day before six o'clock, or before five o'clock on Friday, then the 24 or 48 hour period counts from that day.

Mr. Horner: I will speak again on this point.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): May I remind the hon. member for Crowfoot that on occasion he has been the official opposition spokesman on motions at the report stage, and I believe also on the motion on an opposition day. What happens on an opposition day?

An hon. Member: Very little.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): An opposition member files notice this afternoon and gives it to the table by six o'clock. Tomorrow it appears on the Notice Paper. Tomorrow we debate it. And nobody gets up and says, "We have not had 24 hours. We have not seen this on the Order Paper for two days; it has been on the Order Paper for only a short while." Yet Standing Order 58 (4), which covers this point, is in the same language as the wording in Standing Order 75. Standing Order 58 (4) (a) reads:

> Twenty-four hours' written notice shall be given of an opposition motion on an allotted day or of a notice to oppose any item in the estimates.

It does not say that the notice must appear on the Order Paper 24 hours before the day it is debated. It says the written notice must be given to the Clerk at the table the day before it is debated. I submit, with respect to my hon. friend, that he is confusing these two things. The written notice required in the rules is what the member hands to the table. The appearance on the Notice Paper in the case of a 24-hour rule, or on the Order Paper in the case of a 48-hour rule, is a different thing. I already referred to Standing Order 42. In Beauchesne's fourth edition there is a citation that bears on this point. Citation 188 reads:

> (1) The publication of a proposed motion, once in the *Votes and Proceedings* and the next day on the order paper, is sufficient to cover two days' notice under Standing Order 41.

The reason it says 41 is because Standing Order 41, when this book was written, was the order that is now Standing Order 42. It has been that way from the beginning of time. As far as the 48-hour rule is concerned, notice is given one day, it appears on *Votes and Proceedings* that we see the next sitting day, and the day after that it appears on the Order Paper. As a matter of fact, we debate matters under the 48-hour rule on the first day that they appear in writing on the Order Paper. I therefore ask my hon. friend not to confuse these two things, the written notice that he gives to the Clerk at the table and the appearance of it on the Order Paper.

We have in our possession now 30 or 40 amendments to Bill C-196 at the report stage. Some, perhaps most of them, are in the name of the hon. member for Crowfoot. He gave the notice yesterday.

Mr. Horner: No.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): He did not?

Mr. Horner: Before yesterday.

An hon. Member: He was here all summer.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): All right. They were not on any previous Order Paper. Yesterday was the first sitting day since June 26. The hon. member gave notice yesterday as far as sitting days are concerned. They were not on yesterday's Order Paper.

The written notice was given as of yesterday, so that they are on today's Order Paper and therefore they are debatable today, as have been his previous motions at the report stage and as have been his motions on opposition days. I submit that the wording of Standing Order 75(3) is clear.

• (8:30 p.m.)

Mr. Horner: And 73(5).

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I was speaking of 75(3). The wording is clear.

Mr. Horner: Abundantly clear.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Standing Orders 75(3) and 75(5) do not say that things have to be on the Order Paper for 24 or 48 hours. They say that there must be a 24 or 48-hour lapse of time from the point at which the notice is given to the Clerk at the table until the point at which the matter is taken up. All the Standing Orders that are relevant, all the various sections of Standing Orders 75 and 58, use that same language. In no cases does the time date from the point at which a motion has appeared on the Order Paper. The time dates from the point at which the written notice is given to the Clerk at the table.

The Clerk at the table on June 26 had notice, because it was given to him here in the House by the spokesman for the committee on that occasion, who said that Bill C-196 with amendments had been reported. As a matter of fact, I think I could make a case for the government's right to proceed with this bill yesterday. I think it would have been unfair, but the government could have done that.

Mr. Horner: Emphasize those words. Will the hon. member emphasize what he is saying, sir?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Not only do I think it would have been unfair—and one always hesitates to say what has gone on in the house leaders' meetings—

Mr. Horner: Why would it have been unfair?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Just one moment. The hon. member has made two speeches.

Mr. Horner: I will make a third speech, too.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): That will require unanimous consent. In the house leaders' meeting it was agreed by the government representative that it would be unfair to proceed with this matter yesterday, and that is why it was not proceeded with. The fact of the matter is that on scores of occasions, in the years I have been here, I have filed notices on Friday and they have been on the Order Paper to be called on Monday because 48 hours had elapsed. So the practice is clear, and we should have nothing but confusion if we were to start today what the hon. member for Crowfoot asks.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): He suggests we are limiting freedom of speech, indulging in suppression and getting rid of democracy; we are doing something terribly serious because we are cutting 24 hours down to four.

Mr. Horner: That is what we are doing.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I suppose the hon. member has the right to indulge in such nonsense. The fact of the matter is that when notice is given, and where 48 hours is required and the matter is not proceeded with until two days later, the rule is being kept; and when the rule requires that 24 hours is enough notice, after one day we have the right to proceed with the matter. The case is very clearly established, and I think we should be just getting into confusion if we went the way the hon. member for Crowfoot suggests.

In speaking about the new situation created by the report stage may I say that, like some other hon. members, I was a member of the Special Committee on Procedure that drafted the rules, and we were quite clear on what we wanted.

Mr. Horner: I was a member of that committee.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I was a member of it all the time, and we were quite clear on what was happening. We said that a bill would be reported and that it must not be possible for that bill to be debated for two days, so that there would be one intervening day for the opposition or any member to put down amendments. I think we erred on one point: we ought to have covered the weekend situation.

Mr. Horner: Oh!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I think it is a bit unfair that a bill could be

filed on Friday and called on Monday at the report stage. Yet nobody, not even the wicked government on the other side of the House, is trying to practise that unfairness.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Let the hon. member for Crowfoot face the fact that the government did not try to proceed with this bill yesterday.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): What we are trying to bring about is some order, and I think order is better than confusion.

Mr. Speaker: The point of order raised by the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) is in essence the same as the one which he brought to the attention of the House during routine proceedings yesterday. The hon. member's statement is reported at pages 8708 and 8709 of yesterday's *Hansard*. With the permission of hon. members I will quote the hon. member's statement:

> On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, it has been my understanding that before debate commences on a given government item it must be on the Order Paper for 48 hours. To my knowledge it was impossible for government order 82 to be on the Order Paper for 48 hours because the Standing Committee on Agriculture only submitted its findings to the House on June 26, the last sitting day before the summer recess, and no Order Paper has been published since that day. Therefore I doubt whether, without unanimous consent of the House, we can deal with this item until it has been on the Order Paper for 48 hours.

As I said, this is essentially and basically the point of order which has been raised for the consideration of the House by the hon. member for Crowfoot. This is a relatively new Standing Order, of course, and the practice in relation to Standing Order 75 has not yet been established completely. Because of this I have indicated to the House my view that the matter is one which deserves serious attention. The point has been the subject of an interesting debate this afternoon and this evening, and in light of the advice extended to the Chair I think I should at this time give a ruling.

The facts as presented by the hon. member for Crowfoot, by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Macdonald), by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) and by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), are basically not controverted. There is agreement on the sequence of events in relation to this matter.

The report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture was tabled in the House on Friday, June 26 last, as appears in *Votes and Proceedings* for that date. This was the day on which Parliament recessed for the summer. As is the usual practice, distribution was made of those *Votes and Proceedings* the following Monday, June 29. The House met after the summer recess on Monday, October 5. Again, as is the practice, during the week before the resumption of the business of the House on October 5, the Order Paper was distributed to hon. members. That Order Paper carried as a government order the entry dealing with the report stage of Bill C-196. According to the Notice Paper appended to today's Order Paper, a number of motions standing in the name of hon. member for Crowfoot and other hon. members were received prior to 6 p.m. yesterday, October 5. Standing Order 75 deals with the report stage of public bills following their consideration in committee.

Hon. members have referred the Chair to sections 5 and 8 of Standing Order 75. Perhaps for the record I may be allowed to quote sections 3 and 5 of the relevant Standing Order. Standing Order 75(3) reads:

> The report stage of any bill reported by any standing or special committee shall not be taken into consideration prior to forty-eight hours following the presentation of the said report, unless otherwise ordered by the House.

Standing Order 75(5) reads as follows:

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

The question for the Chair to determine is whether the requirements of the relevant Standing Order have been met. Section 3 of Standing Order 75 is clear that a committee report cannot be considered by the House until 48 hours have elapsed following the presentation of the report. How is this requirement to be interpreted?

There is another Standing Order which requires 48 hours notice. The unquestioned practice of the House has been that the 48-hour notice requirement is met when that period extends over a weekend or over two sitting days. For example, a notice tabled at six o'clock on Monday may be dealt with at two o'clock on Wednesday. Similarly, a notice filed at six o'clock on Wednesday can be dealt with by the House at eleven o'clock on Fri-

day. A notice filed Friday afternoon can be dealt with on Monday afternoon at two o'clock, in spite of the fact that two sitting days have not elapsed between the time of filing of the notice on Friday and the consideration thereof on Monday.

• (8:40 p.m.)

I am sorry I am using a precedent which dates back to April 14, 1913, but I thought we should go back somewhat to indicate that this has been the practice for many years now. This precedent confirms my interpretation of the Standing Order, an interpretation which was accepted before the ruling of 1913 and which has been followed since then. The ruling can be found in Beauchesne's third edition at page 827.

If the 48-hour requirement is met in the circumstances I have just outlined, it has certainly been met if the report has been filed on a Friday and the report is brought forth for consideration on the following Tuesday, even if there has been an extended recess between the two days. I appreciate the point raised by the hon. member for Crowfoot, that it would have been unfair and contrary to the spirit of the Standing Order to have attempted to proceed to the report stage yesterday, since in practice there would not have been the proper time in which to file amendment motions. On this basis I suggest the report stage could not have been proceeded with yesterday. In fairness to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), this is a point which was made very clearly by him.

The point is that the motion was not put yesterday, precisely in order that the spirit of the Standing Order could be complied with. I must therefore conclude that the 48-hour requirement specified in section 3 of Standing Order 75 has been met in the present case. In like fashion, the 24-hour notice required under section 5 of Standing Order 75 is met if notice of amendments is filed at six o'clock for consideration at any time during the following day's sitting. Indeed, most of the notices filed by virtue of Standing Order 75(5) during the past and current sessions were received and considered by the House as a result of this interpretation of the Standing Order.

I personally appreciate the fact that this matter was raised. It placed the Chair in the position of having to reflect on the interpretation of the Standing Order. Perhaps the interpretation I have given is not completely to the liking of the hon. member for Crowfoot or of other hon. members, but it was difficult to reach a contrary decision if, as I feel, the Chair is bound by precedents. If hon. members feel that the rule as I have interpreted it is not conducive to fairness, their remedy is to change the rule and it may be hon. members might wish to do that in due course. But for the moment, after due consideration and having looked at the matter with all possible objectivity, impartiality and fairness, I can reach no other decision than the one I have just communicated to the House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-196, respecting grain, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Jack Horner (Crowfoot) moved:

That Bill C-196, an act respecting grain, be amended by adding to subparagraph 2(10)(a)(i) the words "trucking firms approved as public carriers under section 3 of the National Transportation Act" after the word "ships".

He said: I realize it is against the rules for an hon. member to comment on a ruling by the Chair, Mr. Speaker, and for this reason I shall refrain from doing so. However, I fully appreciate the words of wisdom and guidance you have given the House. Indeed, I raised the question to hear those words of wisdom and guidance as well as to alert the House to the dangerous error inherent in our rules. As you may be aware, Mr. Speaker, I have submitted a number of amendments to this bill; I have not calculated the total number but somebody tells me it is 38.

Mr. Olson: Forty-four.

Mr. Horner: The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) suggests it is 44. I think that may well be the total number of amendments submitted by all hon. members. I raise this question purely for the sake of clarification. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether you or your staff have considered these amendments and reached any conclusion as to whether they are in order. I am, of course, prepared to deal with my first amendment, but before I do so it would be helpful to know which amendments are in order and which are not in order. We would then have a clearer idea of the workload ahead of us during this session.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is asking the Chair to make a ruling on motions which have not yet come before the House. As he has himself pointed out, there are many motions for consideration and perhaps it would have taken more time than the Chair

and its advisers have at their disposal to have considered the acceptability of each one of them. The Chair has been under the impression that we might not reach the end of that long list by tomorrow. The thought of the Chair was that we might at least start on the first one, which is in order. The second and the third also appear to be in order. That should be enough meat to keep the House interested for the next few minutes.

If for any reason it was decided, for example, that we might sit after the normal adjournment hour tomorrow night to consider the hon. member's other amendments, we might be in a position to make a ruling as to whether they are acceptable.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member would agree to our sitting tonight until his amendments have been dealt with.

Mr. Horner: I appreciate the extent of the workload which is placed before the House. It was in these circumstances that I inquired whether you, Mr. Speaker, or your staff, had reached any conclusions about the acceptability of these amendments. Bearing in mind that we are establishing precedents, I thought that question might be posed this evening.

I have read the rules carefully and I see that according to the rules the mover of an amendment is given 40 minutes speaking time. The first amendment in my name is an important one because it deals with the subject of rail line abandonment. But before dealing with it I have a suggestion to make and something in the nature of a request to put forward. As we have heard, I have placed on the Order Paper something like 38 amendments to this bill, and this might well give rise to the question: Why has one particular member done this?

• (8:50 p.m.)

What basic objection do I have to the passage of the bill? I can give my reasons each time I rise to speak to my amendments and then go on to deal with the detail of such amendments. However, what I would like to do is this. I ask permission of the House to explain my basic reasons for suggesting that the bill is badly framed and why I have placed on the Order Paper 38 amendments to a bill that comprises 114 clauses.

If the House feels that I must stick strictly to each amendment as it concerns the whole rationalization of the railways and their problems in western Canada, let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, and the minister that I can spend a full 40 minutes on that subject. However, in my initial speech I should like to take a broad approach to the list of amendments. Perhaps the House would give me some guidance in this regard.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to the hon. member ranging over a broad field, but I think that what must be borne in mind is that it is extremely important in the minds of the majority of farmers that the bill be passed so that changes in the grading system can be put into effect. Secondly, virtually all the amendments put forward by the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) and others were thoroughly discussed in the committee. He has the right to revive that discussion; I do not question that. But it does seem to me that there is no useful purpose served in attempting to restrict the hon. member strictly to clause 1, and I do not ask that that be done. It seems to me the hon. member should take the interests of the farmers to heart.

Mr. Horner: I do have them at heart.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) stated the rule correctly when he said that on amendment motions the rules require that speeches made in the course of debate should be strictly relevant to the motion before the House. At the same time the Chair is in the hands of the House. The hon. member seeks permission to make a general speech on the first of his motions. If the House is in agreement, the hon. member will be granted this permission. I am not sure whether it will extend to other hon. members who want to take part in the debate on the first motion proposed by the hon. member, but we will cross that bridge if and when we get to it.

Mr. Gleave: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I am wondering whether I understand you correctly. Surely on a given amendment there cannot be one judgment for one speaker and another judgment for another. I should like to know from the Chair whether the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) is going to be allowed to roam over the whole spectrum of the bill. If so, surely this would apply equally to those who speak to the same amendment. Is that not what the hon. member requested?

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

Mr. Horner: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the words of the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave) and his concern in regard to a wide-ranging debate on the part of members of the House. I do not particularly want to engage the House in a wide-ranging debate on the bill; all I want—perhaps this is a little selfish of me—is to explain the general purport of my objections to Bill C-196 and the reasons I have filed so many amendments to it. I am prepared to do this when speaking to my first amendment to clause 2(10) of the bill.

I did raise the question in the committee, and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) is quite right to refer to the committee proceedings. If one wants to check the record, it is found in committee proceedings No. 39, the purport of my argument being at pages 18 and 19.

Mr. Olson: And repeated at page 21.

Mr. Horner: The minister advises me it is also at page 21, so he is well aware of the matter. The hon. member for Medicine Hat has undergone a tremendous transplantation in thinking in his move from the party that used to be to my extreme left, the Social Credit Party, to the Liberal Party. I say transplantation in thinking, not in brain, though I realize brain transplants are a very recent happening.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member has been given the permission of the House to make a speech general in nature, but I am not sure that the generality should extend this far.

Mr. Horner: I appreciate Your Honour's ruling and I should like to deal in a general way with the bill. This bill creates a mammoth change in the grain industry.

Mr. Olson: An improvement.

Mr. Horner: The minister says it is an improvement. He has made a very important statement and I will write it down. In duly recording those words, let us ask ourselves: An improvement for whom?

Mr. Olson: For the farmers.

Mr. Horner: The minister says it is for the farmers. This act, which has been in effect for 40 years, was designed to safeguard producers' rights; to safeguard them in matters of weighing, sampling, grading, shrinkage, dockage, shipping, boxcars and so on. The purposes of the new act bear no relationship to the purposes of the old, and this is why I wanted to record the words of the minister. Indeed, the new act enables the government and the railways to control and manage—

An hon. Member: The bureaucrats.

Mr. Horner: Yes, the bureaucrats, as a colleague of mine says—to control and manage the grain handling industry. It does not ensure that the farmers receive fair treatment in the handling and grading of their grain. This new act places the government in complete control at, perhaps, the expense of the producers. The point I want to make clear beyond any shadow of a doubt is that this new act will interfere with the operations of the Wheat Board. The Wheat Board was set up to handle and to safeguard the rights of the producers in the marketing of their grain. It was to bring order into the marketing of grain.

• (9:00 p.m.)

It has often been said that the whole purpose of the bill is to bring about the orderly marketing of grain, not on the part of the railroads, not on the part of the terminals or on the part of the grain companies but in the interests of the producers. But the new act is not designed to give any such assurance to the producers. It in fact interferes with the board which was set up to ensure the producer orderly marketing. I will enunciate just why it does this. We have been told that protein grading means everything. We were told last June, May and April that we had to have protein grading or there would not be a bushel of wheat sold. When I asked Mr. Monk at the committee about this, I had in mind whether he wanted to establish protein grading so that Canada could sell wheat with the highest protein content, perhaps 15.8 per cent or 16 per cent. I asked him whether he wanted Canada to be in a position to sell wheat of this grade, or whether he wanted Canada to be in a position to sell wheat with a uniform protein content. Mr. Monk said we should be in a position to bring about uniformity of our sales and to create uniformity within our grading system in respect of export sales.

Some people have suggested that we are losing sales to Great Britain because we are not selling grain of a high protein content. That is a very interesting suggestion but it has nothing to do with creating uniformity of sales. It is interesting to note what the newspapers say in this regard. The *Western Pro-*

ducer of July 16 had this to say about protein grading:

> Protein grading of Canadian wheat will not replace the traditional standards of quality, according to an expert in grains grading.
>
> Dr. G. N. Irvine, director of the Canadian Agriculture Grain Research Laboratory at Winnipeg, Man., says protein grading "is intended to add a new criterion, and in this way to supplement and improve the present system."

What he is saying is that protein grading will not replace traditional standards of quality. Let us not forget that the old standards are still good. The effect of protein grading amounts to only an addition. This has been the main hue and cry by those who insist that this bill is an absolute necessity because we cannot sell wheat without protein grading. That was the cry last spring? What is the situation today? It is interesting to note what the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool has suggested. Let me read from the *Western Producer* of May 7, 1970, as follows:

> The pool directors point out that uniformity of protein is important in maintaining markets—

One could go on quoting from various newspaper articles. The *Western Producer* of July 23 in its editorial states:

> The demand has grown for wheat of a uniform protein standard—

There is no question that in today's marketing system uniformity can be established without this bill being passed. In fact, the elevator companies were instructed to gauge the protein content of grain received as long ago as July 1. In fact, the Minister of Agriculture stated as early as March 9, as reported in the Regina *Leader Post*:

> There is some doubt, even if enabling legislation is passed, that a completely new wheat grading system could be worked out in time for the new crop year, agriculture minister Olson said Thursday.

That makes it abundantly clear that it was never conceived that this act would be put into operation this fall. What are the facts in respect of the whole question of protein grading? I read from the Calgary *Herald* of September 19 as follows:

> Dr. Irvine said Canada must have protein grading to survive in the export market.

This article continues:

> Dr. Irvine said the new act has had two readings in the House of Commons. If the House gives it a third reading after the summer recess it will allow new grades to be set up with the approval of the cabinet—

I want to emphasize those words "with the approval of the cabinet," rather than Parliament. That is an interesting situation today. Who and what is really running Canada? I am naïve enough to believe that Parliament is still supreme. It certainly should be supreme. Dr. Irvine says if we are to survive in the export market we must have protein grading. I read from an article which appeared in the Winnipeg *Tribune* of September 22, 1970:

> Norman A. Hope, of Winnipeg . . . has orders for 400 million bushels of wheat to fill between August 1 and January 1.

Mr. Hope of Winnipeg was head of a special study in respect of grain transportation which was carried out under the auspices of the Minister of Manpower (Mr. Lang), responsible for the Wheat Board. It is an amazing amount of wheat to deliver during that period of time. Canada is selling an amazing amount in spite of the fact we are really not, and have not been, protein grading. It is interesting to note that at this time the Minister of Manpower, responsible for the Wheat Board, has two committees studying the wheat marketing situation. We are asked to pass this bill quickly without even studying or considering the reports of those committees. I read a newspaper article which appeared in the Calgary *Albertan*:

> "The present transportation and handling system in the west is characterized by a profusion of small elevators located on closely spaced railway branch lines", Mr. Lang said.

The article continues:

> Substantial improvements could be made that would both reduce the costs of handling and transporting the products and shorten the reaction time of the system in moving grain to markets—

The article continues:

> Mr. Lang said the government is setting up an extensive study program to find ways to modernize the system.

He has also set up an extensive study program regarding grain marketing throughout the world. There are two study programs in existence dealing with grain handling in this country and grain selling in international markets. I have quoted a number of newspaper articles which deal with Canada's prospects for selling wheat in international markets. The last article from which I read suggests there is another study taking place concerning grain handling in Canada.

The amendment of which I speak and have enlarged upon deals with clause 2(10) and refers directly to trucks approved by the National Transportation Act. There are other faults in this bill which cannot be allowed to go unnoted because of a desire on my part or

on the part of others to facilitate the passage of the bill and its amendments. Let me deal with some of my other objections. The first is that this bill deletes one of the major features in the old act, which was to the effect that the government shall share the responsibility in respect of acts by the Queen's enemies or acts of God. The new act completely strikes out that provision and states that the elevator companies, the terminals and people storing Canadian wheat must accept that responsibility.

• (9:10 p.m.)

I asked Mr. Monk, legal counsel to the Board of Grain Commissioners and, I believe, in the past legal counsel to the Canadian Wheat Board, about this particular clause and its being included in the bill. He said there is no real need for it because the companies can carry their own insurance programs. No one carries insurance without paying for it. I accept Mr. Monk's statement that it is purely a matter of insurance. In the past the government has been the insurer. The government has come to the aid of any industry which has suffered as a result of an act of God or an act caused by enemies of the Queen. Under this new bill, in respect of striking out that clause Mr. Monk said quite clearly it is up to the insurance company. No insurance company is now writing such insurance. If an insurance company should be required to write such insurance, someone will have to pay the premium. I ask the minister or anybody in this House, who will pay the premium?

An hon. Member: The farmer.

Mr. Horner: As someone to my immediate right said, the farmers will pay. That is right, the farmers or the producers will pay. The cost to the producer will increase as a result. Let us go a little further. Under this bill, grain handlers, grain terminals and grain companies are not to be allowed to charge for the cost of drying grain. It is purely a coincidence that just last fall we suffered a very severe situation in respect of drying grain. Without any hint being given for the reason for doing so, this bill unaccountably reverses the policy which has been long established under the Canada Grain Act. It holds the custodian of grain responsible for any loss of condition not due to fault on his part. At first sight it may appear to benefit producers to throw onto someone else the cost of any necessary conditioning of grain. Instead, by making it hazardous for elevators to handle damp grain and by creating a reluctance to do so, we may slow down the delivery of grain at primary elevators and its movement through terminals.

In a particularly damp fall, when there is a tremendous amount of out-of-condition grain, if the grain companies cannot charge for the drying of the grain, as was the situation under the old act, who will pay for it? The grain companies, if they cannot charge for drying the grain, may say that they are reluctant to take it. I remember the fall of 1959, last fall and particularly the fall of 1951 which was a wet fall. The terminals told the producers to send them their grain and stated that they would dry it, and so on. The new act makes no provision for a charge in respect of damp grain.

What is more important, in the new act there is provision for a period of transition. The bill provides for future changes to be made in specifications for grades of grain. Presumably a definite percentage of protein will be specified as necessary in the higher grades of wheat. The change will apply without difficulty to wheat marketed thereafter. It creates a problem left unsolved concerning what is to happen in respect of tens or perhaps hundreds of millions of bushels of wheat the Canadian Wheat Board will have in store at the time of change.

There would seem to be a quite inaccurate assumption that the problem will be avoided by providing notice of eight months of impending change. There would seem to be an expectation that all problem wheat could be cleared out of the way in that time, something which could not possibly happen. What I am really saying is that under the bill there would appear to be an expectation that it would be possible to change grades within eight months. There is a clause which suggests the grades could be changed in a shorter period than eight months. What will happen in essence is that the grain companies, no matter whether they be members of the Alberta Wheat Pool, of which I am a member, the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, the Manitoba Wheat Pool or any line company, will suffer the loss.

This loss will be transferred back to the producer. I will try to tell you how. For every 100 million bushels of grain in storage, the banking concerns in our society have to put up the financing for its handling. If they suggest a loss could be incurred by the changing of grades, they will say they are not readily prepared to lend money to the grain handlers. If the banks are not readily prepared to lend money, they will demand a higher interest

rate. In other words, if I were an agent of a grain company I would go to the banks to borrow $100 million for the storage of grain in my company but I would receive only $90 million, with interest on $100 million. The higher rates and insecurity as a result of clause 15 of the bill will be passed right back to the producer.

There is another clause in the bill in respect of which I have an amendment. It is clause 41. Clause 41 suggests that the unions, in my interpretation of the clause, will be given greater bargaining power at the bargaining table. What concern, or what government—I say this in light of the government's recent problems in respect of the Post Office—has any real strength at the bargaining table where a labour union is concerned? There is no strength in the hand of business or in the hand of government. The strength in today's society is solely in the hands of the unions. Clause 41 of this bill specifically gives the unions greater strength. There is no change which would withstand the power now within the unions to strike and the subsequent effect of such a strike. So to my mind there is no doubt that the bill is in error in respect of that clause.

Another major problem which I find unacceptable in respect of Bill C-196 is this. Today we have the Canadian Wheat Board which handles all the problems in respect of wheat and grain marketing within the designated area. It provides for orderly marketing. Within that area it provides for a marketing agency and, in effect, a pricing agency in respect of international trade. This bill sets up powers within the Board of Grain Commissioners which definitely challenge the Canadian Wheat Board in more than one situation. Consider, for example, clause 59 of the bill, which suggests that the Board of Grain Commissioners has the right to approve mixing at the terminals. Until now the Wheat Board has been the seller and the pricer. It has put a grade of wheat on the market at a price, and it has had permission to mix all grains at the terminal except for grades 1, 2, 3 and 4. Clause 59 of the bill states that the mixing of grades at the terminal will be within the power of the Board of Grain Commissioners.

• (9:20 p.m.)

I dealt in the committee with the question of the split jurisdiction between the Board of Grain Commissioners and the Canadian Wheat Board as well as other matters. I asked Mr. Monk, legal adviser to the Canadian Wheat Board in days gone by—I do not know whether he will be the legal adviser to the Board of Grain Commissioners—which board had the authority to make various rulings. Mr. Monk said that he guessed the decision of both would be required. No piece of legislation will ever prove successful unless jurisdiction is given to one board only. The two boards should not be allowed to squabble at some port or delivery point. Authority must be given to one board, which must be the supreme board. If that board wishes to establish several other boards under its jurisdiction, that is fine, but the authority of one board must be clearly established. This bill in fact interferes directly with the operations of the Canadian Wheat Board. I will not go into the question of whether the Canadian Wheat Board has become the sacred cow in the grain handling industry. I believe some changes should be made to the Wheat Board, but not such that would challenge the authority of that body with regard to mixing and grading of proteins.

Another area in which split jurisdiction arises is in grading. The Wheat Board is the seller, the pricer and the person who seeks out customers. This bill, however, suggests that the Board of Grain Commissioners should establish the standards and change the grades in order to meet the demands of the customers. The Wheat Board is in the forefront; it meets the demands of the customers and therefore it alone should be the adviser and the authoritative body with regard to the changing of grades. The Board of Grain Commissioners directly interferes with the operations of the Wheat Board.

Another area in which it interferes with the operations of the Wheat Board is in the allotment of box cars. Until now the Wheat Board has had supreme authority in the allotment of box cars to a particular delivery point. In this bill it is not clear which board has that authority. There is some question as to whether the Wheat Board will have the authority or whether it will be given to the Board of Grain Commissioners. I make those three points, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Horner: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I made particular note of the time when I rose to speak. I started to speak at 8.50 p.m. I am allowed 40 minutes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am advised by my advisers that the time allotted to the hon. member has expired. If he wishes to continue, he will have to receive the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent to allow the hon. member to continue?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Horner: I am four minutes short, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I hear no consent. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson).

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, bearing in mind the accommodation that was made for the hon. member 40 minutes ago—

Mr. Horner: 36 minutes.

Mr. Olson: —it seems to me it would be appropriate to go over the many amendments that have been proposed so that those members of the House who were not members of the Standing Committee on Agriculture will be made aware of the numerous representations heard by the committee and, indeed, of the consideration the committee gave to many of the matters that have been revived in the amendments to be considered by the House at the report stage.

I do not intend to take up the full 40 minutes, but I do intend to go over these amendments very briefly so that hon. members will realize that what is happening here is in fact a repetition of much of the debate that took place in the committee. The committee sat for an extended period of time, during which it made a very detailed and exhaustive study of the matters that were before it for consideration. Virtually all of the proposed amendments were discussed in the committee. Some have been slightly modified, but nearly all have been discussed. Many of them were rejected and some were approved with modifications to achieve the objective of the proposer without impairing the workability of the bill. A number of amendments were not put following the explanations that were given. Therefore, I would like to deal with the amendments one by one.

Amendment No. 1 was discussed in the committee on June 5, as recorded at page 17 of committee proceedings No. 39. After an exhaustive discussion it was defeated in the committee on June 16, as recorded at page 21 of committee proceedings No. 40. If we are to have an orderly debate, and if we are to deal with this matter with dispatch so as to take into account all the representations that can properly be made by hon. members, we should respect the decision of that committee after its long and exhaustive discussion. Amendment No. 2 is concerned with clause 2(10). This matter also was fully discussed in the committee.

• (9:30 p.m.)

Amendment No. 3 relates to grain dealers. This amendment was discussed in the committee on June 16, as recorded at page 28 of committee proceedings No. 40 and was defeated on June 16, as recorded in proceedings No. 40 at page 49. So I contend that these matters have been fully discussed by those members of the committee who were charged with the responsibility of considering this matter on behalf of the House.

Amendment No. 4 is designed to limit weigh-overs at primary elevators to weigh-overs of the total grain stored. In practical terms, this does not necessarily work out in all cases and certainly the House would be failing in its responsibilities if it did not design a bill providing those statutory conditions that are necessary for practical and workable legislation.

Amendment No. 5 was discussed in the committee also. Amendment No. 6 was discussed in the committee, and amendment No. 7 was also discussed in the committee on June 17. Report No. 41, at page 17, covers this matter and an amendment has been recorded in the printed bill. It was approved on June 17, and so it has been dealt with.

So far as amendment No. 8 is concerned, it has some new aspects, but the reason for it is not clear unless it is intended to restrict the establishment of grain grades to the Governor in Council. Under the bill as written, statutory grades can only be established by the Governor in Council, but clause 16 provides power for the commission to establish grades for grain that is out-of-condition or ineligible for assignment to a statutory grade. It is very surprising to me that the hon. member would move this kind of amendment when it has always been the practice to set up grades outside of the statutory grades. These grades have been amendable from time to time by the Board of Grain Commissioners, usually on advice by advisory committees to the board, ever since 1930 when the statutory grades were put into the act.

Hon. members who are familiar with the grain industry and with the Board of Grain Commissioners will know, and will know without any equivocation whatever, that the

establishment of grades by the Commission is necessary if we are to establish values and prices and to set up grades for the types of grain that do not necessarily meet the provisions of any particular grade established by statutory provision or by Order in Council.

So far as amendment No. 9 is concerned, it was moved in the committee on June 18 and it was defeated in the committee on that date. This appears in report No. 42, at pages 28 and 47 respectively. So far as amendment No. 10 is concerned, this is new or at least it raises a new subject matter. It appears that it is designed to restrict research to the "quality" of grain. It seems to me it is unnecessary because the Governor in Council, the minister and Treasury Board would not allow duplication of effort by the Board respecting research carried on elsewhere in the government service.

With regard to amendment No. 11, it seems to me it is redundant because it is designed to provide an advisory committee to review proposed regulations. Mr. Speaker, an advisory committee can be established by by-law of the commission, and this can be done under clause 10(e). In my view it would be inappropriate to tie the commission or the Governor in Council into consultation on each and every regulation. This would be a completely new departure and, I suggest, a cumbersome, awkward, almost impossible manner in which to proceed, not only in the administration of this legislation but in regard to almost any other bill that is passed by Parliament and transferred to the government with the responsibility of carrying out the policy and the spirit contained within the legislation.

So far as amendment No. 12 is concerned, this is new but on examination its purpose is not clear. In fact, it seems almost indecipherable. However, if it is to allow the Governor in Council to direct that certain grades may only be assigned to grain being discharged from a terminal or a transfer elevator, it is not necessary because the purpose can otherwise be achieved. Amendment No. 13 is consequential upon acceptance of amendment No. 12. Amendment No. 14 deals with the matter of compensation and in my view, under our rules dealing with money bills, it would be out of order because acceptance of it would in fact put a charge on the Treasury.

So far as amendment No. 15 is concerned, it would appear to me that the mover, under clause 9(a), does not want the elevator company to make the grain or to suffer the loss in grade changes. It then follows that he wants the producer, directly or through the Canadian Wheat Board, or the grain dealer or the purchaser to feel the effect of any change. Also, it seems to me that the second part of the amendment is intended to provide for the use of old grades. I would advise you, Mr. Speaker, that this is now provided for under the transitional powers, however long it is deemed necessary that the transitional period be, through clause 106(1)(b) and 106(2) of the bill that is before us.

So far as amendment No. 16 is concerned, this appears to oppose the establishment of "commercial" and "off grades" by the commission without the approval of the Governor in Council. As I mentioned a few minutes ago, it appears to me that this is too restrictive since orders and actions of the commission are subject to directives issued by the Governor in Council or, indeed, by the minister. Everyone knows—I am sure the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave) will agree with me—that the establishment of certain grades by the Commission is necessary if you are to have a reasonable, practical and workable system of grading and off grades within the system, taking into account the various situations that can arise in dealing with those grades.

Amendment No. 17 seems to me to contemplate some independent action by a committee with reference to the minister instead of to the commission. This can be accomplished for justified studies under clause 17(i)(b) with or without direction of the minister, upon request of the committee. Thus, again I think this point has been provided for and therefore the amendment is unnecessary. So far as amendment No. 18 is concerned, it seems to me that its purpose is that a quorum should be determined exclusive of the public servants who may be involved in the committee.

So far as amendment No. 19 is concerned, dealing with clause 17, this requires a report to Parliament by the western grain standards committee. This suggestion may have some validity, but let us not forget that the Board of Grain Commissioners or the new Canada Grain Commission is obliged to report to Parliament. It seems to me that any body that is set up to be advisory to them ought to report to them and then, if it is advisable, have the committee's report contained within the report that is made by the Canada Grain Commission to Parliament.

Dealing with amendment No. 20, this appears to propose to remove from the work of the committee examination of samples where a non-visual characteristic must be utilized in establishing the grade. In my opin-

ion it is not necessary even if it were desirable, which it is not, because clause 19(3) does not require the commission to supply samples with respect to which the committee is not capable of forming a judgment by visual means. So, Mr. Speaker, I contend that this amendment is not necessary.

Dealing with amendment No. 21, this appears to follow the reasoning of amendment 20. However, it would remove the authority to designate export standard samples where a non-visual characteristic was utilized. Here again, I do not believe it is necessary, or if the substance of the amendment were to be deemed necessary, it could of course be dealt with in the regulations. Amendment No. 22, dealing with clause 24, was submitted to the committee but the clause was approved without amendment. Discussion took place, which can be found in report No. 42, at page 96. Of course, the bill provides for a minimum of 15 days. I suggest that this period could be extended as provided in the act.

• (9:40 p.m.)

So far as amendment No. 23 is concerned, it proposes to have the minister appoint members of grain appeal tribunals. It is not clear in my mind why this would be a more appropriate procedure. However, amendment No. 25 proposes to reduce the panel from eight to four and it reduces the selection of those—this is important—available for appeal duties.

Dealing with proposed amendment No. 26, this proposes that the minister, instead of the commission, establish the term of office of the grain appeal tribunals. It seems that in the situation where the commission is responsible to the minister, and indeed responsible to Parliament, it should not be set up in such a way as to indicate insufficient confidence in the capability of the commission to establish these appeal tribunals, because certainly both the minister and Parliament under the rules and practices have something to say about this if the commission does not in fact meet the policy and general opinions expressed by the House.

Amendment 27 proposes to enlarge the quorum and to add producer representatives of various groups to the tribunal. I suggest there could be some difficulty in finding and appointing people under this qualification, because if anything is desirable in so far as grading is concerned it is that we need expertise and uniformity so that it is applied in the same way to all producers. If we accept this amendment it will downgrade that very desirable objective.

In so far as proposed amendment No. 28 is concerned, this proposes to enlarge the right of appeal and to include appeals against non-visual characteristics. If that is needed, in my opinion it can be provided in the regulations. As far as I am concerned, it is certainly possible now, under the provisions of the bill, to appeal and to have tests made with respect to those characteristics which, as the amendment points out, are non-visual.

Proposed amendment No. 29 relates to the same matter contained in proposed amendment No. 22. Proposed amendment No. 30 has the effect of providing appeals against grades assigned on the discharge from an elevator. Accordingly, these appeals could be made against certificates final. I suggest there is some point in the sale where we reach the point of certificate final and where there can be no further appeal because there are, in my opinion at least, the other courses and channels of redress open to do that. It has the possibility of greatly slowing down the practical and physical matters related to the sale and movement of grain if certificates final can in fact be challenged.

Proposed amendment No. 31 would restrict the bonding, insurance, etc., in respect of acts of God or the Queen's enemies. It seems unnecessary since the act does not require the commission to demand any insurance of any unusual type and we have to assume, I think properly, and indeed expect, that the commission would act in a responsible manner. Proposed amendment No. 32 requests an appeal to the Exchequer Court against a refusal by the commission to licence. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, this has been provided for. The bill provides for public hearings under clause 80 and for a review by the minister under clause 78. As well, under the Federal Courts Act now before the House, appeals are provided under certain circumstances.

Proposed amendment No. 33, dealing with clause 39, as far as I am concerned is a refinement of drafting and really has no import in substance. Proposed amendment No. 34 was in fact moved in the committee and defeated, as recorded at page 55 of report No. 44. Proposed amendment No. 35 has the same status and relates to essentially the same matter.

Proposed amendment No. 36, dealing with clause 41 of the bill, requires producers to pay full storage rates in cases of extended work stoppage even though the cost to the elevator company is minimal. I suggest there

is a marked change in the cost of operating a terminal elevator if there is a work stoppage and therefore no wages to pay. I believe very firmly that there should be provision to substantially reduce the charges to the producers for the storage in those terminal elevators when in fact, because of a work stoppage, there is no opportunity for the owners of the grain to have it discharged from those elevators. It is elementary or common justice that the owner of that grain, in most cases the producers in the name of the Canadian Wheat Board, should not be required to pay the full storage charges to the elevator company when there is a work stoppage.

Proposed amendment No. 37 was proposed in committee as a somewhat similar amendment, as recorded at page 81 of report No. 44. The amendment was negatived but a new subsection 2 was added to cover this point and was put into the bill at page 25 of report No. 45. Dealing with proposed amendment No. 38, this is designed to authorize mixing if a holder of the elevator receipt so desires. In my opinion it is inappropriate, in the interests of producers, to enlarge the circumstances under which mixing may be permitted without authority of the commission. This, of course, will be amplified to some extent in the regulations that are drawn following the passage of this bill.

Proposed amendment No. 39 proposes to amend clause 62. It seems that the purpose is to delete the requirement for written permission of the commission. This section now provides that permission may be given by the commission or by a representative. Such representative is likely to be, and in most cases will be, on location at the elevator. This proposal was discussed extensively in committee, so that the committee members who did in fact consider and amend this bill were not unaware of this matter.

Proposed amendment No. 40, to amend clause 70 (1), seems to be designed to permit trucking by custom truckers and to designate the Canadian Wheat Board as the regulatory body. This is unnecessary, because the clause gives the opportunity for approval of any person to the commission. Furthermore, the Canadian Wheat Board Act provides authority to carry out the business assigned to the Canadian Wheat Board. Proposed amendment No. 41 proposes to remove from the control of the commission the movement of grain to primary elevators by public carriers. This control is considered necessary, in my view, but the section provides for this type of movement when permission has been obtained from the commission. This matter was also discussed extensively in the committee.

• (9:50 p.m.)

I now refer to proposed amendment No. 42, dealing with clause 71(3). The proposal deals with the allocation of railway boxcars at primary elevators in addition to producer cars. It seems to me that this provision is unnecessary and inappropriate because clauses 100 and 97, as well as the Canadian Wheat Board Act, cover the allocation of cars other than producer cars. Producer cars are covered by clause 71 of this bill. Clause 97 provides that the governor in council may direct the allocation of any railway cars. There is no point in elaborating greatly on this. I have been in the House on dozens of occasions when hon. members opposite have made representations to the government for this authority to be exercised by the government when, in the opinion of those hon. members, there was either an inappropriate or unfair allocation of boxcars between points or, indeed, in total. A provision is included to deal with that and, therefore, it does not seem to me it would be necessary or desirable to accept proposed amendment No. 42 dealing with clause 71(3).

Proposed amendment No. 43 deals with a new clause No. 101. This proposal would limit the duration of certain orders and regulations to a year without approval of a particular committee of the House. Mr. Speaker, with all the great respect I have for this House, I do not believe that any member of it really thinks that the committee of this House should change their responsibilities from those of lawmakers to those of administrators of that law. Those are the responsibilities of the government and its agencies, according to our constitution and the structure of our government. Certainly that would not be appropriate. It would be a completely new departure. In my opinion it would be wrong for the government and, indeed, the administration to restrict itself with this kind of amendment and this kind of provision in the bill. I predict that if we were to acquiesce in the amendment it would not take the committee long to realize that this change had placed a burden on it that was not appropriate or in keeping with its responsibilities as a law maker, and that it is not necessarily an administrator of government policies.

Proposed amendment No. 44 deals with clause 106(3). It proposes to allow the commission to follow the old grading system, whereas current clauses restrict that action to pre-

scribed circumstances. Certainly, I believe this is the way to deal with this matter because if we do not deal with the change from the old grading system to the new grading system, which is more beneficial to the producers, under certain circumstances that would have to be prescribed, we would be failing in our responsibilities and not responding to the requests of the overwhelming majority of producers who are asking us to put provisions in a new Canada Grain Act that will allow them to modernize standards and conditions that are currently desirable in the international grain market.

Before sitting down I wonder if it would be appropriate for me at this point to suggest to the House that we continue sitting past the ordinary hour of adjournment until, say, twelve o'clock, in order that we may complete consideration of this bill and get it on the statute books for the benefit of the farmers concerned. If that is appropriate, Mr. Speaker, I would move that we extend the hour of sitting until this bill is completed, or until twelve o'clock midnight.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): I remind the minister that he needs the unanimous consent of the House to continue the debate beyond ten o'clock. Does the House give the Minister of Agriculture unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, I believe there must be an indication by at least ten members that they do not wish to sit past the usual hour of adjournment.

An hon. Member: Give the farmers a break.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): I bring to the attention of the minister the fact that a motion to extend the sitting must be put and if ten or more members do not rise and oppose the motion, it is deemed to be agreed to.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, I understand that clearly. I therefore move, seconded by the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Gray), that we sit until we complete this bill or until twelve o'clock midnight, whichever is earlier.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Does the House agree to adopt the motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[Mr. Olson.]

Some hon. Members: No.

And more than ten members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): I declare the motion lost.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

FILMS—GOVERNMENT INVESTMENT IN ALLEGED "NUDIE FLICK"

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have been concerned for some time about the way in which public money voted by Parliament to assist the Canadian film industry is being spent. Recently I received from a number of Edmonton school children signed petitions asking for more family-type movies in the theatres. In particular, I should like at this time to read one of those letters into the record. It reads as follows:

Dear Sir,

I am a grade 5 student of Grandin School and I don't like some of the movies. Recently I went to movie called "Coogan's Bluff" with my sister and my friend. My sister is 19 and she thought this was just going to be a cowboy show.

I don't think I want to say what it was about. But in part of the movie there were people without clothes on. If this keeps up I'm going to circulate a petition. I was just looking in the paper and there was just 1 or 2 family shows, the rest were adult and restricted adult. And most people my age on a rainy day like to go to a movie. What do you expect us to do, sit around all day and stare into the rain?

Yours truly
Mary Pat Nigro

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the Disney company in Hollywood has for years specialized in family-type film fare and a recent news item indicated this company emerged with the top financial performance of any Hollywood company. You would expect the lesson would be plain enough even for Canadian government culture experts, but no; instead of learning from the success of Disney, the Canadian government has plowed public money into a series of films which are distasteful, disgraceful and deplorable to Canada and are clear evidence of a satellite culture.

• (10:00 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, you as a family man know how difficult it is to find for your children a movie which is not labelled "Restricted" or "Strictly adult." But the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has no children and really does not care, or does not realize the problem. So far we, the taxpayers, have paid for a National Film Board production on Abbie Hoffman, a convicted criminal in the United States now out on appeal, and a film called "Explosion" about an American draft-dodger who runs amok in British Columbia. This should have caused a public explosion among the taxpayers. Then we have the latest venture by Cinepix in Montreal, described by one reviewer as a "nudie flick" and paid for by the Canadian public whose taxes are so high that most of them cannot afford to go and see this garbage. What's next—the life story of Charlie Manson? There is something morally wrong with a government which has this type of priority. At a later date I hope to introduce a private member's bill which will effectively deal with the growing pollution of our film industry.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. James Hugh Faulkner (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I should like to deal briefly with the points raised by the hon. member for Edmonton Centre (Mr. Paproski). I would preface my reply to his question or, more particularly, his representation, by reminding him that the Canadian Film Development Corporation is a Crown corporation which, as such, enjoys the degree of autonomy shared by all Crown corporations. I shall, of course, be glad to transmit the representation he has made to the Canadian Film Development Corporation and to the National Film Board, although the National Film Board was not mentioned during his original question this afternoon.

I am not in a position to make an elaborate reply this evening because I have not had time to get the type of reply I would expect from these agencies. This afternoon the hon. member asked specifically whether the Canadian government had invested a substantial amount of public money in a motion picture made in Montreal by Cinepix. I draw his attention to the fact that in the annual report of the Canadian Film Development Corporation which was tabled yesterday in the House, it is indicated on page 28 that the corporation has in fact invested money in two films made by Cinepix. So the direct answer to the question is that an amount of capital has been invested in these two films by the corporation. I am not aware of the size of the amount. As I say, I will transmit the representation he has made further to his question to the Film Development Corporation.

INDIAN AFFAIRS—CLAIMS COMMISSION—INCLUSION OF ABORIGINAL AND TREATY RIGHTS IN TERMS OF REFERENCE

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, I was afraid I would not be able to raise this matter again in an adjournment debate because a few moments ago we were considering continuing to deal with the agricultural legislation. I am pleased the House has decided, wisely, to continue with our debate on the adjournment motion because I do not think we could resolve the agricultural problems which have accumulated under this government in the space of two hours. Certainly, the question I raised earlier today is one which requires urgent attention.

I asked the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien) whether the government intended to broaden the terms of reference of the Indian Claims Commissioner so that he might deal with aboriginal and treaty rights. The minister referred the question to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) within whose responsibility he indicated the matter rested, and the Prime Minister in turn gave us to understand there was no intention on the part of the government to deal with this extremely important matter at this time. This is a problem that has repeatedly been brought before the government and the people of Canada and it is one of the main sources of difficulty facing Canadians of Indian ancestry.

The matter becomes important when we recall that it not only concerns the treaty Indians but also a large group of Metis who are of Indian ancestry but who have no rights established under the treaties. For them the only recourse is to investigate their claims as aboriginals of this country. That is their only hope of redress for a long period of neglect of which those of us in western Canada in particular have become acutely aware.

My attention was drawn to the problem just recently when the parliamentary committee on constitutional reform and amendments was travelling through northern parts of Manitoba, the Northwest Territories and the

Yukon. At almost every stop we heard representations both from spokesmen for the Indian brotherhood and for the Métis association, urging the government to take immediate action on this point. They were not so much concerned with rewriting the constitution as with redressing the inequities of government practice ever since the time of confederation, inequities which have brought such strong reaction in recent days from both these groups.

In view of the articulate presentation made by such leaders as Harold Cardinal, who recently published his book "The Unjust Society", and the Indian brotherhood which have brought forward their red paper in answer to the so-called white paper of the government, and in face of strong representations made crystal clear in presentations on behalf of our first Canadians in regard to neglect in the area of aboriginal and treaty rights as well as land claims, I hope the government will now move much more expeditiously than in the past.

One of the reasons I want to raise this matter at this time especially is because the Prime Minister in his reply indicated that all members of the House concurred in the recommendations of the white paper. That, of course, is inaccurate, because in 1963 there was a motion on the Order Paper regarding the establishment of a land claims commission made up of a sufficient number of members to deal adequately with the complexities of this problem. Matters changed, of course, when the Liberal administration came into office.

This question has international implications that can only be sorted out by very careful legal study. The claims affect Indians living on both sides of the border. The United States government is proceeding to deal with the problem on their side, and I point out with reference to land claims in the Northwest Territories that it will take considerable legal documentation and deliberation on the part of expert researchers to settle long standing claims under Treaties 8 and 11.

• (10:10 p.m.)

I trust that the Parliamentary Secretary, who I note is speaking for both the Prime Minister and the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien), will assure us that these important actions will be taken.

Mr. Judd Buchanan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, the Indian people have expressed concern about the fulfilment of treaty obligations and the administration of lands and funds as well as their claims to aboriginal rights. They have established a national committee on Indian rights and treaties, which the government is supporting, to do research into the whole question of Indian rights and claims. The government last December also appointed a commissioner to examine the claims of Indians in respect of treaty obligations and the administration of land and funds.

At the meeting between the government and Indian leaders on June 4, it was proposed that a consultative mechanism be established to provide a forum in which consideration could be given to many subjects of concern to Indian groups across the country. Discussions have been going on informally between representatives of the National Indian Brotherhood and the government on this question. At the June meeting the Indian associations also raised the question of how their grievances might be resolved. They were advised that the government would be prepared to examine their proposals. Consultations on this aspect have not yet taken place with Indian leaders.

In addition, it should be noted that an Indian group, the Nishga Tribal Council from British Columbia, has taken court action to affirm their aboriginal rights and, according to our information, an appeal has been taken to the Supreme Court. In view of this it would be inappropriate for the government to comment on this subject at this time.

POWER—SKAGIT RIVER—APPLICATION OF SEATTLE CITY LIGHT COMPANY TO RAISE HEIGHT OF DAM—EFFECT OF INTERNATIONAL RIVER IMPROVEMENTS ACT

Mr. Jerry Pringle (Fraser Valley East): Mr. Speaker, my question today is in connection with a flooding in British Columbia of one of our very beautiful valleys. There is a very serious problem resulting from an arrangement between the province of British Columbia and the city of Seattle department of lighting relating to the flooding of the Skagit valley which is located in Canada. The original arrangement was made in 1942 and provided a power dam to be built for the benefit of power requirements in the U.S.A. on a river running south from Canada into the United States.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that back in 1942, during a time when we were all ravaged

[Mr. Dinsdale.]

by war, international agreements were influenced almost entirely by the requirements of the day, with little or no thought of ecological problems, environmental requisites, etc. The arrangement at that time did receive the blessing of the International Joint Commission, a body charged with the responsibility of approving international agreements. In 1955, some 10 years following the end of the war, the federal government in its wisdom realized that the possibility of exploitation of Canadian river resources to the detriment of Canadian requirements was a real possibility and enacted the International Rivers Improvements Act. This act was designed to provide protection against the possibility of provincial governments entering into international agreements relating to exploitation of our Canadian water resources without due consideration to Canadian policy and Canadian needs.

It is therefore incumbent upon this House of Commons to exert every power within our jurisdiction to assure Canadians in general and British Columbians in this case in particular that the government of British Columbia is acting and operating at the present time in the interests of the people of Canada in relation to the proposed plans for the flooding of the beautiful Skagit valley.

In 1967 an agreement was signed between the province of British Columbia and the city of Seattle to flood the Canadian portion of the High Ross reservoir site. Apart from normal requirements relating to removal of debris, and so on, the compensation to be paid to the province of British Columbia by the city of Seattle department of lighting is $34,566.21 per annum. This amounts to $5.50 per acre per year which is equal to two Christmas trees per acre per year.

An hon. Member: Shame!

Mr. Pringle: The figures issued by the city of Seattle indicate that the net saving per year to the city amounts to $1 million compared with the next cheapest source of power. So we relate some $34,000 to $1 million and we feel the economics are not exactly what we would expect them to be, having in mind the past history of the province of British Columbia. It is possible that the compensation was arranged many years ago, but it is unreasonable to conceive that the puny amount of $35,000 could be acceptable at the present time.

I hold in my hand a number of telegrams, petitions and letters from interested Canadians who deplore the possibility of flooding the Skagit valley. Different people have different values, but all people respect each other's views. It is the view of many that we would not only be selling a valuable resource for a pittance but would be depriving generations of Canadians of the use of a recreational resource replaced by a limited one. This is not a backpack type area. Access is easy now. Some thousands of families use the Skagit for stream fishing, hunting, camping, hiking, enjoying the scenery and lake fishing on Ross Lake as it is today. One reason Ross Lake, which is the lake in question, is now popular is the quality of the fish. Ross Lake does not depend on artificial stocking; the fish are native fish.

Let me quote the Washington State Department of Game. That department states that these are strictly native fish, that they are robust and chunky and that the meat is a deep red. It is stated further that if the dam is raised and the spawning areas are wiped out, it then may be impossible to duplicate this fine rainbow through hatchery breeding. The Ross Lake fishery, like most other lakes in the States does not depend on artificial stocking and the new lake level will flood out major spawning areas along creeks that flow into the lake—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. I must remind the hon. member that his time has expired, and I call upon the Parliamentary Secretary.

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the flooding of the Skagit River valley which has been threatened was authorized under an order of the International Joint Commission dated January 19, 1942. This order was granted after a public hearing to permit opponents to the scheme to make submissions to the International Joint Commission. I am advised that there was no public interest in the hearing and that no opposition was offered to the proposed flooding, which is understandable 30 years ago when the Skagit River valley was almost inaccessible and, to the best of my information, no private land owners were involved.

However, in the past 30 years no action has been taken on the International Joint Commission order and in the course of those years a very considerable change in circumstances has occurred. The Skagit River valley is now accessible by road and because of its proximity to Vancouver, which is rapidly developing

into one of the major cities of the world, it has become a matter of paramount importance that such recreational facilities as it offers and its aesthetic qualities be preserved.

The Department of Energy, Mines and Resources has had under consideration for some time the various methods by which a review of the decision to permit the flooding can be achieved, and it is expected that a decision as to the steps proposed by the government will be announced in the very near future.

At 10.20 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, October 7, 1970

The House met at 2 p.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. COMEAU—EMPLOYMENT OF MEMBER FOR HALTON-WENTWORTH BY NEWFOUNDLAND DEPARTMENT

Mr. Speaker: On Monday, October 5, the hon. member for South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau) raised a question of privilege in which he suggested there could be a conflict of interest in the conduct of the hon. member for Halton-Wentworth (Mr. Morison) in his capacity as Chairman of the Standing Committee on Regional Development.

The hon. member for South Western Nova stated that the hon. member for Halton-Wentworth, while Chairman of the Standing Committee on Regional Development, was employed by the Department of Community and Social Development of the province of Newfoundland. The hon. member for South Western Nova went on to point out that that province signed an agreement with Ottawa and is on the verge of signing a new agreement affecting a greater part of the province; consequently he felt that the Newfoundland plan was much more liable to receive attention than others and, to use the hon. member's words, he sensed a direct conflict of interest.

I think that the hon. member for South Western Nova will agree that his proposed question of privilege may have been raised prematurely in that the Standing Committee on Regional Development has not met for several months and will not meet again in this session. The question of electing a chairman in the coming session is a matter of future determination.

At the same time, I should remind hon. members that it has been a long and well established practice that this House should not undertake any inquiry as to the conduct of any member except when charged with a specific offence. In that regard I would draw to the attention of the House a statement made by Mr. Speaker Michener which is recorded at page 584 of the *Journals* for June 19, 1959, as follows:

> In my view, simple justice requires that no member should have to submit to investigation of his conduct by the House or a committee until he has been charged with an offence.

As matters now stand, I suggest that the question has been stated by the hon. member in general terms relating more to propriety than to misconduct. In the circumstances, the Chair must rule that there is no prima facie case of breach of privilege.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

CONSTITUTION OF CANADA

Third report of Special Joint Committee on the Constitution of Canada—Mr. Gibson.

[*Translation*]

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

Sixth report of Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections—Mr. Laflamme.

[*English*]

INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Ninth report of Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development—Mr. Watson.

ELECTION EXPENSES

First report of Special Committee on Election Expenses—Mr. Jerome.

[*Editor's Note: For text of above reports, see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

CONCURRENCE IN FOURTEENTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Charles Turner (London East) moved that the fourteenth report of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, presented to the House on Monday, October 5, 1970, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Questions

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

ORDER PAPER QUESTIONS

Question No. 190—**Mr. Lefebvre:**

1. Of the 2,723 written questions placed on the Notice Paper as of October 22, 1969 in the First Session of this Parliament, has the government any estimate of the cost of answering such questions?

2. How many questions have been answered to date?

3. How many man-hours is it estimated were involved in answering these questions?

4. What was the total estimated cost of answering the questions?

5. What are the identifying numbers of the 20 questions which cost the most to answer, giving the estimated cost of each one?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): 1. No.

2. 2,723.

3, 4 and 5. Because personnel from many different departments are involved in the preparation of answers, it is impossible to prepare the kind of man-hours or cost evaluation requested in questions 3, 4 and 5. See *Hansard* dated March 1, 1967, page 13,613.

RESEARCH, DEPT. OF SECRETARY OF STATE

Question No. 620—**Mr. Comeau:**

1. In 1968-69 and 1969-70, what were the estimated sums spent on research in the Department of the Secretary of State and what was the purpose of each research project?

2. How much money was actually expended according to Dominion Bureau of Statistics figures?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of the Secretary of State and the Dominion Bureau of Statistics as follows: 1. Sums spent on research: 1968-69, $43,211; 1969-70, $301,891.

Purpose of research projects: Study of film industry; Study of archeology in Canada; Task force on educational broadcasting; Study of heraldry in Canada; Study of media and political process, Study of Francophone youth; Study of immigrants and official languages; Committee on youth; Study of Canadian Indian youth workshop; Action research on youth programs; Research on Indian participation; Study on Winnipeg ethnic groups; Study on research material pertinent to Indian and Eskimo participation; Study for publication on Indians; Study in migration of native people; Study of commissions of enquiry and investigations relating to land claims of people of native ancestory in Canada; A bibliography and critical analysis of existing literature of Malecite language; Study of methodology in a community analysis inventory; A study of the human effects of some economic development decisions; A study of social learning in a cross-socio-economic setting; Study of research projects and government documents for termatrex system; Review of selected research on migrants in Canada; Study of cultural differences of ethnic groups in Calgary; Study of cultural processes in the Chinese community of Vancouver; Study of research relevant to concepts of social distance, culture shock, cultural perception and cultural differences; Study of travel and exchange opportunities at community colleges; Study of Children's International Villages; Methods and recommendations for establishing an international travel and exchange project for the physically handicapped; Study in model procedure and conduct in press analysis; Collect data on emerging black groups in Canada and offer recommendations; Collect and analyze data on neighbourhood action projects and offer recommendations; Study on citizenship; Survey of federal government youth programs; Analysis of community self-analysis project at Algonquin College.

2. The Dominion Bureau of Statistics does not have actual expenditures on research for 1968-69 and 1969-70. A survey requesting information on actual expenditures for 1968-69 and estimates for 1969-70 on research in the natural and engineering sciences is in process.

MILITARY ITEMS OR EQUIPMENT SOLD TO PORTUGUESE COLONIES

Question No. 1,617—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

1. Since 1960 what military items or equipment has Canada sold to Portugal and by type, at what cost?

2. Since 1960, what military arms or equipment has Canada sold to Angola, Mozambique or Portuguese Guinea?

3. Since 1960, has Canada sold any commodity that could be considered of a military nature, to Angola, Mozambique, Portuguese Guinea or Portugal?

4. To the knowledge of the government are any Canadian arms or military equipment being used in the persecution of domestic conflicts in Angola, Mozambique or Portuguese Guinea?

5. In particular, are Canadian Sabre Jets being employed in any of these conflicts and, if so, when were these arms or equipment made available to these Portuguese colonies and from what country were they purchased?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Industry, Trade and Commerce and External Affairs as follows: 1. Canada sold military items of the following description to Portugal during the period 1960-69 inclusive; automotive parts $86,360, radar $28,261, and miscellaneous $51,242. Aircraft piston engine parts in the amount of $3,102,017 have been sold to Portugal. The latter equipment is for use with propeller driven general utility transport aircraft designed for commercial use; any potential military use would be limited by the performance characteristics of this older type aircraft.

2. During the period 1960-69 inclusive, Canada sold to Mozambique $169 worth of electron tubes classed as military items and no military arms or equipment to Angola and Portuguese Guinea.

3. None.

4. Not to the knowledge of the Canadian Government.

5. To the Department of External Affairs' knowledge, no Canadian Sabre jets are being employed in Portuguese Africa.

INCENTIVE GRANTS

Question No. 1,718—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. For the fiscal year 1969-70 (a) which and how many non-resident owned or controlled firms have been awarded financial grants or incentives under the Industrial Research and Development Assistance Program, administered by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce (b) in each case, what was the total financial grant or incentive allotted?

2. For the same year (a) which and how many Canadian owned or controlled firms have been awarded financial grants under the IRDA program (b) in each case, what was the total financial grant or incentive allotted?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): The Industrial Research and Development Incentives Act received royal assent March 10, 1967. Regulations were passed May 25, 1967 and initial payments made under the Act occurred in government fiscal year ending March 31, 1968. To qualify for a grant an organization is required to be a Canadian corporation. No restrictions with regard to ownership exist, however, each applicant receiving a grant must pass the Benefit to Canada requirements of the Act.

Individual grants under the Act are made on a confidential basis and details of such grants are not made available.

The following provides the extent of the information that can be given in response to the above question:

1. Financial Incentives to Non-resident owned or controlled firms

	1969–70
(a) Number of firms	177
(b) Amount ($000's)	9,690.4

2. Financial Incentives to Canadian-owned or controlled firms

	1969–70
(a) Number of firms	248
(b) Amount ($000's)	12,400.1

3. In addition, financial incentives were given to the following firms for which there is no conclusive evidence as to the residence of the principal owner—

	1969–70
(a) Number of firms	87
(b) Amount ($000's)	909.5

Note: (1) Corporations have been classified as non-resident owned or controlled where official information filed with the Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act Administration indicates that more than 50 percent of the voting stock is directly or indirectly owned by non-resident shareholders and there is a concentration of such ownership. Corporations not reporting under the Act have been classifield as non-resident owned or controlled if available public information indicates that more than 50 percent of the voting stock is owned by non-residents and there is a concentration of such ownership.

Note: (2) Corporations have been classified as Canadian-owned or controlled where official information filed with the Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act Administration indicates that 50 percent or more of the voting stock is directly or indirectly owned by Canadian residents or where although more than 50 percent of the voting stock is held by non-residents there is no foreign parent or concentration of foreign control and the effective control rests with the management and directors of the Canadian company. Companies not reporting under the Act have

been classified as Canadian-owned or controlled if available public information indicates that 50 percent or more of the voting stock is owned by Canadian residents. Certain of the companies are exempt from reporting under the Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act and conclusive evidence of the country of ownership is not available from other public sources. The number of such companies and the amount of the incentives given are shown separately.

SECRETARY OF STATE—NUMBER OF CONSULTANTS

Question No. 1,821—**Mr. Robinson:**

How many consultants have been engaged by the Department of the Secretary of State during each year 1950 to 1970 inclusive (a) what was the cost of the consultants (b) how were the consultants utilized (c) for what reasons were the consultants necessary?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): (a) and (b): 1966-1967, $15,508; Consultation on Language Pedagogy; Consultations on Statues and Portraits of former Prime Ministers; Consultations of Centennial Program; Consultations on Library; Consultation on Documentation Deposit and Retrieval System.

1967-1968, $27,519; Consultation on Education Support Program; Consultations on Statues and Portraits of former Prime Ministers; Consultation for National Staff Conference of Citizenship Branch; Consultation on Language Pedagogy; Consultation on Documentation Deposit and Retrieval System.

1968-1969, $10,939; Consultation on Education Support Program; Consultation on Statues and Portraits of former Prime Ministers; Consultation on Community Development Training.

1969-1970, $20,125; Consultation on July 1st Celebration; Consultation on Education Support Program; Consultation on Statues and Portraits of former Prime Ministers; Consultation on Manitoba Centennial Caravan.

Note: Records are not available prior to 1966-1967.

(c) The engaging of consultants enables the department to take advantage of expertise not available within the department.

[*English*]

INDUSTRY, TRADE AND COMMERCE CONSULTANTS

Question No. 1,828—**Mr. Robinson:**

How many consultants have been engaged by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce during each year 1950 to 1970 inclusive (a) what was the cost of the consultants (b) how were the consultants utilized (c) for what reasons were the consultants necessary?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Acting Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): In so far as the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce is concerned: Financial records are no longer in existence for the years prior to 1964-65.

1964-65, 11; 1965-66, 13; 1966-67, 12; 1967-68, 132 *; 1968-69, 225 *; 1969-70, 157 *.

(a) 1964-65, $30,396; 1965-66, $49,612; 1966-67, $160,032; 1967-68, $418,798 *; 1968-69, $1,047,831 *; 1969-70, $984,348 *.

* Includes consultants who participated in design clinics and product evaluation panels convened to determine the eligibility of products for the Canadian Design Index.

1967-68, 100 consultants totalling, $5,659; 1968-69, 175 consultants totalling, $6,844; 1969-70, 115 consultants totalling, $10,235.

(b) To analyse data and to advise departmental officials on various economic factors affecting Canadian industry, such as potential markets, productivity, comparative cost studies and technical comparison of Canadian industry to that of other countries.

(c) To provide specialist knowledge and to supplement the expertise available in the Department.

REORGANIZATION OF AIR CANADA

Question No. 1,939—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. Has the government received a detailed report of the reorganization of Air Canada and, if so, will this report be tabled in the House?

2. Will the annual report of this corporation be studied by a parliamentary committee and, if so, on what date?

3. Are there any plans to change the capital structure of Air Canada?

4. Have Air Canada profits taken a sharp drop and, if so, for what reason?

Mr. Gérard Duquet (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. The government has not received copies of the detailed reports dealing with the reorganization of Air Canada although verbal progress reports have been presented periodically. Since they contain a great deal of proprietary information, there is no intention to table them in the House. Members will, however, have an opportunity to discuss organizational matters with Air Canada when the corporation's annual report is referred to Committee.

2. Yes, the date will be for the Committee to decide.

3. Yes, but these plans are still in the formative stages.

4. There was a reduction in Air Canada's profits in 1969 as compared with 1968 but this was due to a month-long strike. The year 1970 is proving a difficult one for airlines in North America as a whole. The reasons are many and complex but Members will have an opportunity to discuss these in connection with Air Canada's Annual Report.

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD—PERMIT BOOK APPLICATIONS

Question No. 1,993—**Mr. Skoberg:**

What was the total amount paid by the Canadian Wheat Board to mail permit book applications to the Wheat Pool and Line elevators in the Provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration (for the Canadian Wheat Board)): Permit book applications together with "Lift" material were distributed to elevator managers by express at a cost of approximately $18,081.62.

NEWFOUNDLAND—DERAILMENTS AND MAINTENANCE COST OF ROADBEDS

Question No. 1,995—**Mr. Lundrigan:**

1. How many derailments has CNR had in Newfoundland since the discontinuation of the passenger trains?

2. What was the total cost of the derailments?

3. How much money has been spent in maintaining CNR trans-provincial roadbeds since the discontinuation of the passenger trains?

4. How many men now are employed in the maintenance and upkeep of CNR roadbeds in Newfoundland?

5. How many men were employed in the maintenance and upkeep of the roadbeds before the discontinuation of the passenger trains in Newfoundland?

6. What was the cost to CNR for maintenance of the roadbeds in Newfoundland for each of the years 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969?

7. How many derailments did CNR experience in Newfoundland during the years 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969?

Mr. Gérard Duquet (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The management of Canadian National Railways advises as follows: 1. Up to June 1, 1970, 7.

2. $283,386.

3. $1,150,000 from July 1, 1969 to April 30, 1970.

4. 149 regular, 108 extra.

5. 216 regular, 60 to 100 extra for seasonal work depending on scale of extra work program.

6.

Year	Maintenance	Capital
1965	$2,106,000	$ 360,900
1966	2,100,000	695,700
1967	2,000,000	1,475,300
1968	1,650,000	282,300
1969	1,580,000	543,850

7.

Year	No. of Derailments
1965	1
1966	4
1967	2
1968	7
1969	6

EXPENDITURES UNDER CANADA-FRANCE AGREEMENTS

Question No. 2,043—**Mr. Paproski:**

1. What is the total expenditure by Canada authorized for 1970, under the Canada-France agreements?

2. What, in detail, are the objects of each class of expenditures in the total amount?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): In so far as the Department of External Affairs is concerned: 1. The Department's financial contribution under the 1965 cultural agreement with France for the fiscal year 1970-71 is $825,000.

2. There are two classes of expenditure: academic and scientific exchanges, to which $600,000 of the total amount is allocated, and artistic and cultural activities, to which $225,000 of the total amount is allocated. The latter class of expenditure includes allocations for a tour by a Canadian theatre company, performances by a Canadian dance company, the operation of the Canadian Cultural Centre in Paris, book presentations, exhibitions of Canadian art, exchanges of persons, a tour by a Canadian musician, and administration of various projects.

In so far as the National Research Council of Canada is concerned: 1. $80,000 for 1970-71.

2. To assist Canadian and French scientists in travelling abroad and to promote international scientific activity.

In so far as the Department of the Secretary of State is concerned: The Department is involved in two programs which are the result of agreements between Canada and France. Amounts authorized for the fiscal year 1970-1971: International Travel and Exchange Program: To be expended under Standard Object—10 grants, $150,000. Coopérant Militaire Program—two contract employees under program: To be expended under Standard Object—4 professional and Special Services, $8,095; To be expended under Standard Object—2 Transportation and Communications, $734.

RESEARCH INTO INDUSTRIAL USES OF GRAIN

Question No. 2,045—**Mr. Rowland:**

Is the government actively engaged in research of the industrial uses of grain, especially wheat and, if so (a) what is the nature of the research (b) does it include studies into the feasibility of adding grain alcohol to motive fuels as an anti-pollution measure?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): In so far as the Department of Agriculture is concerned, the answer is: (a) The Department conducts research on the quality of wheat for baking and pasta products and on barley for its use in the brewing and malting industries. (b) No.

In so far as the Canadian Wheat Board is concerned, the answer is: The economic feasibility of manufacturing industrial products from wheat and other grains have been considered by several study groups. The manufacturer of industrial alcohol from grains and the subsequent use of such alcohol in gasoline has been studied by many including the Science Secretariat. To date, studies have shown that alcohol production from wheat is more costly than other methods. However, considering Canada's tremendous resource for the production of plants suitable for the manufacture of alcohol, a different approach is now being taken. A study group composed of specialists from three government departments and agencies is being assembled to determine the plant material, process, fuel and engine characteristics required to make alcohol an economically viable fuel for combustion engines.

[Mr. Jerome.]

USE OF COMPUTER—DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRY, TRADE AND COMMERCE

Question No. 2,051—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce have the use of a computer in its operations and, if so, to what extent is it utilized?

2. Is the computer programmed 24 hours per day and, if not, for what reason?

3. What is the number of hours planned for utilization of the computer?

4. What has been the annual cost of computer services for each year 1960 to 1970 inclusive?

5. How many programs are in preparation for the computer at the present time and how will each affect the efficiency of the Department?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Acting Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): 1. The Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce presently utilizes the following computers: (a) IBM 1440—utilized full-time. (b) Time Sharing Terminal—utilized an average of 30 hours per month. (c) Central Service Bureau and other Ottawa based service bureaus are utilized for approximately 12 hours per month.

2. The IBM 1440 computer production is scheduled for 24 hours per day, five days a week; in addition, 32 hours per weekend was scheduled during a peak period this year (March, April and May).

3. The Department is presently engaged in a computer feasibility study to determine the overall computer requirements; a firm answer cannot be given at this time.

4.

Year	Amount
1960/61	$ —
1961/62	—
1962/63	—
1963/64	—
1964/65	—
1965/66	35,612
1966/67	78,885
1967/68	100,939
1968/69	135,171
1969/70	124,713
1970/71	150,000 (est.)

5. Some 63 programs are presently in preparation for computer processing. These programs will reduce clerical effort, increase efficiency, provide information not previously available and provide for greater depth analysis.

SS *PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND*

Question No. 2,065—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. What was the sale price of the *SS Prince Edward Island*?

2. What other tenders were received and what was the amount of each?

Mr. Gérard Duquet (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. $20,000.

2. There were seven other tenders received in the amounts of $400; $555; $3,000; $3,700; $5,300; $7,125; $10,150.

DOWNSVIEW AERODROME

Question No. 2,071—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. Has the municipality of North York made representations to take over the operation of the Downsview Aerodrome as a civil airport and, if so, what action is being taken?

2. Has the Department of National Defence agreed to sell the Downsview Aerodrome runways and certain other adjacent property to the municipality of North York?

3. Is the Minister of Transport prepared to licence the aerodrome as an airport and supply normal air traffic control services?

4. Will the Minister provide Transport departmental funds to help develop the Downsview Aerodrome as a civil airport?

5. Does the Minister consider that the operation of the Downsview Aerodrome as a civil airport will assist in solving the overall air facility problem in the Toronto area?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): In so far as the Department of National Defence is concerned: 1. Discussions have been held between North York and the Department of National Defence relative to the continuing operation of the Downsview Aerodrome. No decision has been taken on the future level or nature of civilian operation.

2. No.

In so far as the Department of Transport is concerned:

3. (a) Downsview Aerodrome can be licensed when and if it becomes a civil facility provided the present zoning protection is maintained. However, because of the geographical situation of Downsview as regards noise pollution, and because of other aviation facilities close by (Toronto International, Toronto Island and Buttonville Airports) the role of Downsview is foreseen as providing a limited facility for general aviation serving industry. (b) Air Traffic Control services can be provided should traffic conditions generated by the limited aviation activity envisaged at the airport warrant it at that time.

4. This will depend on the circumstances which exist when and if the aerodrome becomes a civil facility.

5. The degree to which the operation of Downsview Aerodrome will assist operations in the Toronto area will depend on the ultimate use which is made of it as a civil facility. However, bearing in mind its limited role, it is expected that the impact of the use of Downsview in the overall aviation plan for the Toronto area will be minimal.

TRAINING OF PUBLIC SERVANTS IN GOVERNMENT LANGUAGE SCHOOLS

Question No. 2,082—**Mr. Moores:**

1. How many public servants have been trained in the government language training schools up to May 31, 1970 and, of these, how many have studied (a) French (b) English?

2. Excluding the regular salary of the trainee, what is the approximate cost per trainee?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Public Service Commission as follows: 1. From 1963 to May 31, 1970, 17,324 employees subject to the Public Service Employment Act and other Federal officials and employees have been enrolled in French training and 4,367 in English training.

2. Excluding salaries, the cost of training is approximately $1,000. per level and each employee normally completes one level in one year.

[*English*]

LIFT PROGRAM APPLICATION, H. A. OLSON

Question No. 2,091—**Mr. McIntosh:**

Has an application been received from H. A. Olson of Medicine Hat, under the provisions of the "Lift Program" and, if so, what are the details of such application?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Under the provisions of the Lift Program the application form and other documents associated with the program are considered to be privileged information between the farmer involved and the Department of Agriculture. It is therefore the policy of the Department not to divulge details of any producer's farm operations or information as to his eligibility for a payment under the regulations.

Orders for Returns

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

INCREASE IN GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT OFFICE SPACE

Question No. 1,314—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. In the past ten years, how much new office space, by square foot, have government departments (department by department) increased their office space (a) in Ottawa (b) outside Ottawa?

2. Of this space, how much is (a) in buildings owned by the government of Canada (b) in privately-owned buildings?

3. Of the space in government-owned buildings, what was the cost of building construction per square foot and what is the actual cost of maintenance per building per square foot?

4. Of the space occupied in rented buildings, what is the actual rental per square foot and what is the cost to the government of maintenance per square foot?

5. For what period is the government committed to remain and to pay rent in the buildings in which they have rented quarters?

6. Does the government assume financial responsibility for structural and decorating costs of rented space?

SUPPORT SHIPS H.M.C.S. *PROTECTOR* AND *PRESERVER*

Question No. 1,362—**Mr. Dumont:**

1. Has the contract price for *H.M.C.S. Protector* and *Preserver* been changed from the amount of $50,186,650 indicated in answer to Part 4 of Question Number 1,305 answered February 17, 1969 and, if so, what is the present contract price?

2. If an increase is involved, what factors contributed to such an increase and what are the amounts involved?

3. What is the estimated amount that will be paid the contractor when the two ships are completed?

4. Was the delivery date of September, 1969 met for the first ship as indicated in answer to Part 7 of Question Number 1,305 and, if so, what is the present operational status of the ship and where is it located?

5. If the ship is not operational, what are the reasons?

6. Will the delivery date of February, 1970 for the second ship be met as indicated in answer to Part 7 of Question Number 1,305?

AMOUNTS OF FEDERAL TAXES COLLECTED AND FEDERAL PAYMENTS MADE—1968

Question No. 1,403—**Mr. Paproski:**

1. What amounts of federal taxes were collected, by provinces, in 1968, in each category (a) personal income tax (b) corporation taxes (c) sales taxes (d) social security taxes (e) other taxes and duties?

[Mr. Olson.]

2. What were the amounts of federal payments by provinces in 1968 in each category (a) equalization grants (b) higher education (c) occupational training (d) Unemployment Insurance (e) hospitalization (f) Medicare (g) Old Age Security (h) veterans and disabled pensions (i) other joint programs?

3. What were the amounts of expenditures by government departments in each province and territory in 1968?

Return tabled.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTIONS TO SHARED-COST PROGRAMS

Question No. 1,430—**Mr. Beaudoin:**

In each fiscal year since March 31, 1960, what was the total amount contributed by the Government of Canada to (a) shared-cost programs undertaken in conjunction with any province or territory (i) by province or territory (ii) by department or agency for each province or territory (iii) by division for each department or agency in each province or territory (iv) by showing the percentage contributed by each department or agency in each province or territory (b) programs financed completely by the federal government (i) by province or territory (ii) by department or agency for each province or territory (iii) by division for each department or agency for each province or territory (iv) by item, in the case of Quebec?

RESEARCH STUDIES—DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRY, TRADE AND COMMERCE

Question No. 1,465—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. What research studies have been carried out by, or on behalf of, the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce during each year 1960 to 1969 inclusive?

2. What research studies are presently being carried on and/or are contemplated during the next five years?

3. What was the cost of each of the research studies completed in each year 1960 to 1969 inclusive?

4. What is the estimated cost of each of the studies presently in being or contemplated during the next five years?

EXPORT OF MILITARY AIRCRAFT

Question No. 1,521—**Mr. Lewis:**

1. By country, for each year 1963 to 1969 inclusive, how many military aircraft (export commodity classification 601-59) have been exported from Canada?

2. Does the Government of Canada keep records on whether the purchasing country re-exports military aircraft purchased from Canada and, if so (a) what types of aircraft were re-exported (b) what country re-exported them (c) to what country were they re-exported?

3. For which of the transactions in Part 1 did the Government impose as a condition of sale the requirement that Canadian permission be obtained before the purchasing country could re-sell the aircraft?

4. If Canada keeps the records referred to in Part 2, was Canadian permission sought in each case where there was a re-sale?

Return tabled.

ENGAGEMENT OF CONSULTANTS—DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

Question No. 1,596—**Mr. Robinson:**

How many consultants have been engaged by the Department of Public Works during each year 1950 to 1970 inclusive (a) what was the cost of the consultants (b) how were the consultants utilized (c) for what reasons were the consultants necessary?

RESEARCH STUDIES—DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR

Question No. 1,678—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. What research studies have been carried out by, or on behalf of, the Department of Labour during each year 1960 to 1969 inclusive?

2. What research studies are now being carried on and/or are contemplated during the next five years?

3. What was the cost of each of the research studies completed in each year 1960 to 1969 inclusive?

4. What is the estimated cost of each of the studies now in being or contemplated during the next five years?

Return tabled.

RESEARCH STUDIES—DEPARTMENT OF SECRETARY OF STATE

Question No. 1,710—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. What research studies have been carried out by, or on behalf of, the Department of the Secretary of State during each year 1960 to 1969 inclusive?

2. What research studies are now being carried on and/or are contemplated during the next five years?

3. What was the cost of each of the research studies completed in each year 1960 to 1969 inclusive?

4. What is the estimated cost of each of the studies now in being or contemplated during the next five years?

Return tabled.

ENGAGEMENT OF CONSULTANTS—DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE

Question No. 1,794—**Mr. Robinson:**

How many consultants have been engaged by the Department of National Health and Welfare during each year 1950 to 1970 inclusive (a) what was the cost of the consultants (b) how were the consultants utilized (c) for what reasons were the consultants necessary?

Return tabled.

RESEARCH STUDIES—DEPARTMENT OF SUPPLY AND SERVICES

Question No. 1,827—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. What research studies have been carried out by, or on behalf of the Department of Supply and Services and the Receiver General during each year 1960 to 1969 inclusive?

2. What research studies are now being carried on and/or are contemplated during the next five years?

3. What was the cost of each of the research studies completed in each year 1960 to 1969 inclusive?

4. What is the estimated cost of each of the studies now in being or contemplated during the next five years?

Return tabled.

NEWFOUNDLAND—FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL TRANS-CANADA HIGHWAY CONTRACTS

Question No. 1,845—**Mr. McGrath:**

1. What Federal-Provincial Trans-Canada Highway contracts have been awarded in Newfoundland since January 1, 1960?

2. What was the location and length of each such contract?

3. What was the name of the general contractors?

4. What was the total amount of each accepted contract?

5. What was the total amount paid to the general contractors?

6. What was the (a) estimated (b) actual cost of materials supplied by the government?

7. What was the (a) estimated (b) total fees paid to the consultant engineers?

8. What was the total contributions paid to the provincial government for each contract?

9. On what date were the contracts awarded and what was the date of the actual completion?

10. What is the anticipated date of completion for current contracts?

11. Are the stated amounts the contributions made by the federal government or the total cost of the various items?

12. In each case, was there a 50-50 or a 90-10 agreement between the federal and provincial governments?

Orders for Returns

FUNCTIONS OF MINISTER WITHOUT PORTFOLIO IN CHARGE OF HOUSING

Question No. 1,903—**Mr. Alexander:**

1. What is the function of and the responsibility delegated to the Minister without Portfolio in charge of Housing, other than Housing?

2. What recommendations of the Task Force on Housing and Urban Development (a) have been accepted and implemented and as to these, when and to what extent (b) regarding recommendations not dealt with in Part (a), which other recommendations are acceptable to the government and when will they be implemented (c) what was the total cost of the Task Force?

Return tabled.

MINISTERS' TRAVEL EXPENSES, 1969-70

Question No. 1,985—**Mr. Coates:**

1. What was the total of travelling expenses for each Minister of the Cabinet during the fiscal year 1969-70?

2. Does this include the use of government aircraft and, if not, on how many occasions was a government aircraft used?

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES' TRAVEL AND REMOVAL EXPENSES, 1969-70

Question No. 1,986—**Mr. Coates:**

1. How many members of the Public Service of Canada or members of Crown corporations or members of government commissions received in expenses under the Travel and Removal Expenses classification an amount in the fiscal year 1969-70 in excess of $2,000.00?

2. In each instance, what was the name of the person, his or her position, and the nature of his or her work?

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES' TRAVEL EXPENSES, 1969-70

Question No. 1,987—**Mr. Coates:**

1. What was the total of travelling expenses for each of the Parliamentary Secretaries during the fiscal year 1969-70?

2. Does this include the use of government aircraft and, if not, on how many occasions was a government aircraft used?

"CROSS CANADA SPORTS DEMONSTRATION"

Question No. 2,002—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Is it the intention of the federal government to continue the programme "Cross Canada Sports Demonstration" and, if so, to what extent?

[Mr. McGrath.]

2. How many sports demonstrations were held in 1969 and 1970, where was each held and what was the cost of each demonstration?

3. Who are the members of the Cross Canada Sports Demonstration team, how long has each been with the team and how much is each paid and is each member under contract and, if so, for how long and at what cost?

Return tabled.

ATTENDANCE OF HEALTH AND WELFARE MINISTER AND EMPLOYEES AT WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION MEETINGS

Question No. 2,008—**Mr. Coates:**

1. Did any employees of the Department of National Health and Welfare attend the World Health Organization meetings that were held recently in Geneva and, if so, who were they, what were their positions and for what period of time did each attend the meetings?

2. In each instance, how did the individual travel to and from Geneva and what was the cost of travel and expenses?

3. Did the Minister of National Health and Welfare attend the World Health Organization meetings and, if so (a) what period of time (b) what meetings did he attend (c) did he participate in an active manner (d) where did he stay while at Geneva (e) how did he travel between Ottawa and Geneva (f) what was the total cost in travel and expenses?

USE OF COMPUTER, DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE

Question No. 2,012—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of National Health and Welfare have the use of a computer in its operations and, if so, to what extent is it utilized?

2. Is the computer programmed 24 hours per day and, if not, for what reason?

3. What is the number of hours planned for utilization of the computer?

4. What has been the annual cost of computer services for each year 1960 to 1970 inclusive?

5. How many programmes are in preparation for the computer at the present time and how will each affect the efficiency of the Department?

MERCURY POLLUTION

Question No. 2,056—**Mr. Barnett:**

1. (a) How many industrial and manufacturing establishments in Canada utilize mercury or mercury compounds in their operation (b) what are the names and locations of these establishments?

2. (a) In what watersheds are these plants located, and into what streams or lakes would any effluent from these establishments drain most im-

mediately (b) how many such streams, lakes and potentially involved areas of watersheds have been tested for mercury pollution, and which ones (c) in which has evidence of mercury pollution been found, and of these in which have fish been tested for mercury content (d) of these, in which ones are fish considered (i) safe for human consumption (ii) unsafe and, in the latter case, which species?

3. What reimbursement and/or financial assistance has been made to commercial fishermen (a) for direct losses (b) for indirect losses resulting from mercury pollution (i) by the federal government (ii) those causing pollution?

4. Has the Department of Fisheries and Forestry taken any steps under the Fisheries Act to ban or regulate the discharge of mercury into Canadian waters and, if so (a) what measures were taken (b) do these measures include the enactment of regulations (c) what are these regulations?

5. Is any testing being done of fish for dangerous levels of any of the other elements and, if so, which ones?

6. Are there any elements listed in the Food and Drug regulations, as being dangerous for human consumption, which might be consumed by fish, for which a content in fish is not being tested and, if so, what are they?

Return tabled.

USE OF COMPUTER—DEPARTMENT OF SUPPLY AND SERVICES AND RECEIVER GENERAL OF CANADA

Question No. 2,068—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Supply and Services and Receiver General of Canada have the use of a computer in its operations and, if so, to what extent is it utilized?

2. Is the computer programmed 24 hours per day and, if not, for what reason?

3. What is the number of hours planned for utilization of the computer?

4. What has been the annual cost of computer services for each year 1960 to 1970 inclusive?

5. How many programmes are in preparation for the computer at the present time and how will each affect the efficiency of the Department?

Return tabled.

USE OF DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT—DEPARTMENT OF SUPPLY AND SERVICES AND RECEIVER GENERAL OF CANADA

Question No. 2,069—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Supply and Services and Receiver General of Canada have data processing equipment (automatic) and, if so, for how long?

2. What was the initial cost of the equipment?

3. What yearly costs are anticipated for data processing in the Department?

Return tabled.

Motions for Papers

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, Notices of Motions numbers 406, 455, 476, 517 and 519 are acceptable to the government.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that Notices of Motions numbers 406, 455, 476, 517 and 519 be deemed to have been adopted?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

REPORT ON BRITISH COLUMBIA TOWBOAT INDUSTRY

Motion No. 406—**Mr. Howard (Skeena):**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the Report on the Investigation into the Tow-Boat Industry in British Columbia conducted in 1969.

Motion agreed to.

CONFERENCE OF GOVERNMENT SCIENTISTS ON ARCTIC RESEARCH

Motion No. 455—**Mr. Harding:**

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House copies of all reports, studies, etc., discussed at the recent four day meeting held at Montebello, Quebec between United States and Canadian Government scientists to discuss Arctic research problems sponsored by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Motion agreed to.

ERNST AND ERNST CONSULTANT REVIEW OF PLANNING STUDY

Motion No. 476—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study by Ernst and Ernst undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding planning study as mentioned in answer to Question Number 897 and reported in *Hansard* of March 18, 1970 at page 5163.

Motion agreed to.

SHARING OF CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT COSTS, SASKATCHEWAN PROVINCIAL PARKS

Motion No. 517—**Mr. Burton:**

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House a copy of an agreement between the Government of Canada and the Government of Saskatchewan providing for the joint sharing of capital costs for the development of provincial parks in Saskatchewan during 1970-71 and 1971-72.

Motion agreed to.

Motions for Papers

SURVEY ON RETAIL PRICES OF PRESCRIBED DRUGS

Motion No. 519—**Mr. Orlikow:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the survey on the retail prices of nineteen commonly prescribed drugs undertaken by the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs as mentioned by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs in his speech before the Federal-Provincial Conference, June 10-12, 1970.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Jerome: Mr. Speaker, Notices of Motions Nos. 60, 263, 369, 396, 404, 480, and 518 are acceptable to the government subject to the usual reservations concerning confidential papers and to the authorization of the government authority concerned.

Mr. Speaker: Subject to the reservations and conditions expressed by the Parliamentary Secretary, is it the pleasure of the House that Notices of Motions Nos. 60, 263, 369, 396, 404, 480 and 518 be deemed to have been adopted?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

PLACE DU PORTAGE, HULL

Motion No. 60—**Mr. Thomson:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all correspondence between the Department of Public Works and the former owners of Place du Portage in Hull, Quebec, in relation to the rental of space by the Government of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

FEDERAL BUILDING, VICTORIAVILLE, QUE.

Motion No. 263—**Mr. Fortin:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all correspondence, reports, briefs and other documents submitted to the Government of Canada regarding the construction and equipping of a federal building in Victoriaville, Quebec.

Motion agreed to.

U.S. NORTH PACIFIC NUCLEAR EXPLOSION

Motion No. 369—**Mr. Mather:**

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House copies of the exchange of information between the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada on the results of the United States nuclear explosion underground in the North Pacific as mentioned by the Secretary of State for External Affairs in *Hansard* on February 11 at pages 3481-3482.

Motion agreed to.

[Mr. Burton.]

CORRESPONDENCE WITH DETERGENT COMPANIES ON POLLUTION CONTROL

Motion No. 396—**Mr. Skoberg:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all correspondence exchanged from January, 1968 to March 1970, dealing with pollution control between the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources and the following Companies: Proctor and Gamble Ltd., Lever Bros. Ltd. and The Colgate-Palmolive Company Ltd.

Motion agreed to.

GRANTS IN AID OF CANCER RESEARCH

Motion No. 404—**Mr. Rynard:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all letters, telegrams, briefs or other documents dated since the 1st of July, 1969, exchanged between the Minister or any official of the Department of National Health and Welfare and any person or organization regarding grants in aid of cancer research.

Motion agreed to.

LALONDE VALOIS REVIEW OF TRANSPORTATION STUDY OF GASPÉ REGION

Motion No. 480—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study by Lalonde Valois undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding the transportation study of the Gaspé region as mentioned in answer to Question Number 897 and reported in *Hansard* of March 18, 1970 at page 5163.

Motion agreed to.

AGREEMENT RESPECTING DEVELOPMENT OF FORILLON NATIONAL PARK

Motion No. 518—**Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse):**

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House copies of the agreement and all correspondence between the federal government and the Government of the Province of Quebec respecting the development of the Forillon National Park.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Jerome: Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call Notices of Motions Nos. 218, 282, 288, 307, 322, 331, 356, 362, 395, 446, 451, 456, 458, 488, 491, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511 and 512?

SUBSIDIARIES IN CANADA

Motion No. 218—**Mr. Skoberg:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant report by H. R. Kemp on data on

subsidiaries in Canada undertaken for the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce for the fiscal year 1966-67, as mentioned in answer to Question Number 1,323 of the past Session.

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): This motion is not acceptable because the consultant in question unfortunately passed away during the time he was commissioned to conduct the study, and therefore the report is in draft form only. The minister feels he could not table the report in this form and he asks the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Skoberg: I will give it due consideration, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

PRIVATE AIRCRAFT USER CHARGES AND FEES

Motion No. 282—**Mr. Skoberg:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the review on user charges and fees paid by private aircraft using the facilities provided by the Department of Transport as mentioned by the Minister without Portfolio in *Hansard* of November 26, 1969 on page 1291.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Duquet (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, it is a continuing study which is not yet completed. The Department of Transport is presently considering the whole matter of charges, including those that are paid for various types of private aircraft.

When a decision is reached in that regard, the government will examine the possibility of giving the requested information to the House.

Until then, I would ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Skoberg: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

DEFENCE PRODUCTION SHARING—U.S. FIRMS EXPORTING TO CANADA

Motion No. 288—**Mr. Broadbent:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a list of all United States firms exporting to Canada, products under the Canada-U.S. Defence Production Sharing Agreement from its inception in 1959 to November 30, 1969, listing the specific materials and components coming into Canada and the dollar aggregates involved.

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce wishes to inform the hon. member that to compile a list of purchases by the Canadian government would be costly and, at best, would constitute only a partial reply since information on private companies' purchases is held to be commercially confidential. He is able, however, to table estimates of the dollar aggregates involved if this is acceptable to the hon. member.

Mr. Broadbent: It is acceptable.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is carried subject to the reservations and conditions expressed by the Parliamentary Secretary.

Motion agreed to.

MOVEMENT OF OIL FROM ALBERTA TO QUEBEC

Motion No. 307—**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all studies, reports, memoranda, etc., regarding the statement made in Parliament by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and reported in *Hansard* of December 11, 1969 on page 1851 that: "if oil were sent from Alberta to Quebec in the east, it would be very costly. Indeed, pipelines would have to be built from Western Canada, which would not be profitable".

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, with reference to the hon. member's motion I have to say that there are no specific studies, reports, memoranda, etc. regarding the statement to which he refers. I would point out, however, that it was remarked before the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works on May 8 last year that the price of Alberta crude brought as far west as Toronto was some 60 cents a barrel above the laid-down price—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member knows that he cannot make a statement. He has to indicate whether or not the return is to be made. He should not take the occasion of the calling of the motion to make a speech.

Mr. Baldwin: We want to get on with the Grain Act.

Mr. Speaker: Is the motion to be dropped or transferred for debate?

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): In view of the Parliamentary Secretary's statement that the government has no

information and that the minister was speaking without any survey or knowledge of the facts, I am prepared to withdraw the motion.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

STUDIES BY TRANSPORT POLICY AND RESEARCH BRANCH

Motion No. 322—**Mr. Skoberg:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of the research studies undertaken by the Transportation Policy and Research Branch of the Department of Transport as reported in answer to Question Number 233 in *Hansard* of December 17, 1969 at page 2069.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Duquet (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the member has asked for twelve different studies, some of which have already been published while others have not yet been completed. The government will consider the possibility of communicating the remainder to the House. If the hon. member would be good enough to indicate clearly in separate notices of motion which reports he would like to obtain, the government could deal with each of them according to its own importance.

I would therefore ask the hon. member to withdraw that motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order I want to reinforce the point that this is not the time for this sort of thing. The time of the House should not be taken up by this continuous repetition of alibis by the government. There could be private exchanges. We are anxious to get on with the business of the House in the short time remaining during this session, and we think that in the future the rule that Your Honour mentioned should be strictly enforced.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, it will be noted that the objection of the hon. member for Peace River is that we are giving the House too much information.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Left unresolved is the question of whether Motion No. 322 should stand, be voted upon, transferred for debate or dropped.

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

Mr. Skoberg: I would like some of that information, Mr. Speaker, and so I will resubmit the question next session.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

PURCHASE RESEARCH BRANCH STUDIES

Motion No. 331—**Mr. Skoberg:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of the research studies undertaken by the Purchase Research Branch of the Department of Supply and Services as mentioned in answer to Question Number 128 and reported in Hansard of December 15, 1969 at page 1949.

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, the Purchase Research Branch of the Department of Supply and Services was established to improve methods of government purchasing. The studies and reports produced by the branch were written for departmental use, and not primarily for wider distribution. They contain information given in confidence by business firms on the understanding that this information would not be made public. In addition, some of the documents contain classified material. It is therefore not possible for these papers to be tabled in their present form.

There is, however, a large amount of useful information that is not classified which I believe would be of interest to the public. It is, therefore, my intention to have the classified information removed from these papers and to have all of the remaining documents and studies made available to the public.

Mr. Bell: Censorship.

Mr. Speaker: Subject to the conditions and reservations expressed by the minister, is the motion carried?

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Motion agreed to.

REPORTS REGARDING FOOD PROTEST, SASKATCHEWAN PENITENTIARY

Motion No. 356—**Mr. Howard (Skeena):**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all reports received by the government or any agency, branch or department thereof from the Warden or other officers of the Saskatchewan Penitentiary at Prince Albert, Saskatchewan with regard to the so-called "food protest" or "food strike" engaged in by inmates at the said Penitentiary in December, 1969, and for a copy of all reports relating to any follow-up or subsequent action taken by the Administration of the said Penitentiary.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Stand.

Mr. Speaker: Motion stands.

INDUSTRY STUDIES

Motion No. 362—**Mr. Broadbent:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all industry studies completed by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce pursuant to Deputy-Minister Reisman's memo on that subject.

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce wishes to inform the hon. member that the internal memo he refers to provided general instructions to branch directors in their activities and was not directed to specific studies. If the member is interested in any particular industry, the minister would be happy to see if a study has been prepared and if the material is in a form suitable for tabling.

Mr. Broadbent: Despite the felicitous tone of the answer I wish to have the motion transferred for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

PORT ALBERNI HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS FINANCIAL REPORTS

Motion No. 395—**Mr. Barnett:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of each of the three most recent annual financial reports received by the Minister of Transport from the Port Alberni Harbour Commissioners.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Duquet (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the reports in question include detailed confidential information on the internal operation of the Commission. To divulge their content seems contrary to public interest.

However, the government is willing to table a condensed report showing the financial position of the Commission for the years 1967, 1968 and 1969.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Subject to the reservations and conditions expressed by the Parliamentary Secretary, is it the pleasure of the House that this motion be carried?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

Motions for Papers

CNR RIVERS SUBDIVISION ACCIDENT

Motion No. 446—**Mr. Skoberg:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the report of the Canadian Transport Commission concerning the investigation into the mishap on the CNR Rivers Subdivision on April 28, 1968, where three employees were killed when the engine went through the bridge.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Duquet (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, we are advised by the Canadian Transport Commission that, following a specific request to its committee on rail transport, the latter has investigated the particular circumstances in which the accident occurred and has decided to make an order providing for publication of the information contained in the report of the committee's inspector. Copies of the order and related documents will be forwarded to the hon. member.

In view of this information, would the hon. member kindly withdraw his motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Skoberg: I am pleased to hear that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

FOREIGN OWNERSHIP AND CONTROL OF CANADIAN MINING INDUSTRIES

Motion No. 451—**Mr. Saltsman:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the studies undertaken in the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources on the degree of foreign ownership and control of the Canadian Mining and mineral processing industries as indicated at page 33 of the 1968-69 Annual Report of the Department.

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the preliminary investigations on foreign ownership, referred to on page 33 of the 1968-69 annual report of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, are still continuing and have not yet reached the report stage. It is anticipated that one phase will be completed for publication within the next few months. I would, therefore, ask that the hon. member withdraw his motion.

Mr. Saltsman: Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

Motions for Papers

WATER POLLUTION BY CHEMICAL AND PULP AND PAPER INDUSTRIES

Motion No. 456—**Mr. Harding:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all correspondence between the Department of Fisheries and Forestry and the Chemical and Pulp and Paper Industry regarding mercury water pollution in Canada.

Mr. Eymard Corbin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): It is the view of the government that the tabling of the correspondence requested in this motion would seriously and adversely affect the confidence and effective working relationship between the Department of Fisheries and Forestry and the companies in question. In view of this fact we should like to request that the hon. member withdraw his motion.

Mr. Harding: Transfer for debate, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

GLACE BAY HEAVY WATER PLANT—CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN GERALD A. REAGAN AND GOVERNMENT

Motion No. 458—**Mr. Muir:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of any or all correspondence between Gerald A. Reagan and the federal government or any department, division, agency or Crown corporation, relating to the financing of the heavy water plant at Glace Bay, Nova Scotia.

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, a search of departmental files has established that there exists no correspondence within the purview of this motion. The motion is therefore not acceptable to the government and it is hoped the hon. member will withdraw his motion.

Mr. Muir: That is agreeable, Mr. Speaker. But I have other ideas.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

EASTERN DESIGNERS LIMITED REVIEW OF SAINT JOHN WATER SUPPLY STUDY

Motion No. 486—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study by Eastern Designers Limited undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding the Saint John Water Supply Study as mentioned in answer to Question Number 897 and reported in *Hansard* of March 18, 1970 at page 5163.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, this is a continuing study and as yet there is no report suitable for tabling. I would ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Burton: I am in a very agreeable mood today, Mr. Speaker.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

J. PARIKHAL REVIEW OF REGIONAL MIGRATION STUDY

Motion No. 488—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study by J. Parikhal undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding the regional migration study as mentioned in answer to Question Number 897 and reported in *Hansard* of March 18, 1970 at page 5163.

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, the report requested takes the form of a computer printout and, as I mentioned in June, it is not suitable for tabling. I would ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Burton: We are still agreeable, Mr. Speaker.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

SHAWINIGAN ENGINEERING LTD. REVIEW OF SAINT JOHN WATER SUPPLY STUDY

Motion No. 491—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant study by Shawinigan Engineering Ltd. undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding the Saint John Water Supply Study as mentioned in answer to Question Number 897 and reported in *Hansard* of March 18, 1970 at page 5163.

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, the study requested has not yet been submitted to the department. In these circumstances I would ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Burton: Agreed, Mr. Speaker.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

1968-69 STUDY OF EFFECT OF OESTROGEN-PROGESTIN COMPOUNDS

Motion No. 493—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study undertaken in the fiscal year 1968-69 funded by the Department of National Health and

Welfare on "The Effect of Oestrogen-progestin Compounds on Platelet Surface Reactions in Women of Childbearing Age".

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gaston Isabelle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, a reply has already been given to the question and it still stands. I must say that—

[*English*]

The Department of National Health and Welfare does not publish the results of scientific studies carried out in these circumstances without the written permission of the investigators. Furthermore, the studies of which copies are requested have not been completed.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I am afraid the hon. gentleman's "furthermore" is beyond the scope of our rules. The Parliamentary Secretary should indicate whether or not he is prepared to file the report.

Mr. Isabelle: In view of these circumstances, the hon. member might wish to withdraw her motion.

Mrs. MacInnis: I am unable to understand why this information should be classified but in the interest of co-operation I am willing to drop the motion today and put it back on the order paper tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is dropped for today.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

1969-70 STUDY OF EFFECT OF OESTROGEN-PROGESTIN COMPOUNDS

Motion No. 494—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study undertaken in the fiscal year 1969-70 funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare on "The Effect of Oestrogen-progestin Compounds on Platelet Surface Reactions in Women of Childbearing Age".

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gaston Isabelle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the reply is the same as the one I gave for notice of motion No. 493, and for the same reason I would ask the hon. member to withdraw her motion.

Mrs. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, my reply is also the same.

[*English*]

STUDY OF THERMAL METHOD OF BIRTH CONTROL

Motion No. 495—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study "Causes et conséquences démographiques économiques et sociales de la pratique de la méthode thermique de régulation des naissances" funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare in the fiscal year 1969-70.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gaston Isabelle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the answer to this question is the same as for the two previous motions. For this reason, I would ask the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway to withdraw her motion.

Mrs. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, my answer is the same as for the two previous motions.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is withdrawn for today.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

[*English*]

1970-71 STUDY "PROJET DE RECHERCHE AUPRÈS DU MILIEU DÉFAVORISÉ URBAIN QUÉBÉCOIS"

Motion No. 496—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study undertaken by Le Centre de Planification Familiale, Montreal, in the fiscal year 1970-71 funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare on "Projet de recherche auprès du milieu défavorisé urbain Québécois".

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gaston Isabelle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, for the same reasons that I have already given about the previous requests, I would ask the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway to withdraw her motion.

While I have the floor, Mr. Speaker, and with the unanimous consent of the House, I might perhaps suggest that the same answer should apply to motions Nos. 497, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510 and 511.

Mrs. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, I shall spare you the trouble of reading the other motions but I shall submit them again tomorrow morning.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: Nos. 497 and 500 to 511 inclusive are dropped.

1969-70 STUDY, "PROJET DE RECHERCHE AUPRÈS DU MILIEU DÉFAVORISÉ URBAIN QUÉBÉCOIS"

Motion No. 497—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study undertaken by Le Centre de Planification Familiale, Montreal, in the fiscal year 1969-70 funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare on "Projet de recherche auprès du milieu défavorisé urbain Québecois".

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

1969-70 STUDY "PHYSIOLOGICAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF ORAL CONTRACEPTIVE MEDICATION"

Motion No. 500—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study undertaken by the Jewish General and Montreal General Hospitals in the fiscal year 1969-70 funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare on the "Physiological and Psychological Aspects of Oral Contraceptive Medication".

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

1968-69 STUDY "PHYSIOLOGICAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF ORAL CONTRACEPTIVE MEDICATION"

Motion No. 501—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study undertaken by the Jewish General and Montreal General Hospitals in the fiscal year 1968-69 funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare on the "Physiological and Psychological Aspects of Oral Contraceptive Medication".

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

1969-70 STUDY "EVALUATION OF RESULTS OF GENETIC COUNSELLING"

Motion No. 502—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study undertaken by the Montreal Children's Hospital (McGill) in the fiscal year 1969-70 funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare on the "Evaluation of Results of Genetic Counselling".

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

1968-69 STUDY "EVALUATION OF RESULTS OF GENETIC COUNSELLING"

Motion No. 503—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study undertaken by the Montreal Children's Hospital (McGill) in the fiscal year 1968-69 funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare on the "Evaluation of Results of Genetic Counselling".

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

1967-68 STUDY "EVALUATION OF RESULTS OF GENETIC COUNSELLING"

Motion No. 504—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study undertaken by the Montreal Children's Hospital (McGill) in the fiscal year 1967-68 funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare on the "Evaluation of Results of Genetic Counselling".

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

1966-67 STUDY, "EVALUATION OF RESULTS OF GENETIC COUNSELLING"

Motion No. 505—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study undertaken by the Montreal Children's Hospital (McGill) in the fiscal year 1966-67 funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare on the "Evaluation of Results of Genetic Counselling".

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

1969 STUDY "AN EXPERIMENT IN COMMUNITY HEALTH CARE"

Motion No. 506—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of a study undertaken by Toronto General Hospital (University of Toronto) in the fiscal year 1969-70 on "An Experiment in Community Health Care: The Evaluation of Voluntary Family Planning (a) the need; (b) the desire; (c) the effect", funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

1968-69 STUDY "AN EXPERIMENT IN COMMUNITY HEALTH CARE"

Motion No. 507—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of a study undertaken by Toronto General Hospital (University of Toronto) in the fiscal year 1968-69 on "An Experiment in Community Health Care: The Evaluation of Voluntary Family Planning (a) the need; (b) the desire; (c) the effect", funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

1967-68 STUDY "AN EXPERIMENT IN COMMUNITY HEALTH CARE"

Motion No. 508—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of a study undertaken by Toronto General Hospital (University of Toronto) in the fiscal year 1967-68 on "An Experiment in Community Health Care: The Evaluation of Voluntary Family Planning (a) the need; (b) the desire; (c) the effect", funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

1969-70 STUDY OF SOCIAL AND MEDICAL FACTORS OF WOMEN ATTENDING FAMILY PLANNING CLINIC

Motion No. 509—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study undertaken by the University of British Columbia in the fiscal year 1969-70 funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare on "Social and Medical Factors of Women Attending Vancouver Family Planning Clinic and a Group of Women not Attending a Family Planning Clinic in two areas of the City of Vancouver".

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

1968-69 STUDY OF SOCIAL AND MEDICAL FACTORS OF WOMEN ATTENDING FAMILY PLANNING CLINIC

Motion No. 510—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study undertaken by the University of British Columbia in the fiscal year 1968-69 funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare on "Social and Medical Factors of Women Attending Vancouver Family Planning Clinic and a Group of Women not Attending a Family Planning Clinic in two areas of the city of Vancouver".

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

STUDY OF EFFECT OF ORAL CONTRACEPTIVES ON FOLATE METABOLISM

Motion No. 511—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study undertaken by St. Boniface General Hospital in the fiscal year 1969-70 funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare on "The Effect of Oral Contraceptives on Folate Metabolism as Related to the Outcome of Subsequent Pregnancies".

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: Motion No. 512 in the name of the hon. member for Kootenay West.

Mr. Jerome: Mr. Speaker, I believe Motion No. 512 is included in the group just referred to.

An hon. Member: No. There is an error in the list.

Mr. Jerome: Mr. Speaker, I ask that No. 512 and the remaining notices of motions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining notices of motion stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

PROROGATION OF PARLIAMENT

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a communication has been received, which is as follows:

Government House
Ottawa, October 2, 1970

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that the Right Honourable Gérald Fauteux, P.C., Chief Justice of Canada, in his capacity as Deputy Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber at 4.45 on Wednesday, October 7th, for the purpose of giving Royal Assent to certain bills and proroguing the Second Session of the Twenty-eighth Parliament of Canada.

I have the Honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,
Louis-Frémont Trudeau
Brigadier General
Assistant Secretary to the Governor General.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

DRUGS

MARIJUANA—TRANSFER FROM NARCOTIC CONTROL ACT TO FOOD AND DRUGS ACT—ANALYTICAL LABORATORIES—INFORMATION CENTRES

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. On June 19 he indicated that the government was considering recommending to Parliament that marijuana be transferred from the Narcotic Control Act to the Food and Drugs Act in a way that simple possession of marijuana could be prosecuted by summary conviction as an offence not subject to jail terms. Can the minister indicate whether the government has reached a decision in this matter and, if so, what the decision is?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, may I advise the Leader of the Opposition that the government has not reached a decision yet.

Mr. Stanfield: In view of the recommendation of the LeDain Commission that the federal government should investigate the establishment of regional drug analytical laboratories at strategic points across the country, can the minister tell the House whether he has done anything about the suggestion and give the House an assurance that these laboratories have been established and are in existence?

Mr. Munro: Yes, the government is giving active consideration at the moment to giving food and drug licences to responsible and competent people and inviting them to conduct these analyses. When the final arrangements are made I will be pleased to make the announcement in the House.

Mr. Stanfield: I gather the announcement is that nothing has been done yet?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Hees: That is correct.

Mr. Stanfield: In view of the recommendations of the LeDain Commission, can the minister assure the House that the government has now established a system of centres across the country to provide information and consultation for drug users?

Mr. Munro: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The department and the Food and Drug Directorate are busy now in preparing a detailed program for information and educational purposes, and we hope to have it operating within the next few months.

Mr. Bell: The minister has had a busy summer.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

SUBMISSION OF REPORT ON FOREIGN OWNERSHIP TO CABINET—AVAILABILITY TO PUBLIC—STATEMENT OF POLICY

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of National Revenue and, in doing so, congratulate him on his appointment to his new position. Since the minister has been charged by the Prime Minister with the responsibility for conducting a study into the whole question of foreign ownership and control of the Canadian economy, may I ask him how soon we may expect his report to be ready for presentation to the cabinet? I recognize that this is a large subject. Will the presentation be ready in a matter of weeks, months or years? Can the minister give us some approximate date when this report will be ready for presentation to the cabinet?

Hon. Herb Gray (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, first let me thank the Leader of the New Democratic Party for his words of congratulation. I am happy to inform the House that the work I am supervising is relatively far advanced. It is my expectation that it can be in the hands of the cabinet this fall.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Prime Minister. Is it the government's intention, after it has had adequate time to study this report, to make it available to the public?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker, that will not necessarily follow. At some point we will have to disclose the government's policy on this matter.

Mr. Stanfield: But not its reasons.

Mr. Trudeau: Whether the report will be in a form which can suitably be presented to the House is a matter we shall have to consider when we see the report. I am hopeful that when we are in a position to state our policy we will do so. In the meantime I hope the New Democratic Party will find a way of making up its own mind, without waiting for this report.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, we have made up our minds.

Mr. Trudeau: Whose minds are made up?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): We have made up our minds but anybody waiting for the government to bring down the report will never be able to make up his mind, because this report has been a long time in the making. Now the Prime Minister tells us it is not going to be available to the public. May I ask the Prime Minister, at what point does the government intend to

make known to the House and the country what its policy is with regard to foreign ownership? Is it the government's intention to bring down a White Paper, or is it the government's intention to bring down legislation during the next session of Parliament?

Mr. Baldwin: That will be part of the government's next election campaign, Tommy.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, the same answer applies.

[*English*]

Mr. Stanfield: What about participatory democracy?

[*Translation*]

HEALTH AND WELFARE

GOVERNMENT POLICY RESPECTING TOBACCO

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

The news is that the federal government would spend millions of dollars to fight smoking which is causing so many Canadians to cough as some television programs have shown. Yet the same government is spending millions of dollars to help tobacco farmers.

Could the minister explain the logic of these government expenditures, namely encouraging tobacco production on the one hand and trying to get people to stop smoking on the other hand?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member will agree that his question is rather controversial and I do not think it is in order.

[*English*]

FINANCE

LOWERING OF INTEREST RATES—SUGGESTED MEETING WITH BANKS

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. Is it the intention of the minister to call together in the near future the heads of the chartered banks of Canada and advise them that there is no justifiable excuse for Canadian chartered banks not following the lead given by the Bank of Canada and United States chartered banks in lowering interest rates in order to stimulate production and increase employment? If the minister is not planning to hold such meetings, would he give immediate consideration to holding meetings of that kind in the very near future?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I always consider proposals put forward by the hon. member. Answering the first part of his question, I have no such intention for the near future.

NATURAL RESOURCES

PEACE RIVER—EFFECT OF DAM ON WATER LEVEL, WILDLIFE, ETC.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Has the minister received a report on the continuing and serious deterioration affecting wildlife and other resources in the Peace River and Athabasca Delta? If so, is he able to file that report or advise the House of its contents?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, my department has carried out studies on the situation that would be created by the very low water level in this area due to the erection of the Bennett dam in British Columbia. These studies are solely of a departmental nature and I wonder whether their findings should be tabled. I will study the matter and see if this can be done.

[*English*]

Mr. Baldwin: Because of the urgency of the situation and because the divided jurisdiction makes it difficult for any individual to secure redress, will the minister consult with the Minister of Justice and the ministers in the provinces about the possibility of a constitutional amendment in the form of a bill of rights for natural resources guaranteeing the enjoyment by the people of Canada of the natural resources of Canada and the right to secure remedies and redress in any part of Canada?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to convey the hon. member's suggestion to my colleague the Minister of Justice.

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*English*]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

PROPOSED TAKEOVER OF W. J. GAGE TEXTBOOK DIVISION BY UNITED STATES COMPANY

Mr. S. Perry Ryan (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Revenue in his capacity of being in charge of the study on foreign ownership. I would first like to sincerely congratulate my former colleague on his elevation to his new portfolio. We all know what a hard worker he is and wish him every success.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Ryan: In view of the apparent takeover of the W. J. Gage textbook division by an American company and the potential impact of United States control of the textbook industry, will the minister inform the House if the government has any policy on foreign takeovers in this crucial area, particularly as advocated by the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board? Are we—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is asking the minister to make a statement of policy. In those terms the question is not acceptable at this time.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

POSSIBLE DEPLOYMENT OF ANTI-BALLISTIC MISSILES IN CANADIAN NORTH—AWACS PROGRAM—DISCUSSION WITH UNITED STATES

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of National Defence will no doubt remember, if he has not had more slippage, that I asked him a question yesterday with regard to information from the United States concerning the deployment of ABM's and also with regard to AWACS and any discussions taking place between our authorities and American authorities on this subject?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): Yes, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member asked if the Canadian government had been informed about the future ABM plans of the United States and the deployment of any ballistic missiles near the Canadian border. The answer is yes, we have been informed. With regard to AWACS, officials from both the United States and Canada have already had discussions on the proposed AWACS program. We are being kept informed of developments in this technical field, but it will be some couple of years before decisions by Canada on the AWACS system would be appropriate.

[Mr. Chrétien.]

Mr. Lewis: I ask the minister whether Canada's participation with American scientific people in discussing the AWACS system implies that the government has made a decision to participate in the development of the AWACS system whenever it may come into operation?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): It does not have that implication, Mr. Speaker.

ANTI-BALLISTIC MISSILES—AWACS PROGRAM —CONSULTATION WITH HOUSE COMMITTEE

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): A supplementary question. Can the minister assure the House that decisions with regard to the installation of new systems, either AWACS or some complementary system to the ABM system deployed in the United States, will not be made without consultation with the House through the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): My recollection is that there has been some consultation already on the general principle of the AWACS system. Of course the government will have to make its own decision in that regard. Naturally these decisions are reviewable by the House through its committees.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF POLICY ON ANTI-BALLISTIC MISSILE SYSTEM

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): I wish to direct a further question to the Prime Minister. In view of commitments made earlier by the right hon. gentleman to make public the government's policy on ABM's after both United States decisions had been made and the Canadian foreign policy review had been published, when can we expect an announcement of the government's policy and decision on the ABM system?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I answered this question several months ago, Mr. Speaker. I have no further statement to make at this time on the subject.

FUTURE ROLE FOR CF-5 AIRCRAFT—ADHERENCE TO TENDER PRICE

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington): I wish to direct my question to the Minister of National Defence. On Monday the minister said he would check to see whether there were change orders involved in the purchase of the CF-5 airplanes. Has the minister checked that? Also, will he advise the House if tenders were called or was the price simply negotiated?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, my information is that the contract at the present time is within the financial limits approved by Treasury Board. As the hon. member knows, the contract has not yet been ultimately completed and is subject, of course, to any intervening contingencies. As to whether it was subject to tendering, I cannot answer that offhand but I can inquire.

FISHERIES

LAKE ONTARIO AND ST. LAWRENCE RIVER—COMPENSATION TO FISHERMEN FOR LOSSES CAUSED BY SEIZURES

Mr. A. D. Alkenbrack (Frontenac-Lennox and Addington): My question is for the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. It arises out of serious financial losses to fishermen and fish dealers in the lower Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence River regions as a result of last summer's seizure, condemnation and destruction of their products by the Department of Fisheries and Forestry because of an alleged prohibitively high mercury content. Will the minister and his department give favourable consideration to compensating these operators for their losses which, of course, are unforeseen and no fault of their own?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): The answer is essentially yes, Mr. Speaker. The department will give favourable consideration. As the hon. member knows, where closures have taken place loans are advanced on a 50-50 basis, shared with the province. With respect to the fish that have been condemned, certain lots are under consideration for compensation to those who bought them.

Mr. Alkenbrack: I respectfully point out to you, sir, that loans are of no value to the operators at this time.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member cannot point anything out to the Speaker, even respectfully.

Inquiries of the Ministry

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ABDUCTION OF SENIOR BRITISH TRADE COMMISSIONER—PRESENT SITUATION—OFFER OF REWARD BY TORONTO BUSINESSMEN

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, sometimes angels fear to tread, but the fact that there has been silence here today with regard to a matter that has the attention of Canadians everywhere prompts me to ask either the Prime Minister or the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether the silence today is due to the fact that there is hope for the survival of Mr. Cross? I ask this question so that Canadians may be restored in their faith in our administration of justice.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker, hope still exists.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, is the Prime Minister not prepared to go any further than to state that "hope still exists"? Hope is eternal in the human breast! Is the Prime Minister not able to say something regarding the present position of a matter concerning which members realize anxiety is being felt in all parts of Canada?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I answered the right hon. member's question in the terms in which he asked it, whether hope still existed. I can only say it does. I do not think I can usefully add anything at this time. Mr. Choquette, the Attorney General of Quebec, made a statement last night. The Secretary of State for External Affairs made a statement to the House last night. These are the positions of the two governments. They are well known to the public.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether a number of businessmen in Toronto have stated that in view of the failure of the government to join in providing a reward they would be prepared to go to the extent of putting up $50,000 to assure that action is taken?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure if the reward is for the delivery of the abductors or of the abducted. Could the right hon. member be more precise?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I suggest the Prime Minister should not be facetious with regard to a matter as serious as this.

Some hon. Members: Order!

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Diefenbaker: Yesterday he was smiling when questions were asked in this regard.

Some hon. Members: Order!

Mr. Diefenbaker: I ask the Prime Minister whether such an offer has been received or whether the government has given any consideration to making a reward available? It has worked in the past even though the Prime Minister does not seem to be aware of that.

Mr. Trudeau: Obviously, Mr. Speaker, if the right hon. member cannot answer my question as to supplementary details, he has not given it any thought, either.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Is the right hon. member rising on a supplementary?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, the answer of the Prime Minister indicates—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I was wondering whether the right hon. gentleman wished to ask a supplementary question.

Mr. Diefenbaker: No, Mr. Speaker, I am rising on a question of privilege. The facetious manner in which the Prime Minister treats this House of Commons indicates that he has complete contempt for it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, in view of the answers given by the Prime Minister to the right hon. member for Prince Albert, which might create some confusion, will the Prime Minister answer this question: Has the federal government opted out of negotiations with Mr. Cross' abductors but is permitting the Quebec government, through the Quebec Minister of Justice, to do the bargaining with the FLQ?

Mr. Trudeau: No, Mr. Speaker.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

FAILURE OF CHATEAU LAURIER HOTEL TO COMPLY WITH MINIMUM WAGE LAW

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Labour. Is the minister aware of reports that the Chateau Laurier is not complying with the new minimum wage law? If so, does the minister plan to take any action?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I have the impression that this is the kind of question that should be considered at the time of adjournment. At the same time I realize that there is prorogation today, so in view of the special circumstances perhaps the question may be allowed and replied to by the minister.

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the fact that the CNR has refused to extend minimum wages to those employees working in their hotels. Because of the fact that it has been traditionally considered by the Department of Labour that these people come under federal jurisdiction, I have given the necessary instructions to proceed with a prosecution against Canadian National Railways.

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the minister. May I ask him whether this applies to all CNR hotels across the country and, if not, why not?

Mr. Mackasey: Mr. Speaker, as I say, this matter has traditionally been within the jurisdiction of the Department of Labour and the Canada Labour Relations Board. Therefore, to be consistent it would apply as far as we are concerned to all hotels where the CNR or any crown corporation is violating labour standards.

[*Translation*]

INDIAN AFFAIRS

QUEBEC—TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATION TO PROVINCIAL JURISDICTION

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Are discussions being held with the Quebec government about the eventual transfer of jurisdiction with regard to Indian affairs within Quebec territory?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, we have formed, with the Quebec government and the Indians of that province, a tripartite committee to study the problem. A year and a half ago, we made offers to the Indians with regard to the eventual right of Canadian Indians to political assistance; the whole matter is being studied, on the national as well as provincial level, by this three-member committee.

[*English*]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

PROPOSED TAKEOVER OF W. J. GAGE TEXTBOOK DIVISION BY UNITED STATES COMPANY

Mr. Alastair Gillespie (Etobicoke): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of National Revenue in his capacity as the minister responsible for proposing policies on foreign ownership. What action, if any, does the federal government intend to take with respect to the proposed sale of the leading Canadian textbook publishing enterprise, the publishing division of W. J. Gage Limited, to Scott Foresman Company?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The question asked by the hon. member sounds very much like one asked earlier today. Although the original question asked the minister to give a statement on policy and I thought that in those terms it was perhaps too broad, perhaps the minister might want to indicate in reply to the first question whether a general statement will be made at a later date and at the same time reply to the question asked by the hon. member for Etobicoke.

Hon. Herb Gray (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, as I think I indicated in reply to a question from another member, I am not yet in a position to state a definite time with respect to the making public of a general statement on policy in the area of foreign ownership. With your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, may I reply very briefly to both questions in this area in a form that you may consider acceptable.

There is no current federal legislation on the basis of which action can be contemplated at this time with respect to this transaction. However, there appears to be a certain jurisdiction on the part of the provinces arising out of their authority to deal with the acceptability of textbooks. It had been my intention to contact the Ontario Minister of Education and other provincial ministers about this question. However, I am pleased to see that, according to news reports, the Ontario minister is proceeding to take action under his jurisdiction, and I would be happy to discuss the matter with him further.

Mr. Gillespie: Recognizing the importance of a Canadian-owned educational publishing industry, is the government prepared to consider extending financial incentives to Canadian publishers in the same way that they are extended to manufacturing industries in Canada?

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps this question might be answered when the minister makes his statement on policy.

FISHERIES

MARINE RESOURCES—DISCUSSION WITH THE SOVIET UNION BY PRIME MINISTER DURING VISIT—CANADIAN POSITION

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. Can the Prime Minister indicate whether he will be discussing the question of the conservation and management of our marine resources when he visits the Soviet Union in the near future?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, our two governments are now in the process of trying to establish an agenda for the talks that is agreeable to both sides. Until such agenda is agreed to I would prefer not to make any comment, but I will certainly take the hon. member's representations into account.

Mr. Lundrigan: In view of the alarming exploitation of our marine resources, mainly by foreign countries such as the Soviet Union, can the Prime Minister say whether Canada has formulated a clear position with respect to the management and conservation of our marine resources in waters adjacent to our territorial seas? Can the minister further indicate when he is prepared to make this position known to the Canadian people?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, we have been very concerned about over-exploitation of the fisheries resource near our coasts. We have also made our position quite clear. I think we must still use the Law of the Sea Conference in order to convince the long-distance fishing nations of the reasonableness of our case.

NEGOTIATIONS WITH SOVIET UNION RESPECTING FISHING OFF PACIFIC COAST

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, with regard to the discussions now going on between representatives of the Canadian government and representatives of the Soviet Union on the whole question of fishing, and particularly some of the difficulties that have arisen recently on the Pacific coast, may I ask the Minister of Fisheries, who is representing Canada in these discussions, what progress, if

any, is being made toward reaching a mutually satisfactory agreement?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, the discussion is taking place at the official level. In other words, officials from the federal Department of Fisheries are involved on the Canadian side and officials from the Russian side are meeting with them here in Ottawa. The officer in charge of the Pacific operations of the Russian fishing fleet is here for the discussions. We have representatives from all segments of the industry on the west coast who are acting in an advisory capacity to our officials.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A further supplementary question. Are these discussions that are going on mainly between scientists and officials, or is the minister or any person closely associated with government policy sitting in on the discussions?

Mr. Davis: I am not personally sitting in on the meetings, but many people who are knowledgeable of the fishery in this country are involved in an advisory capacity and know, day by day, what progress the talks are making.

Mr. McGrath: A supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Gander-Twillingate is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Lundrigan: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the minister will want to correct the statement he made that everyone knowledgeable of the fishery is involved because everyone on the east coast of Canada has been left out of these negotiations.

Mr. Speaker: Order. That is hardly a point of order.

CANADIAN POSITION AT LAST ICNAF CONFERENCE

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Fisheries what position Canada took at the last conference of the International Commission on the North Atlantic fisheries? May I also ask whether Canada is proposing to call another meeting of the commission?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, basically the position taken was this: that over-fishing should not occur, that fishing operations over our continental shelf area should be on a sustained yield basis, and that Canada's share should expand as the years went by.

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

Mr. McGrath: A further supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I think we ought to pass on to another subject. I know how important this question is to hon. members, but there are many other members waiting for a chance to ask questions. We might return to this point if we have time toward the end of the question period.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REPORTED INTENTION OF SOVIET UNION TO DIVERT RIVERS EMPTYING INTO ARCTIC OCEAN

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether the report that the Soviet Union intends to divert three rivers emptying into the Arctic Ocean, thereby draining off some 50 per cent of the supply of fresh water to the Arctic seas, is a factual one? Is this of concern to Canada in respect of its potential effect upon the Arctic seas and perhaps upon our own climate?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I think I must have listened to the same program as the Leader of the Opposition, and my curiosity was piqued too. I shall try to satisfy it.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, when the Secretary of State for External Affairs satisfies his curiosity, will he be good enough to make a report to the House to enlighten us also?

Mr. Sharp: Yes, Mr. Speaker. If there is anything useful I can convey to the House, I certainly shall.

LABOUR RELATIONS

EAST COAST FISHERMEN'S STRIKE—ROLE OF DEPARTMENT IN EFFECTING SETTLEMENT

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Labour. Will he inform the House whether his department has involved itself in any way in trying to bring to a conclusion the six months-old strike of deep sea trawl fishermen on the east coast?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, we became involved many months ago. In co-operation with the province of Nova Scotia we set up an industrial inquiry commission under Judge Green. As I remember it, at the moment the case is before the Court of Appeal of that province, and anything I might say at this moment would be quite inappropriate.

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, in view of Judge Nathan Green's recommendation that the Minister of Labour should publicly state that the federal government would introduce the necessary legislation to formalize the collective bargaining rights of fishermen, can the minister now say whether he has accepted the recommendation and has publicly made that statement?

Mr. Mackasey: Mr. Speaker, I would prefer to make no statement on a case of this importance that is before any court of the land.

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): Mr. Speaker, has the Prime Minister under active consideration the filling of the 18 Senate vacancies and, if so, is he considering the appointment of persons such as the Minister of Finance, who would be more favourable to the white paper on taxation if he were in the Senate?

HEALTH AND WELFARE

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON BIRTH CONTROL PROGRAM ABROAD AND WITHIN CANADA

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of his very welcome statement to the media on September 19 that the government is now prepared to help with birth control at home and abroad, and in view of the fact that almost four babies were born into the world every second in 1969, will he make an early statement to the House giving details of the overseas program and the expenditure to be allocated to it?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, if any relevant question should be put on the Order Paper I will see that an answer is expedited.

Mrs. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Will he also make an early statement describing the projected program within Canada and its cost?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Yes, Mr. Speaker. As I have already announced, the government has set up within the Department of National Health and Welfare a unit—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question, as I understand it, is whether a statement will be made. The question is acceptable only to that extent.

[*Translation*]

DRUGS

IMPORTATION OF RUSSIAN ARTERIOSCLEROSIS VACCINE

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Was a request made by a Soviet manufacturer to the Food and Drug Directorate to get a license for selling in Canada a vaccine under the name of Margoulis-Schoubladze, for the treatment of multiple sclerosis?

Mr. Speaker: I think the question should normally be put on the order paper, but given the present circumstances, maybe the minister wishes to answer.

[*English*]

NATIONAL PARKS

BONNE BAY, NFLD.—REPORTED AGREEMENT BY PROVINCE TO PROVIDE LAND

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Will the minister advise what action he is taking in view of the announcement by the province of Newfoundland that it is prepared to sign an agreement to hand over the land for the establishment of a national park at Bonne Bay?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear that, but I have not received any official information from the government.

Mr. Marshall: I would like to say that I am glad to hear it too, because what appears in the papers is altogether different from what really happens.

Inquiries of the Ministry

HOUSING

POSSIBLE SUBSIDIZING OF INTEREST RATES AND PRINCIPAL PAYMENTS FOR LOWER INCOME GROUPS

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister without Portfolio in charge of housing I address my question to the Minister of Finance. Has the government given consideration to the possibility of subsidizing interest rates and principal payments on mortgages for lower income groups and, if so, with what result?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the question as notice.

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

REGINA AND SASKATOON—REQUEST FOR ANNOUNCEMENT OF PROGRAMS

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion in the absence of the minister. In view of the time that has elapsed since the announcement that Regina and Saskatoon would be established as special areas under the program of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, will the Parliamentary Secretary indicate when there might be program announcements which would have the effect of giving some real meaning to the minister's earlier announcement?

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, the designation of these two cities means that we are prepared to accept applications at any time for projects that will come forward.

POLLUTION

LAKE HURON—SOURCE OF MERCURY CONTAMINATION—USE OF FISH FOR ANIMAL FOOD

Mr. P. V. Noble (Grey-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct this question to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. Has the source of mercury contamination of fish in Lake Huron been determined, and if so, what action has been taken?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Yes, Mr. Speaker, one source has been determined definitely but there may be other sources.

[Mr. Marshall.]

Mr. Noble: In view of the fact that many tons of fish are being condemned, has any thought been given to carrying out the necessary research to determine whether mercury-contaminated fish might be used for animal food?

Mr. Davis: An investigation is under way but it is not conclusive, as yet, Mr. Speaker.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

JORDAN—INQUIRY AS TO FURTHER ASSISTANCE

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Will he advise whether there are in contemplation any further measures for assistance to Jordan, where the situation is grave?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, as members of the House may know, we have recently made two grants for the relief of conditions in Jordan—a $25,000 grant to the Red Cross and an additional $150,000, I think, over and above the very large amount already granted for the assistance of refugees. We have no further requests under consideration. I believe it is considered that Canada has made a very generous contribution.

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

EGGS—INTERPROVINCIAL MARKETING—MEETING BETWEEN MINISTER AND QUEBEC AND ONTARIO REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

I have no doubt that the Minister of Agriculture is aware of the open warfare between the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, or, as it were, between the egg and the hen, because the situation involves egg producers on the one part, and chicken producers on the other.

As it seems that only the Supreme Court could settle the question, I would like to know whether the Minister of Agriculture, in the best interest of both provinces involved, has tried to meet the representatives of those provincial governments or if he is planning to do so.

[*English*]

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Yes, Mr. Speaker, on several occasions. I

would say that the best interests of both these provinces as well as of Canada as a whole would be served by passing Bill C-197 quickly.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, is the minister's department or the government represented in the proceedings before the Supreme Court of Quebec for the purpose of advocating the unconstitutionality of the proceedings in Quebec, or is this matter too sensitive for the minister to become involved in it?

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, the government and this department get involved in all things that are useful to the farmers of Canada. I will take notice of the question, which should properly have been referred to the Minister of Justice.

Mr. Baldwin: You are pretty late in the day.

SHIPPING

NEED FOR ADDITIONAL COASTGUARD VESSELS TO PROTECT CANADIAN SOVEREIGNTY IN ARCTIC

Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, in view of the warning issued last week by Captain T. C. Pullen, official Canadian observer aboard the *Manhattan,* that Canada is in danger of losing the Canadian Arctic to the United States unless we initiate a crash construction program of coastguard ships, can the Minister of Transport say what steps he is taking to improve the operational capability of our coastguard fleet? Is the department preparing to instal navigational aids in the Arctic, and is it planning to expand our ice reconnaissance capability?

Mr. Speaker: I suggest to the hon. member that this is a far reaching question which normally should be replied to by way of a statement on motions.

[*Translation*]

EDUCATION

APPOINTMENT OF CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State.

Would he tell us when he intends to set up an advisory committee on culture?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, this committee is being set up and should hold its first meetings in the fall.

Mr. Asselin: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a supplementary question.

Has the minister consulted with the provinces before creating that committee, since culture is a provincial matter, and will the members of that committee be selected jointly by the provinces and the federal government?

Mr. Pelletier: I do not acknowledge the validity of the hon. member's opinion, Mr. Speaker, but I must say that we have entered into negotiations with all provincial ministers involved in cultural affairs and the fact that the federal government intends to co-ordinate the initiatives of its agencies in this field has not as far as I know given rise to any objection from the provinces.

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

BOLIVIAN TURMOIL—PROTECTION OF CANADIAN CITIZENS

Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Having in mind the reports of turmoil existing in Bolivia, can he indicate the situation there with regard to Canadian citizens?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): We are following developments in Bolivia very closely. If it appears to us that special precautions have to be taken for the safety of Canadians, we are prepared to do so.

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

NEWFOUNDLAND—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. It arises out of the fact that evidently nobody knows what happens in Newfoundland in regard to matters involving the federal government. Would the minister make a statement on motions outlining the plans of his department arising out of the cabinet's acceptance of the Newfoundland government's white paper proposal to develop two national parks, an all-weather paved highway between Deer Lake and St. Anthony, air strips in Newfoundland and

Labrador and the development of historic sites on the west—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Parliamentary Secretary might indicate whether a statement will be made.

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I will draw the question to the minister's attention.

NATURAL RESOURCES

PEACE RIVER—EFFECT OF DAMS ON WATER LEVEL, WILDLIFE, ETC.—ASSISTANCE TO RESIDENTS IN LITIGATION

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development which is supplementary to one asked a few moments ago by the hon. member for Peace River. Will the minister consider giving assistance, by way of research, counsel or financially to the town of Peace River and the large number of residents in northern Alberta who have indicated they are taking action for damages against the province of British Columbia or its agencies in connection with the Athabasca situation?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I have been consulted on this point by the Indians involved and I gave them assurances that they would receive all the assistance that my department can provide concerning the claim.

As to financial aid, I believe that the inhabitants of this area should be able, given their number, to finance their own legal proceedings.

[*English*]

POLLUTION

ACTION TO CLEAN UP RIVERS IN OTTAWA AREA

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. What specific action is being taken by the Department of Fisheries and Forestry to ensure that the rivers in the Ottawa area are cleaned up in order to allow their use for fishing and other recreational purposes next summer?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member will appreciate that this, too, is a very far-reaching question and should be the subject of a reply of a general nature under motions. The minister might indicate whether this kind of statement is contemplated.

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, the Fisheries Act is delegated for administration to Ontario and Quebec. While we are in close consultation with the relevant departments in those provincial administrations, we are not at this time directly involved in any planning process on the Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

DISPOSITION OF BILL C-196

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order with regard to the order of business for today. It has been indicated that there is one remaining item, namely, Bill C-196. There have been indications that there is a general desire that this bill might go through, but in view of an announcement read from the Chair a while ago I raise the question whether there is sufficient time between now and 4:45. I wonder if the government would consider—because, after all, it is in the hands of the government—recommending to His Excellency the Governor General that prorogation of this session be delayed for the rest of today, or for another day or two if necessary, so that this important piece of legislation might be completed by the House as well as by the other place, and thus become law.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, we are quite prepared to proceed with the debate on the measure for as long as possible. I would point out, however, that there are 44 amendments at the report stage, all of which on close examination are amendments designed to greatly improve the bill and facilitate its use for the grain farmers of Canada. In addition, on third reading two objections will be taken concerning the validity of the bill, both of which would be fatal to it. I thought this point should be in the mind of the minister when he considers the situation.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest a compromise. From what the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) has stated today, it seems unlikely that in the next several days it would be possible to complete the bill. However, I repeat to the House what I today suggested to

the representatives of the parties privately. It might be possible to make an agreement, with regard to this bill comparable to that which I understand has already been arranged in respect of other bills, that is, a special order of the House might be made to advance the bill to its present state of progress so that it would not be necessary to repeat what has gone on before.

Such procedure would not complete the study of the bill in the next day or so, but it would mean that in the next session we would be able to utilize the necessary time in order to pass the bill. The order that would be made could be made only in the new session, but I suggest this procedure as a compromise.

Mr. Baldwin: It is true, Mr. Speaker, that we did make this agreement with regard to one bill, not bills as the minister mentioned. However, it all depends on the question of discussion later and the extent to which the government is prepared to rectify its bungling incompetence and bring in a better bill.

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): Rising on the point of order, Mr. Speaker, may I say I am perfectly willing to sit as long as possible in order to sell my ideas and my amendments to the government. If the government wants to sit until midnight tonight, I am perfectly willing to do so. If the government should accept the amendments, I assure them that I will do my utmost to facilitate the early passage of this bill at the next session. But if the government should reject all the amendments on the Order Paper, I cannot guarantee my assistance in passing the bill because I do not think it is good without all the amendments being included.

Mr. Speaker: I doubt that we will achieve any kind of unanimous agreement on the point raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. If there is to be an agreement, perhaps it should be reached by consultation outside the House. If there is a feeling on the part of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre that the matter might be advanced in some other way, I will hear him further or hear the minister.

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I think any condition set down to reach unanimous agreement that involves total acquiescence to one member of this House of 264 members is complete lunacy.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order. It would seem that my assessment of the situation was the correct one. I doubt that we can reach agreement at this time. I suggest to hon. members that if they think they can reach agreement on that point, it might be discussed outside the House in private consultation.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I on this point address just one question to the Minister of National Defence in his capacity as Acting House Leader? Do we have his commitment that if Bill C-196 is not completed at this session, a bill like it will be brought in early in the new session?

Mr. Baldwin: How much like it?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): You have that commitment, sir.

• (3:20 p.m.)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CANADA GRAIN ACT

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION, PROVISIONS RESPECTING GRADING, LICENCES, ELEVATORS, ETC.

The House resumed from Tuesday, October 6, consideration of Bill C-196, respecting grain, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Agriculture, motion No. 1 (Mr. Horner).

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, the time in which we may discuss this measure in this session is running out. I intend to be fairly brief in discussing this amendment and indeed in discussing the bill. Let me say at the start that when this amendment was discussed in committee, the legal advisers who were available to us pointed out that this particular clause simply defined an elevator in the clear and concise terms that were necessary so that an elevator would have a legal definition and the bill could be effective and workable in the legal sense.

This bill was exhaustively discussed and examined in the committee. At times the committee sat three times a day when the bill was before it. We called before us all the witnesses who wanted to appear, and we invited some others. So far as I am concerned, out of that committee came as workable a bill as we are every likely to get. If the bill is

passed by the House, it will adequately serve the interests of the farmers in western and in eastern Canada. This is what interests me primarily.

The most central factor in the bill is a change in our standards of grading to allow us to meet the competitive conditions which we are now having to meet and will have to meet if we are to sell our product and merchandize it well in today's markets. Anyone who listened at noon today to the farm broadcast would have heard a European marketing expert speaking to the Agricultural Economic Research Council saying that Canada's sales of wheat to Europe have declined mainly because of what he termed "damn poor merchandizing." He added that Canadian farmers have placed too much stock in the myth that Canadian grain is the best in the world. Canadian growers, commented the European trade expert, have failed to keep up the standards, with the result that customers have walked away.

This bore out my own observations in London, England, where I talked with people responsible for marketing who told me that our competitors, the U.S.S.R., Australia and the United States were taking an ever larger share of that market simply because they were able to and did guarantee a uniform content of protein in the wheat which they provided to the British millers.

It was said in the House just yesterday that there was no need to pass this bill because under the old measure we could effectively market wheat on a protein-grading basis. That is utter nonsense. Our wheat is sold on the basis of a certificate final, and all that can be put on that certificate final is what is allowed in the grain standard under the present Canada Grain Act. Perhaps there are some smart operators who manage to run in a little wheat in this corner or that corner and say to the buyer, "We know it is this kind of grain." This is something like a bootlegger appearing at the door with a bottle of whisky which he assures the buyer has not been cut. This is no way to market Canadian wheat. We can no longer afford to take second place, and that is what we are doing in the quality markets of the world. If any hon. member wants that statement substantiated, he should just take note of those areas in which sales have been increasing. They have been increasing in the low-quality markets but they have been decreasing in the high-quality markets. That is what this bill is concerned with and that is at the heart and core of it.

[Mr. Gleave.]

Certainly, the Canada Grains Council could come to the committee, as they did, with an armful of amendments to protect the interests of the grain trade. Do hon. members want another name for the Canada Grains Council? Call it the traders, call it the grain trade and call it the elevator companies. While they are playing games, the farmer is paying the shot. They have a guaranteed income. I will tell the House who has a guaranteed income: it is the grain companies, not the farmer.

I am prepared to criticize the government. I do not suppose that any member in the House has criticized the government more than I have at times with regard to their grains policy. I told them what I thought of their Lift program when they brought it in, and my mind has not changed. When the government of the day brings in a measure designed to help sell and market grain and to allow us and the Canadian Wheat Board to do a better job, I will support that measure and I will not quibble, dodge around corners or nit-pick over a few amendments that are supposed to make the legislation more palatable to the grain trade.

When the minister requested last night that the House sit for two extra hours to consider the amendments, some hon. members on this side of the House rose and said they were not ready to sit for two more hours to consider this measure which is so important to the western Canadian farmer—one of the most important measures that will come before the House in this calendar year.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Gleave: What is the matter, do they need to go to bed?

Mr. Lewis: They could sleep here.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): And they do.

Mr. Baldwin: They might find you under the bed.

Mr. Gleave: We are here to do the job on behalf of the farmer. The bill as it is presently drawn is not an imposition on the grain companies. In my book, it does not work any greater hardship on them than was worked under the previous Canada Grain Act. It merely makes the act more operative and permits the incoming commission to be more efficient. Yet some hon. members talk about an imposition on the grain companies and about "little amendments."

• (3:30 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, the Board of Grain Commissioners for years have had control of life and death over the grain companies. They set the tariffs which the companies may charge. They decide their gross income. If the Board of Grain Commissioners wanted to work a hardship on the grain companies, all it had to do was cut off their money. The same thing exactly would apply under this bill. This is the essence of it, and no government is going to permit any commission to put the grain handling industry of Canada in jeopardy, because the grain handling industry is absolutely essential to the Canadian farmer. Hopefully, no government would set up an act or give a commission power to confer favouritism on the grain handling trade. This is the heart of the issue.

Under this new bill, if passed, we would permit mixing at terminal elevators. Mr. Speaker, as an individual I have always been unalterably opposed to mixing at the terminal. But this bill would permit mixing with permission of the commission and we have to accept it because of changing conditions. Anyone who is close to the grain trade knows that we have been stuck at the west coast with high grades of grain which we could not mix but which buyers were not prepared to purchase because it had the No. 1 label on it, because it was not high-protein wheat and was not necessarily the package they wanted to take to their home countries. These are the realities we have to face; these are the facts of life. This is what the farmer out in western Canada wants. He wants all members who represent him in this Parliament to be concerned about this matter. He wants Members of Parliament to be concerned, to move his product and allow him to hold his place in the competitive markets of the world.

One of the reasons we have lost sales in the quality markets is that we did not move sooner to do what this bill proposes to do. Anyone who is closely connected with the trade knew this, not only in 1970 and 1969 but in 1968 and 1967. That is why we had professional and well-informed people from the Board of Grain Commissioners and in the appropriate department of government working out a bill clause by clause, a bill that would be bring us into the 1970s and not leave us sitting back in the 1950s.

I cannot understand members of this House who have dillied and dallied, who have spent endless hours nit-picking in committee and who now sit here while this bill dies on the Order Paper. Certainly, the charge could be made that the government should have referred the bill to the Standing Committee sooner than it did. That is a charge that the government will have to meet, if it is levelled against it. But be that as it may, we are now in this place and we are faced with making a decision. It will help nothing to look back and say this person or that person should have done something else.

This new bill will license elevators; it will license agents; it will control rates; it will control tariffs; it will change the grading system. But, Mr. Speaker, the old act controlled rates, it controlled tariffs, it licensed elevator agents and it licensed off-track storage. It permitted or did not permit off-track storage. A dealer had to be licensed if he was to handle grain and deal in it. This new bill does not change that situation.

Let me read part of a press release sent out by the Palliser Wheat Growers' Association. These people appeared before our committee and said that certain amendments were needed. But this is what they said on October 2:

> Mr. Nelson said the Palliser association understood some amendments "which we feel are essential" received support before parliament's summer recess and the legislation should not now be held up. He called on Mr. Olson to take "positive action" to have the government give the legislation priority before the House prorogues and the act dies on the Order Paper.

This is not an old organization. It claims to have 8,000 members who were enrolled within a couple of years in what is called the Palliser triangle in western Canada, the wheat country. I know its members dug into their pockets and put up the money for membership. If we had time we could talk to the National Farmers' Union and the Federation of Agriculture, two major organizations. If any member wanted to call them on the telephone right now, I know they would say, "Yes, we want the bill passed. We want it put into effect." If this is the case, who is saying no?

An hon. Member: Horner.

Mr. Gleave: I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the trade is saying no.

Mr. Benjamin: And their mouthpieces in here.

Mr. Horner: Ask Mr. McNamara.

Mr. Gleave: Those who want to carry the ball for the grain trade in here will have to take their responsibility in time to come.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gleave: I have been a grain grower all my life. I have made a living at it. I live in the centre of the wheat growing area of Saskatchewan and I am not here to promote the interests of anybody but the farmers. I have seen them sit on their farms with grain stored in their granaries which, under an adequate grading system, should have been moving into the prime markets of the world. That is what we ought to be doing now.

Mr. Horner: Well, aren't we?

Mr. Gleave: No.

Mr. Horner: Grain is not moving?

Mr. Gleave: We ought to be putting this bill into effect, Mr. Speaker. I say that those who do not support it, and those who have not made every move to bring the bill into effect before the session dies, have been doing a disservice to the western grain farmer.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gleave: Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I would have been happier had the government acceded to the request made to continue this session until the bill was passed. I think the bill is important enough to keep the session going until it is passed, until it becomes the law of the land and enables our selling agents to do the job which they want to do in the markets of the world, the job which they are ready to do and have the capability to do. We have had good men in this field. Mr. McNamara, who retired, was one of the great men in the grain industry. We will have other great men, but we will not arm them with the necessary tools for the job by bringing in 44 amendments in the dying hours of this session so that the bill will not be passed by the House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gleave: Mr. Speaker, no matter how good are the men who run the Wheat Board, and no matter how good are the men in the private trade, they must have the tools with which to do the job. We are on the threshold of new developments. Here we are talking about protein grading in regard to wheat. We will be making changes in the grading system to handle rapeseed, barley and some of our other farm products. In fact, some of the changes in prospect are not even now being considered. I predict we shall eventually move to the point at which rapeseed will be subject to variety control in the field, and that we shall follow this control through right to the selling point. It will have to be variety pure. We shall have to deliver what the consumer wants. We cannot stand still while time marches on. We must match the technology and know-how which exists on the farm with technology, efficiency and know-how in the grain handling system. If we cannot match what the farmers are doing, we shall have failed them.

• (3:40 p.m.)

Mr. Horner: You know what you are talking about there.

Mr. Gleave: Thank you kindly. I would be very happy if I could say the same for the hon. member. I have made the points I wanted to make this afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, we have listened to a very good speech. I compliment the hon. member on it. I would have been more impressed by the speech if it were not for the fact that members of his party showed a considerable amount of approval when they agreed to the second reading of the farm products marketing bill, though it is true they did indicate demurrers to some of its provision. When this bill was brought before the committee it met with the unqualified disapproval of most of the farm organizations.

Mr. Olson: That is absolutely wrong.

Mr. Baldwin: That is absolutely correct. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) was playing games elsewhere. He was not in the committee, but I was there and heard what was said. True enough, some of the briefs stated, as we have said, that the principle involved was good. But in effect they asked Parliament to jack up the principle and run a new bill under it. Some organizations were more restrained than others in their opposition to the bill. But when I hear hon. members to my left being exceedingly critical of us for exercising our parliamentary duty and carrying out our responsibility—

Mr. Olson: Abusing it.

Mr. Baldwin: —I would point out it is our duty to ensure as far as possible that bills passed in this House are good bills, bills which will meet the needs of economics, bills which are good in law and, in this instance,

good for the agricultural industry. Because this is not the case in regard to the legislation now proposed we have seen fit to put down amendments intended to make it better legislation. The hon. member suggested we should not do this, that we should shut our eyes to the defects of the government's proposal. We do not forget that the government has already produced two farm bills which failed to meet the needs of the country. Do hon. members to my left now say we should be silent? If that is so, it is not my understanding of the parliamentary process or of the rights of members of this House, particularly of members of the opposition.

I just heard from the ranks of those supporting the previous speaker a voice saying the magic word "Lisgar". Is this why that great speech was made? Is there concern about a by-election which is going on? Is this the pitch, irrespective of the merits of the bill? Is an attempt being made to prey upon the sympathy of the farmers, to persuade them that legislation which contains great defects should be passed and that we should gloss over those defects? I would not like to think that members of the NDP would be guilty of such tactics. It may be that what I gathered was meant, was not really meant—but time will tell.

Somebody made the statement a short while ago that one of the problems attached to selling our grain arose through damned poor merchandising. Never was a truer statement made. We in this party, as well as members of the New Democratic Party, have for some years been pleading with the government and with its creation, the Canadian Wheat Board, to involve themselves in a more competent, reliable and sensible system of merchandising. At last it would appear that the then Minister without Portfolio, now the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Lang), who has in addition to his other onerous responsibilities, responsibility for the Wheat Board, has listened to us. I would judge this to be the reason there has been a greater measure of success in improving grain sales; the government has at last seen reason and done the things it should have done years ago.

I have explained why I cannot go along with the reasoning of the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave), bearing in mind the position his party took with regard to the other bill to which I referred. Since then it has been established how defective the other bill was. This party suggested a simple method by which that bill could have been improved. An amendment of not more than a few lines could have been inserted requesting this House and Parliament to grant the government the right to pass regulations dealing with protein content.

I am not saying that I would have supported such an amendment, but that is beside the point. It was a simple way in which this issue could have been divorced from many of the obnoxious features of the bill before us. It is not all bad; there are parts of it I could support. I do not commit myself to supporting all the amendments set down in the name of members of this party. But there are other aspects of this bill which no responsible Member of Parliament could approve, knowing the attitude of the government in its voracious quest for power and its lust for securing authority to pass regulations and Orders in Council which intimately affect all the people of Canada. I say this after spending 2½ years studying the nature of the beast sitting over there. I am speaking politically, of course, Mr. Speaker.

In these circumstances we are bound to be most cautious when it comes to granting this government the authoritarian and bureaucratic powers it so obviously craves. We shall be even more cautious in this respect during the session which is shortly to open. I say to the minister that if the bill before us is not passed during the present session, and if he brings it back in the new session, he would do well to make changes in the legislation which will make it more palatable. I would advise him strongly to ensure that changes such as I have suggested are brought about. It should certainly not be passed until the House has appointed a committee of scrutiny charged with responsibility for examining this measure in detail, particularly these dangerous grants of power along the lines of others which have been given to the government and which are being exercised every day, every week and every month to the detriment of the people of Canada. If the minister believes we shall not exercise our duty in this sense, he is making a serious mistake.

• (3:50 p.m.)

I can understand what my friends on the left say about the granting of bureaucratic powers. At least they are honest. Securing a large measure of bureaucratic control in certain fields is part of the policy we have heard much about from Toronto during the last few days. But I am amazed at the Liberals, the party, allegedly, that espouses liberalism.

What a shock this is; what a terrible thing we have here. Surely the minister himself, after his interesting career in public life, is not saying that he supports fully and unequivocally all these grants of power to the executive.

Mr. Bell: Shame!

Mr. Baldwin: If so, he reminds me very much, in a political sense, of the chameleon which, it is said, if placed on a red rug will turn red, if placed on a brown rug will turn brown, and if placed on a scottish plaid will go mad.

Mr. Olson: I do not support the hon. member's interpretation.

Mr. Baldwin: Since the bill has been thrown open as a result of various amendments, I will not discuss any proposed changes to the bill. However, I should like to read an editorial which appeared in the Winnipeg *Free Press*. That newspaper certainly does not support my party. I know it is having difficulty supporting the government at this time and I do not know where it stands now. Perhaps it supports my friends to my left.

An hon. Member: It could have changed.

Mr. Baldwin: This editorial of August 19, 1970, reads in part:

> Because of the failure of Bill C-196 to be approved at the last session of Parliament, western wheat farmers are being penalized.
>
> The bill failed to pass because opposition members, rightly, did not want to hand life-and-death control of the grain industry over to a few bureaucrats—which the legislation would have done. The government refused to remove the offending portions of the bill—

It refused to remove them in committee, and it is still refusing.

> —and, as a result, it failed to get parliamentary approval—
>
> There was universal approval for grading regulations under the Canada Grain Act, because they provided protection for the farmer in an era of uncertainty.

The government does not really understand simple things, but it would have been simple for the minister and the government to have sought an amendment to the old act and then, if further changes were needed, to have brought them in during the next session of Parliament. The proposals which would put large powers with regard to marketing and transport into the hands of bureaucrats who would control agriculture in this country are, I am convinced, not acceptable to the farmers of this country and will not be accepted. But the government does not see that; it wants the bill, the whole bill and nothing but the bill.

Mr. Olson: Our farmers have been asking for this bill for years.

Mr. Baldwin: That is the minister's interpretation.

Mr. Horner: Did the grains council want this bill?

Mr. Olson: I said the farmers wanted it.

Mr. Baldwin: The farmers of this country did not ask for this bill in its present form. They will become aware of what the government really wants, as they became aware of its intentions in connection with Bill C-197. It wants to secure a death-grip on the whole Canadian agricultural industry and run that industry from the ivory towers of the Department of Agriculture in Ottawa. If my friends to my left want that, they can have it. I do not want it and I know that the farmers in the Peace River country do not want it. I am convinced that most Canadian farmers do not want it.

Mr. Olson: That is another wrong interpretation.

Mr. Baldwin: If it should happen that every amendment presented at the report stage of the bill is passed, even then I say there would be a technical and major objection to the third reading of this bill. I will not become involved at this time in a discussion of the points of order which will have to be raised during the remainder of the present session or the next session, on third reading. I merely give the minister notice of a caveat.

This bill is objectionable because the consent of the Crown has not been secured to certain of its proposals. Also, it is bad because it is in direct violation of section 54 of the British North America Act. Those are fatal objections. Having the utmost faith in the judgment of the incumbent of the chair and in his application of law and common sense to the precedents of this House, I am convinced from my close examination of the bill that he will toss it out. I do not see how the bill can get past these fatal objections. I earnestly suggest to the minister that he look at it again. I will be only too glad to co-operate and give him the benefit of my opinions both in a legal and parliamentary sense.

Like all hon. members of the House, I want to see sound legislation which falls within the four corners of the law of the land. It appears to me that the government is attempting to bring in legislation which is defective not only as to substance but as to law. I offer this advice in the hope that before we again deal with the bill the minister will take another look at it.

Mr. Cliff Downey (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise and speak on this bill. Although I was not present during all the committee hearings on the bill because I was a member of the Finance Committee when it discussed another government botch, the white paper on taxation, I think I am fully qualified to speak on the bill in view of the fact that, as is the agricultural spokesman for the NDP, I am a grain farmer. I have made a good living from being a grain farmer and think I know as well as anyone in the House the problems that arise in this area.

The impression that has been created by several speakers is that this bill must go through in great haste or, it is implied, Canadian grain sales will suffer. Due in part to better salesmanship and, I suppose, to unfavourable weather conditions in many parts of the world, grain sales in general have increased rapidly in the past six months. The entire picture has changed for the grain farmer.

I can imagine what would have happened had this bill been passed last spring or last winter. Approximately 107 pages containing increased bureaucratic controls and regulations would have been given as the factor behind our increased grain sales. I can imagine the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) saying, "What a wonderful thing we have done. We have a new grain act. Look at all the grain sales in the country. We have more grain sales in prospect than we can possibly move to the markets. It will strain our transportation facilities to sell it. All this is the result of this glorious bill that introduced protein grading and various other provisions." I do not deny that some provisions of the bill may be worth considering; I am simply saying that under the existing rules applicable to grain sales all these sales have been made without any help from this bill.

A great deal is made of the protein grading provisions. Protein grading is said to be the "in" thing if you want to sell grain. In some areas protein grading probably will be beneficial. I submit that only a small amendment to the present grain act would have been needed to bring in protein grading. We do not need 107 pages of controls which will result from a bill such as this one. The hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave) made a very eloquent presentation on this subject, but in common with almost everything else the New Democratic Party proposes, his suggestions entail controls, controls and more controls. The more control they have over every individual in this country, the better they like it. That is what their presentations boil down to on whatever subject they speak. The Canada Grains Council was appointed by the government. They recommended the majority of these amendments but as was pointed out earlier, very few were accepted. I think the amendment regarding the inclusion of trucks as well as railway cars is an important one. It becomes increasingly important when we consider future possible railway line abandonment. The government, as well as many others, have suggested that eventually the number of delivery points across the Prairie region should be cut to 50. I think there are a great many impractical points in this argument. There are now 1,800 delivery points. If this number is reduced to 50, there will be 36 times the number of deliveries to each elevator. The mechanical problems involved would be astronomical.

• (4:00 p.m.)

If deliveries to an elevator were multiplied by 36, grain could be handled if deliveries were evenly spread over the whole year. However, weather conditions must be considered, and times when the agricultural industry is occupied with seeding, harvesting and other necessary work. It is impossible to spread unloadings from farm to elevator so there will not be a complete bottleneck in an area. In the future we may have three classes of elevators. Naturally, there will be the terminal elevators. We may also have on-track delivery points,—a larger, more consolidated unit—as well as off-track delivery points where it would be necessary to move the grain out of this type of elevator by truck. Movement of this kind is not impractical when we consider that many railway boxcars today handle only 1,300 or 1,400 bushels of grain. I think there are cars that handle only 1,300 bushels. There are trucks for highway travel that carry 1,000 bushels. The element of cost as between the two types of transportation is not significant. There are two elevators within 15 miles of the town in which I live. Although the tracks were removed

during the last few years, deliveries are still made there. The grain is moved from these points to the on-track elevators. This system may become increasingly practical in the future.

Last night and on other occasions the minister stated to the press that this bill, which is supposedly the cure-all and the end-all of the problems of the producer, is being held up by opposition members, particularly those in the Conservative Party. I remind the minister that it was brought into the House erratically. Last night the minister spoke for 35 minutes, talked it out until ten o'clock and then asked us to stay until midnight. I do not know whether he intended to continue speaking. This is a point he has failed to let everyone know.

I do not intend to speak further in this regard. In summary I wish to point out that we are not holding up any grain sales by considering the bill further because we have moved these amendments. The sales now in prospect will more than utilize our transportation facilities in the months ahead.

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): I declare the motion negatived on division.

Mr. Bell: No, Mr. Speaker; we want a recorded vote.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Pursuant to Standing Order 75(11), the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

[Mr. Downey.]

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, I understand it is usually the practice to defer the vote, but there is a measure of similarity between the first amendment and the second. The motion might well be put. If, as I suspect, the good sense of the House prevails and the first amendment is carried, the government might see fit to give its approval to the second one. This might save some time of the House. For this reason I suggest that with the consent of all parties we vote at this time.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): At this stage all I can do is read Standing Order 75(11). Being at the disposal of the House, I will then be ready to hear comments. Standing Order 75(11) reads:

> When a recorded division has been demanded on any amendment proposed during the report stage of a bill, Mr. Speaker may defer the calling in of the members for the purpose of recording the "yeas" and "nays" until any or all subsequent amendments proposed to that bill have been considered. A recorded division or divisions may be so deferred from sitting to sitting.

Mr. Baldwin: I recognize that Your Honour is perfectly correct, but the determining word is "may": there is a discretion. Obviously, if the government does not see fit to accept our very reasonable suggestion, Your Honour would be quite right to call the next amendment. I hope that sweet reason is now residing within the breast of the minister and that he will agree to this suggestion.

• (4:10 p.m.)

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned last night, I took the time to deal as briefly as I could with all 44 amendments because the second proposed amendment was in fact discussed in the committee over a rather long period of time. I should draw to Your Honour's attention that 25 amendments were accepted in the committee and many other subject matters were dealt with, including the substance of proposed amendment No. 2. As far as the one before the House is concerned, that too was voted on in the committee on June 16 and defeated.

It seems to me that while hon. members have every right to make this kind of proposition and to revive the subject matter of the amendments in the House—I do not question that at all—we have, as some hon. members have already pointed out, spent long, hard hours drawing up a bill that seems to be the best that can be reached. I think we should try to get on with dealing with all these amendments. If we can go through the rest of

the amendments and then take a vote on all of them at the end, that would be satisfactory to me.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): I have taken into consideration the remarks of the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) and also the remarks of the minister. The Chair does have latitude to permit a vote at this stage, but I think a ceremony that will be taking place in half an hour will limit the Chair in its decision. Therefore, it is my opinion that the vote should be deferred.

The hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Downey) moves motion No. 2 as follows:

That Bill C-196, an act respecting grain, be amended by striking out the words "way cars or ships," line 28, page 2 thereof, and substituting therefor the following, "way cars, ships, or motor vehicles of an undertaking operating by licence issued under the National Transportation Act,"—

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Downey) has greater belief in my eloquence than I have, because he was satisfied I would persuade the Chair and the government that it was wise and sensible to have a vote at this time. Consequently, he thought he would be summoned by the bell, and he is not here. Therefore I would ask that the motion stand at this time and that we proceed to the next one.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Is it agreed that motion No. 3 be put at this stage, and that we stand motion No. 2?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion No. 2 stands.

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot) moved:

That Bill C-196, an act respecting grain, be amended by deleting subclause 17 of clause 2 and substituting therefor:

"(17) "grain dealer" means a person in the western division who, for reward, on his own behalf or on behalf of another person, deals in or handles western grain;"

He said: Mr. Speaker, this amendment is not what I would call a major amendment, but in tidying up a poorly-drafted bill one has to deal with some of the details of the bill. The amendment seeks to add the words "a person in the western division" to clause 2(17), which as the bill reads now is all-inclusive and refers to a grain dealer in any part of Canada handling or dealing in western grain, including any person in eastern Canada or anywhere else. The old act pretty well spelled out that a grain dealer was a person in the western division handling western grain. The amendment merely provides that the definition of "grain dealer" applies only to persons located in the western division who for reward deal in or handle western grain.

As I said, as presently drafted the bill leaves in doubt what is meant by the expression "grain dealer". The whole question of grain dealing and grain dealers was thoroughly examined by the Canada Grains Council, a body appointed by this government at the time of the last election. I personally felt at that time that the appointment of the grains council was rather a political thing; but the government has made an attempt to solicit from the grains council what might be considered wise counsel in the drafting of this bill.

I should like to read what the grains council had to say in regard to this question, and perhaps others, as reported in committee proceedings No. 34 at page 9. The Canada Grains Council was discussing the study that had been made and had this to say:

The Canada Grains Council, at the request of the Minister of Agriculture, undertook a thorough review of the old Canada Grain Act and, more recently, a review of Bill C-196. During this review, 45 meetings have been held by the Canada Grain Act Committee in conjunction with other associations. The details of these meetings are contained in the document I am now reading and the report before you.

This was a report that they filed with the committee, with a sheaf of amendments, some 50 in number.

Based on the meetings held and the personnel involved, it is estimated that the review of the Canada Grain Act by the Canada Grains Council consumed 4,320 man hours, equivalent to 2.2 man years. Therefore, the report being presented to this Committee today represents a comprehensive review of the legislation affecting Canadian grain by personnel knowledgeable of, and intimately affected by, such legislation.

They go on to make a number of suggestions. The brief of the Canada Grains Council has this to say, as reported at page 10:

In the submission to the Grains Council, the CGA Committee was requested to express the great dissatisfaction of the industry to the limited deadlines set for study. To elaborate on that, gentlemen, we had all of the grains community that we could possibly approach in the short period of time for the preparation of this document, actively engaged in sessions, many of which were delayed for various reasons, some because of the inability to get copies of Bill C-196.

That statement immediately brings to mind our inability all summer long to get copies of Bill C-197. But that is another matter with which I shall not deal at this moment. The brief continues:

I appreciate in this day and age that we have means of communication but these things do hap-

pen, and we do have some difficulty occasionally approaching all of the grains community, particularly members of the producer group who do not have ready access to information at times.

• (4:20 p.m.)

In the same committee proceedings, at page 12 they say—this is very important because this is a board and council set up to advise the government—in their concluding remarks:

Reports received from various reporting subcommittees appear almost unanimous that the Governor in Council and the Canadian Grain Commission have been invested with powers which in present form, appear too broad. There is genuine concern that strict adherence to the letter of the proposed legislation, as presently formulated, could impose restraints and decrease, rather than increase, the efficiency of the grain handling system.

Let me repeat those words for emphasis, "decrease, rather than increase, the efficiency of the grain handling system." That statement was made by the most knowledgeable men in the grain trade. What persons compose the Canadian Grain Council? Who are they, and what do they do? They are comprised of producer groups, the UGG, the Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba wheat pools. In fact, up until very recently even the National Farmers' Union was a member of the Canada Grains Council. That organization withdrew its support for political reasons—something to do with their political survival. In any case, these are the most knowledgeable men in the trade. They state at page 12 that the study has been too rapid and that there is grave concern that if the bill is followed exactly it will impose restrictions and bring about decreased rather than increased efficiency in the grain handling system. This is a major complaint against this bill by these knowledgeable people who are directly responsible to their grain producers, the grain farmers.

I do not want to make a wide-ranging speech about this clause of the bill, but it provides that "grain dealer" means a person anywhere in Canada who handles western grain. Does this mean that "grain dealer" will include the Canadian feed board, commonly known as the eastern feed board, which was set up by this government a couple of years ago? Within this meaning they will be considered grain dealers. If this wording is interpreted correctly, they are grain dealers. I do not think this was ever the intent or that the grain commissioner should have authority over the eastern livestock feed board or the Canadian livestock feed board, whichever is the right name I certainly do not think that was the intent.

[Mr. Horner.]

The old act was certainly worded differently. It stated, as my amendment suggests, that "grain dealer" means a person in the western division who for reward, on his own behalf or on behalf of others, deals in or handles western grain. This is part of the difficulty in trying to fully understand Bill C-196. To me it causes a great deal of confusion and will continue to do so unless some amendments are accepted. This is why myself and as others have felt that amendments ought to be made to it. The bill in its present form should not be allowed to pass quickly. Rather than facilitate a more clear understanding within the trade, this would cause great confusion.

This clause indicates that anybody, even, the eastern feed board, who handles western grain or is concerned with the distribution of western grain—even to a large extent throughout eastern Canada, Quebec, the Maritimes and Newfoundland—would be deemed to be a grain dealer. He would have to abide by the act and, I suppose, obtain a licence from the Board of Grain Commissioners. Surely that was never the intent. If it was the intent, the minister should say that everyone is covered, nobody misses out. He should make it clear that everybody has to obtain a licence to handle western grain, no matter in what part of Canada.

I should like to go along with this bill, but I want the government to clarify its position and accept some of these amendments. With certain amendments the bill would be a great deal more sensible. My amendment suggests that "grain dealer" means a person in the western division who handles western grain. That might be only a small improvement but it is one which would bring about greater clarity and acceptance across Canada. It would create less confusion and fear in the licensing system which will be established under this bill, particularly in eastern Canada including Ontario, Quebec and the Maritimes. It is a small amendment but I urge the minister and the House to accept it. It involves the addition of the two words "western division". I seriously urge the House to forget its prejudice and accept this small amendment, because it will make for greater clarify in eastern Canada in respect of the handling of western grains.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. The hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Anderson) is seeking the floor for the purpose of tabling a committee report. Does the House agree?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

ENVIRONMENTAL POLLUTION

Second report of Special Committee on Environmental Pollution—Mr. Anderson.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CANADA GRAIN ACT

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION, PROVISIONS RESPECTING, GRADING, LICENCES, ELEVATORS, ETC.

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-196, respecting grain, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Agriculture, motion No. 3 (Mr. Horner).

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Horner: Before the question is put, Mr. Speaker, would the minister comment on the point I made? His fellow members may be looking to him for guidance in deciding how they vote. I think they pretty well accept my argument and I appreciate that, but I wonder whether the minister would clear up this matter.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, the only comment I make is that amendment No. 3 was discussed in the committee on June 16, as reported at page 28 of report No. 40. It was defeated on June 16, as indicated at page 49 of that report.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): All those in favour of motion No. 3 will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

• (4:30 p.m.)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Pursuant to Standing Order No. 75(II), the recorded division on proposed motion No. 3 stands deferred.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Until when?

Canada Grain Act

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot) moved:

That Bill C-196, an act respecting grain, be amended by deleting subclause 50 of clause 2 and substituting therefor:

"(50) "weigh-over" means

(a) in respect of a licensed primary elevator, the weighing up of all grain in the elevator;

(b) in respect of a licensed terminal or transfer elevator the weighing up and inspecting of the grain, grain products and screenings contained therein for the purpose of determining the amount of grain of each grade, grain products and screenings therein for the purpose of determining the stock of each such grade in the elevator and whether there is an overage or shortage of grain of any grade, grain products or screenings."

He said: Mr. Speaker, for a moment or two I thought the House was about to adopt the amendment without hearing my persuasive arguments. Naturally, that would be very acceptable to me. This amendment is not quite as simple nor as clear as the last one. I say that for the benefit of those not fully knowledgeable on the question of weigh-overs and elevator companies. Having said it is not quite as clear, I hope hon. members will give me their undivided attention so that when I am through they will be very clear as to what this amendment purports to do.

The system regarding of weigh-overs has always been a very important part of the operations of the Board of Grain Commissioners. There is no question that in the grain trade this board has acted, in essence, as a policeman. Up until this time the board has been very careful in checking the grading, dockage and shrinkage to which producers may be subject at the elevators when they deliver their grain. In doing so, the weigh-overs in the elevators must be checked very closely to make certain there is no build-up of grain purchased over the years because of faulty scales or by taking off too much for dockage, and so on. It may well build up. The bill before the House of Commons suggests that weigh-over means the weighing and inspection of all grains of any grade. Grades and grain in a terminal elevator may well change, because the primary elevators today have the right to mix grain. If I take in a load of No. 4 wheat and my neighbour takes in a load of No. 2, the primary elevator can mix those two grades and come up with a No. 3 grade.

Up until this time in the terminal elevators the first four grades of wheat could be mixed, but in the primary elevators, to which this clause applies, there can be no mixing because the clause says that weigh-over means the weighing and inspection of all grain of any grade in an elevator. Basically,

my amendment suggests that the words "of any grade" be taken out particularly when they refer to primary elevators. The proposed amendment to this clause will distinguish between weigh-overs which occur at primary elevators as opposed to terminal elevators. This distinction is important because the Board of Grain Commissioners must inspect weigh-overs in each type of elevator.

This clause of the bill does not make any such distinction, although there is a distinct difference in the procedure at terminal elevators and country elevators. Until this time the terminal elevators have not been allowed to mix the four first grades of wheat. The primary elevators can mix them, and therefore there might be overages or losses in respect of a given grade at the time of weigh-over in a particular primary elevator. Basically, that is the purport of the amendment.

On this and other points it is interesting to note what the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool representatives had to say in their brief, as reported at pages 99 and 100 of report No. 34 of the proceedings of the Committee on Agriculture. Mr. McLeod, research co-ordinator of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, made the statement to which I refer. The suggestion has been made in the House this afternoon that this bill will not benefit the producers. This is what the Saskatchewan wheat pool, which is directly responsible to its membership and producers participating in the pool, had to say about this clause. I quote from page 100 of the proceedings and evidence of the committee:

> It would appear that the extensive powers proposed would place a very heavy load of responsibility on the shoulders of members of the proposed Canadian Grain Commission for wide-ranging decisions affecting a very large and very important Canadian industry.

They go on to say that very great care must be taken in regard to appointments to the Canadian Grain Commission, perhaps even more care than has been taken in past years. I just point that out. Even the largest producer-owned co-op handling grain in western Canada admits that this bill gives wide-ranging powers to the Canadian Grain Commission which it did not have until this time. The wide-ranging powers are there because losses and overages do occur. Until this time weigh-ups have been a regular part of the duties of the Board of Grain Commissioners. There should be no misunderstanding. If wide-ranging powers to operate something are to be given by the government, Parliament or the people there should be no misunderstanding in the interpretation and in the wording of the bill. Subclause 50 of clause 2 provides that a weigh-over means the weighing and inspection of all grain of any grade in an elevator for the purpose of determining the amount in stock of grain of that grade in the elevator. It does not distinguish between terminal and primary elevators, and it is a "must" that that distinction be made because in one elevator there has been freedom to mix.

[Mr. Horner.]

• (4:40 p.m.)

Even after this bill passes, in the terminal elevators there will be mixing only under special conditions and under the supervision of the Board of Grain Commissioners. But no supervision is carried on now, and even if this bill should pass there would be no supervision of mixing at the primary elevators; any man could mix as he desired. So there is in the two types of elevators a distinction between the operations in the mixing of grades. Therefore, this clause should be amended before such wide-ranging powers are given to the board.

I do not profess to know too much about the grain handling business; I just sell wheat to the elevators once in a while. I am not hooked on Operation Lift. I do know that this clause in the bill is not clear and I hope I have cleared it up in the minds of hon. members. I also hope that the minister will act in a spirit of co-operation, which I know at times he can develop. I hope he understands the point I am trying to make, that a distinction must be made between primary and terminal elevators. I dealt with this point in the committee and I urged the government to consider the point I am now making. This is not an earth-shaking amendment; it will not block the operations of the Board of Grain Commissioners but, rather, it will clarify the wide-ranging powers that this bill would give to the board.

If we are giving the board such wide-ranging powers we should at least make them clear, so that those powers are used in the best interests of the producers of Canada. I am not asking for a great change in the bill or that the bill to be scrapped. This is just a small amendment to clarify the duties of the board that will be set up under the act. Surely the minister and the House can see some logic in the arguments that I have put forward in this regard. I hope that hon. members who are not knowledgeable regarding the grain trade now see the reason for the amendment I propose and will support it.

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Horner: Surely my persuasive argument has not been made in vain and the minister will comment on it without referring to a page in the committee's proceedings.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. I must remind the hon. member that his point was made earlier. If the minister wishes to rise to speak to the point, he can do so. The Chair cannot call on the minister to speak.

Mr. Baldwin: We will allow him unlimited time, if he wants it.

Mr. Olson: I will reply to the hon. member. In spite of his eloquence he forgot to say one thing, that is, that his amendment is designed to limit the weigh-ins or weigh-overs at primary elevators to the total grain stored in that elevator, and in my view that is unacceptable.

Mr. Horner: Are they going to weigh-over other grain that is not stored in the elevator?

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Pursuant to Standing Order 75 (11), the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain) moved:

That Bill C-196, an act respecting grain, be amended by striking out the word "pleasure" in line 39, page 9 thereof, and substituting therefor the words "good behaviour for ten years".

He said: Mr. Speaker, my amendment this afternoon, although a short one, is very important. But before making my comments to support the amendment I would like to congratulate the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) for his comprehensive review last night of a number of amendments now on the Order Paper which ran contrary to the dissertation and pleadings of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) in trying to defend himself against the 44 amendments now on the Order Paper.

I would also like to compliment the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) who this afternoon brought to the attention of the House and a number of hon. members who were not aware of them, some of the constitutional inadequacies in this bill which would make it impossible for the House to pass it. This prevents our making progress so far as these amendments are concerned.

I was quite concerned and in fact astonished at the glaringly political speech of my friend and colleague from Saskatchewan who spoke this afternoon. He left the impression that God is in his heaven and all is right with the world. I suggest that there would not be 44 amendments on the Order Paper if everything was right with this bill. True enough, we had considerable discussion in the Standing Committee on Agriculture, but even there it was only after pleading with the chairman of the committee that I, as a temporary member of the committee, could persuade the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave) and the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) that we should not proceed without hearing witnesses.

When we did hear them, one of the main organizations referred to this afternoon by the hon. member for Crowfoot, the Canada Grains Council, presented no less than 83 amendments to this so-called perfect bill, 50 major amendments and 33 minor ones. I say this just to give an example of how defective is this bill. Therefore, I am not making any apology to the government or to any member of the House for supporting my colleagues and for asking that further consideration be given to amending some of these defects?

My amendment to Bill C-196 deals with the appointment of commissioners to the new Canadian Grain Commission and, more specifically, relates to their tenure of office. I shall read my amendment to clause 3 of the bill. Part I, setting up the Canadian Grain Commission, is entitled "Constitution of the Commission and Commissioners", and clause 3 reads as follows:

There shall be a commission to be known as the Canadian Grain Commission consisting of three commissioners to be appointed by the Governor in Council to hold office during pleasure.

This commission is at the very heart of the bill and the success of the bill depends on it, because the interpretation and the application of this legislation will be no better and no worse than the people we appoint to the commission. Therefore, this is a very important amendment. It reads:

• (4:50 p.m.)

That Bill C-196, an act respecting grain, be amended by striking out the word "pleasure" in line 39, page 9 thereof, and substituting therefor the words "good behavior for ten years."

As I said, Mr. Speaker, the present proposed clause suggests that these men be appointed at pleasure. I wish to make the following points to support my amendment. There is always considerable difficulty in finding qualified personnel unless a reasonable tenure of office is assured. Appointment at pleasure is too indefinite. Normally it takes several years of experience in a new post, at first hand in a job like this, before a man can be expected to contribute his maximum effort. Under the present clause nominees may just be reaching the peak of their efficiency and may then be replaced, as the Prime Minister did recently in his shuffling of Parliamentary Secretaries.

By accepting my amendment this government and any succeeding government would be relieved of any temptation to practice political patronage. Last but not least, a member of the commission should have a longer tenure of office guaranteed than at pleasure, for another important reason.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

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

Mr. Speaker, it is the desire of the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General that this honourable House attend him immediately in the chamber of the honourable the Senate.

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

In the Senate chamber, the Deputy Governor General was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the royal assent to the following bills:

An Act to provide for the establishment of a Standards Council of Canada.

An act to amend the Canada Corporations Act and other statutory provisions related to the subject matter of certain of those amendments.

[Mr. Southam.]

An act respecting Hudson's Bay Company.

An act to exempt certain shipping conference practices from the provisions of the Combines Investigation Act.

To these bills the royal assent was pronounced by the Clerk of the Senate in the following words:

In Her Majesty's name, the Right Honourable the Deputy Governor General doth assent to these bills.

PROROGATION OF PARLIAMENT

After which the Deputy Governor General was pleased to close the second session of the twenty-eighth Parliament of Canada with the following speech:

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

The second session of the twenty-eighth Parliament was opened on October 23, 1969. During this period, you have approved legislation of far-reaching importance to the well-being of Canada and all Canadians, and you have considered a number of significant policy proposals for the future.

Canadians were honoured by the visit of Her Majesty the Queen, the Prince of Wales, the Duke of Edinburgh and the Princess Anne, all of whom assisted in the celebrations of the Centenary of the Province of Manitoba and of the Northwest Territories. Their visit to our northern and arctic regions helped to remind the people of Canada of this vast frontier's great potential for growth and development.

Recognizing the promise of the North, you have enacted legislation to promote its development. You have enacted amendments to the Yukon Act, the Northwest Territories Act, and the Territorial Lands Act to provide the residents of those territories with greater responsibility in the administration of their respective governments. You have enacted amendments to the Oil and Gas Production and Conservation Act, and have passed the Northern Inland Waters Act, and the Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act in order to assure that the development of the North's abundant resources will not be accompanied by destruction of its undespoiled environment.

Your concern for the quality of our environment in all regions of Canada also moved you to enact the Canada Water Act which will provide the framework for the preservation and restoration of this most essential of our resources.

You have adopted a number of measures to assist the development as well as the conservation of our natural resources. You have enacted the Saltfish Act and amendments to the Fisheries Act and the Coastal Fisheries Protection Act. You have amended the Territorial Seas and Fishing Zones Act creating, in so doing, new, exclusive fishing zones and protecting this resource from the danger of total depletion.

In order to provide for the more effective administration of our energy resources, you have enacted amendments to the National Energy Board

Act and have passed the Dominion Coal Board Dissolution Act. To offer protection from possible hazards resulting from the development of our energy resources, you have passed the Nuclear Liability Act.

In addition to your actions for the responsible development of our resources and preservation of our environment, you have enacted legislation intended to protect and assist the consumer and improve the quality of our life. You have passed the Textile Labelling Act, the Radiation Emitting Devices Act and the Standards Council of Canada Act. You have received for consideration Proposals for Metric Conversion in Canada in order that our country can study the advantages of adopting this widely accepted basis for international measurement and standardization. You have enacted the Motor Vehicle Safety Act, a measure which will make more secure, travel on our highways, and assist in combatting air pollution in our cities.

Protection of the fundamental liberties of all Canadians was extended by amendments to the Criminal Code with respect to hate propaganda, and by the passage of the Expropriation of Land Act. By enacting the Criminal Records Act, and amendments to the Supreme Court Act, you provided for more effective and enlightened reform of offenders and for the better administration of justice. In order that our laws can be reviewed more comprehensively and made to respond more quickly to the needs of a rapidly changing society, you passed the Law Reform Commission Act.

You have taken steps to assist the farmers of Canada by enacting the Prairie Grain Provisional Payment Act 1969-70 and amendments to the Agricultural Products Co-operative Marketing Act. You approved Operation Lift which brought financial relief to hard-pressed farmers by reducing production costs and stockpiles of grain.

You provided further assistance towards the education of our young people when you enacted amendments to the Children of War Dead (Education Assistance) Act and to the Canada Student Loans Act.

Constantly aware of the need to maintain high standards of health for the people of Canada, you enacted amendments to the Canada Shipping Act (Part V) and you passed the Quarantine Act. Deep concern about the harmful effects on the individual and society of the non-medical use of drugs moved the Government to receive the Interim Report of the Commission of Inquiry into this controversial subject.

By enacting the Statute Law (Supplementary Retirement Benefits) Amendment Act 1970, you provided more adequate pensions for public servants who have devoted their energies to the service of our nation.

Consistent with Canada's desire to strengthen the effectiveness of the United Nations, the Government submitted proposals for the procedural and organisational reform of the General Assembly. In the world body, Canadian representatives exercised a leading role in negotiations to achieve international agreement on the peaceful use of the seabed and ocean floor.

Following a comprehensive review of Canada's external relations, the Government continued to undertake new diplomatic initiatives in different parts of the world. A ministerial mission was dispatched to the Caribbean and negotiations were continued with the representatives of the People's Republic of China with the aim of establishing formal diplomatic relations with that government. Consistent with its desire to give full expression to two official languages and to exchange cultural and technological information with the francophonie, the Government ratified the Convention of the Agency for Cultural and Technical Co-operation among French-speaking countries.

The Prime Minister visited with Secretary-General U Thant at the United Nations. The Government's desire to expand diplomatic and trade relations with the countries of the Pacific rim was illustrated by the Prime Minister's visit to New Zealand, Australia, Malaysia, Singapore, and Japan, including Expo '70 at Osaka.

The Prime Minister and his colleagues received a number of leaders of other countries, including the President of Cameroun; the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom; the Premier of the British Honduras; and the Foreign Ministers of Israel, Upper Volta, and Turkey.

In order to assist the under-developed nations of the world, you have increased the total aid budget by sixteen per cent and undertaken to increase this budget year by year. You have enacted legislation creating the International Development Research Centre so that methods of assistance might be studied and improved.

The past year has been marked by an abatement of inflationary pressures. This was the direct result of the Government's economic policies and the strict control it has exercised over its own expenditures. Rising costs, however, continue to jeopardize price stability and the Government must not relax its efforts to bring about a greater consistency between future cost increases and productivity growth.

Favourable balance of payment trends led to a strengthening of the Canadian dollar. Upward pressure on the dollar intensified this year and on May 31, 1970, the Canadian dollar was allowed to seek its natural level. The Canadian Government declared, however, that it intended to resume its obligations under the IMF articles of agreement when circumstances would permit.

You have continued in your efforts to eliminate regional economic disparities and to encourage the development of our economy. You have enacted amendments to the Industral Research and Development Incentives Act. You have also enacted amendments to the Small Business Loans Act, to the Quebec Savings Bank Act, to the Foreign Insurance Companies Act, the Trust Companies Act, the Loans Companies Act and to the Canadian and British Insurance Companies Act.

You have made provision for a more just and equitable administration of our financial and commercial affairs by enacting amendments to the Bills of Exchange Act and the Canada Corporations Act.

Committees of both the House of Commons and the Senate have considered the Government's Proposals for Tax Reform and have made recommendations thereon. Committees in the Senate have continued their studies of the mass media, of poverty, and of science policy. In the House of Commons, committees have studied a great variety of matters including veterans' pensions, interest rates, external affairs, defence policy, electronic eavesdropping, and unemployment insurance.

The Constitutional Conference continued the difficult task of seeking a national political con-

sensus that will reflect the needs and aspirations of all Canadians. To assist in achieving this objective, you have established a Special Joint Committee on the Constitution.

Many other important initiatives have been taken during this session; much legislation of administrative importance has also been enacted; we have accomplished a great deal. But our immense task has only begun. We must continue to work together, to combine our strength, our will, and our imagination in the building of a peaceful, dynamic and prosperous society.

Members of the House of Commons:

I thank you for the provision you have made for the public services in the previous and the current fiscal year.

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

May Divine Providence continue to bless our country.

This concluded the second session of the twenty-eighth Parliament.

END OF SESSION